



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

Mulbarton, Bracon Ash, Swardeston and East  
Carleton

## Contents

SN0026SL .....	3
SN0195 .....	11
SN0247 .....	19
SN0315 .....	29
SN0367 .....	37
SN0426 .....	45
SN0428 .....	55
SN0496REV.....	63
SN0517SL .....	72
SN0549 .....	80
SN0551 .....	88
SN0600REV.....	97
SN1037 .....	106
SN1058 .....	114
SN1059SL .....	122
SN2039 .....	130
SN2087 .....	139
SN2087REVA .....	147
SN2165 .....	156
SN4032 .....	165
SN4059 .....	174
SN4082 .....	182
SN4086 .....	190
SN5000SL .....	198
SN5005 .....	208

## SN0026SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0026SL
Site address	Jasmine Cottage, The Street, Bracon Ash
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusal for three dwellings
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.36 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – single dwelling
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for a single dwelling at 3 dwellings/ha (would be 9 dwellings at 25/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 constrained due to backland nature of site  <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.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 1.6km with footways  Distance to bus service 300 metres with footways  Distance to Co-op in Mulbarton 1km with footway	

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 Bracon Ash village hall 200 metres with footway  Distance to Worlds End public house 1.5km largely with footway  Distance to sports facilities at Mulbarton 2km with footway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	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	Amber	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk covering much of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Relatively contained in landscape and would not compromise nucleate character of settlements. Not in high agricultural soil classification	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Backland development would have poor relationship with other development along The Street	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Access would be onto B1113 which has a footway  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision.	Red
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?	Site would have poor relationship with existing pattern of development in settlement. Although there are existing dwellings to the rear of dwellings fronting onto The Street, this would be to the rear of those dwellings essentially creating a further line of backland development which would also result in harm to the amenities of the existing properties from what would be a convoluted access arrangement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	As noted above, the access arrangement would be convoluted given the existing dwelling to the rear of Jasmine Cottage. Highway advise would be needed on suitability of existing access point onto the highway to serve a further dwelling	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Land used ancillary to residential use. 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 west. Domestic garden space to north and south. Agricultural to east. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees, hedging and some fencing	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Lots of trees on or around site which development of the site would be likely to impact on with a number potentially needing removal	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on or adjacent to site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	No public views of site which is visually well contained	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 to include in settlement limit as inappropriate backland development	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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?	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)	One dwelling unlikely to require any off-site improvements	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 not provided but is only looking to provide one dwelling on a site less than 0.5 hectares so no affordable housing requirement	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 for a settlement limit extension. However, the site is has surface water flood risk issues and Highways' concerns about the suitability of the local road network.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site has convoluted access and is to the rear of existing backland development, with potential amenity issues. Potential loss of trees to develop the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to 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 backland development, out of keeping with the exiting settlement pattern, requiring a convoluted access and with potential amenity concerns for existing residents. Highways concerned about the suitability of the local road network. Surface water flood risk and potential loss off trees would also need to be addressed.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

SN0195

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0195
Site address	Land off the B1113 Norwich Road, Bracon Ash
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development but no recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation – 15 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**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access to the site would be directly onto B1113 with possible visibility issues  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Visibility from existing access onto B1113 would appear to be constrained by third party land and access is too narrow. Also no continuous footway on east side of B1113 linking site to Mulbarton.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 500 metres largely with footway  Bus service in close proximity  Distance to Budgens and Post Office in Mulbarton 500 metres largely with footway	

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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 900 metres largely with footways  Distance to Worlds End public house 800 metres largely with footways	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, electricity and gas are all available; unsure about mains sewerage	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	Large part of site in Flood Zone 2 and some within Flood Zone 3a	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Relatively contained and would be read against backdrop of estate development in landscape terms. Would also erode landscape gap between settlements. Not in high grade agricultural soil classification	Green
Townscape	Amber	As a consequence of need to access site from B1113, development of the site would have a poor relationship with adjacent estate development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south-west	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Conservation Area and listed buildings to north of site  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	B1113 is more rural in character as it passes the site with higher speeds, although there is a footway on the other side of the road  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Visibility from existing access onto B1113 would appear to be constrained by third party land and access is too narrow. Also no continuous footway on east side of B1113 linking site to Mulbarton.	Red
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 this would impact on setting of conservation area from its southern approach along the B1113. It would also have a poor relationship with existing development in the area as there would be no connectivity with adjoining development to the east with the development being entirely accessed off the B1113.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential issues due to speed of traffic. Likely to need 30mph speed limit to be extended to south	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 to south and on opposite side of B1113 to west. Residential to east. Likely to be no compatibility issues although clarification over cabinet to north is required to confirm this	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Thick hedging and trees on southern and highway 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 hedgerows	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination. Clarification over cabinet to north of site would be required if site were to be progressed.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is relatively contained from public views due to thick vegetation on boundaries	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 would erode gap between settlements of Bracon Ash and Mulbarton. Also does not relate well to existing development and has potential harm on setting of conservation area. Large parts of site are also at risk of flooding. Site should not therefore be progressed.	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 ownership. Promoted by SNC.	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)	Possible improvements to footways to connect to site	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	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. However, there are concerns regarding the relationship to the existing development, both in terms of form and connectivity. Consideration would need to be given to the impact on the approach to the Mulbarton Conservation Area from the south and sense of gap between Bracon Ash and Mulbarton.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Although adjacent to built-up area of Mulbarton it does not relate well to the estate development to the east with no connectivity. All access would need to be from the B1113, where development could also impact on the setting of the conservation area from the approach on this road. Would also erode the gap between Bracon Ash and Mulbarton.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to 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:**

Poor relationship with existing development, both in terms of form and connectivity, as well as the erosion of gap between Bracon Ash and Mulbarton and the impact on the setting of Mulbarton Conservation Area. The current access is too narrow and visibility improvements appear to require third party land. Flood risk is a constraint, with most of the site in Zone 2 and parts in Zone 3a.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

SN0247

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0247
Site address	Site off Low Common, East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Recent approvals to change use of part of site including access from public highway into residential garden (2019/1718) and remainder to equestrian use (2019/0744). Application for three dwellings on the site refused in 2018 (2018/0912, also dismissed on appeal) and eight dwellings in 2017 (2017/1686). Numerous historic refusals for residential development.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.95 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – 4 to 10 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 11 dwellings/ha as promoted.  (would be 24 dwellings at 25/ha)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield (primarily but with some remnants of former structures)

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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
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	Only possible access passes through garden  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> - Red. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No direct access to the highway, unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility, or to deliver required improvement to form safe/acceptable access.	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 Mulbarton school and surgery 3.3km only partly with footways, some of which are very restricted in width.</p> <p>Distance to bus service 1.15km with little footway provision</p> <p>Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in Swardeston all over 1km away but within 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>		Cricket club within settlement less than 1.8km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>NCC M&amp;W</b> – A site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. The site is also within 400m of a consultation area for a safeguarded key Water Recycling Centre. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
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	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	Green	Relatively contained within existing pattern of development. No loss of high grade agricultural soil	Green
Townscape	Green	Linear pattern of development that site does not relate to	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Swardeston Common CWS to east  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat - potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Constrained network of narrow country lanes  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> - Red. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No direct access to the highway, unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility, or to deliver required improvement to form safe/acceptable access.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Horticultural and residential	Green



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	New dwellings on this site would not relate well to the existing linear character of development in the area and result in urbanisation to the rural character of the public footpath	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may no longer be achievable now the land adjacent to the public highway has been incorporated into private gardens	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Permitted equestrian use. Some remnants of existing structures but unlikely to result in significant costs to remove them	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 the site to north and east, with land associated with the former horticultural use to the south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Slight undulations but relatively level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Post and rail fence with newly planted hedge on northern boundary with footpath. Belt of trees divides site from land to south.	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 grassland	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)	Possible contamination from former structures but should be able to be mitigated	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 right of way that bounds site to the north	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 would not relate well to the existing form and character of the area, and is also remote from services and in particular Mulbarton school which is over 3km away	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?	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 not stated that affordable housing will be provided	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site potentially suitable size for a settlement limit extension, although there is no current settlement limit in this location, or possibly a small allocation. However, development would need to respect the linear pattern of existing development, otherwise it would have an urbanising effect on this rural location. Site is also at the limits of accessibility to services in terms of distance, a problem which is exacerbated by the lack of footways.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Development of site would not relate well to linear development. Furthermore, access may no longer be achievable due to change of use of part of the highways verge to domestic garden, possibly outside of the control of the promoter.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and removed from any development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable. No indication has been given as to whether affordable housing is deliverable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Site not suitable for allocation or inclusion in settlement limit due to: remoteness from the services and facilities in Swardeston and Mulbarton, exacerbated by the lack of footways; out of keeping in terms of form and character; and possible deliverability issues, specifically regarding a suitable access.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

## SN0315

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0315
Site address	Land to the east of Mulbarton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	130.087 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Residential led strategic extension of Mulbarton
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Potentially in excess of 3,000 dwellings at 25/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	Green	Access should be achievable, however despite being a large site, points of access are all onto relatively minor rural roads between the B1113 and A140.	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>	Green	Distance to Mulbarton school 700 metres  Distance to bus service 500 metres  Distance to Mulbarton surgery 700 metres  Distance to shops in Mulbarton 700 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ café o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Mulbarton village hall 800 metres  Distance to Worlds End public house 1.25km  Distance to sports facilities at Mulbarton 800 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Parts of site within areas under consideration for further upgrades or no planned upgrade	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	Areas of identified surface water flooding along and close to Rectory Lane. Surface water flow path through north-western part of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland and Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Part in D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland, part in B1 Tas Tributary Farmland and part in C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Significant impact on all local landscape types as even development of any smaller portion of the overall site would still be intrusive into rural landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Red	No relationship with existing townscape	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Lodge Farm and associated barn on Rectory Lane are Grade II listed. Other heritage assets in wider vicinity	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Largely agricultural land	Green



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of most portions of the site would be removed from the existing settlement. The only portion that could relate to the existing settlement is assessed under SN4059.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable on some part of the site	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Primarily 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)	Primarily agricultural land with no compatibility uses	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Some level changes over the wider site but no significant changes that would impede development	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedging on many field and highway boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	In addition to trees and hedging on field and highway boundaries there are some ponds within the site	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power cables running north south through the site to the west of Shotesham Road and Gowthorpe Lane meeting at substation by Church Road	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 a number of roads and public footpaths	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 poor relationship with existing settlement	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	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)	Highway improvements would be likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	As part of a strategic site there would be a number of public benefits. None identified from allocating part of the site for 12 to 25 dwellings	

## 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. However, the site is largely detached from the existing settlement by other fields which are assessed separately. Whilst there are various access points to the site, these are on smaller rural roads between the main B1113 and A140 which are mostly narrow and lacking in footways. Surface water flood risk and heritage concerns affect parts of the site. All parts of the site likely to need Broadband upgrades.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site has a poor relationship with the existing settlement, being largely detached by intervening fields. Most areas of the site would impact on the local landscape characteristics. The local highways network appears constrained.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside of 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 wider site is significantly too large in the context of the Village Clusters document. No smaller parts of the site are considered suitable due to the poor relationship with existing settlement (i.e. detached by intervening fields), and the consequent townscape/landscape concerns. Whilst parts of the site are in close proximity to some local services and facilities, actual accessibility is much more limited due to the constraints of the local highway network. Areas of the site are also affected by surface water flood risk and heritage concerns.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 14 December 2020

SN0367

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0367
Site address	Land off Chesnut Close, Swardeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	History of refused and withdrawn applications with most recent for six dwellings (2010/2152)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.55 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – 3 or 4 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	7 dwellings/ha as promoted. (would be 14 dwellings at 25.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 via private drive  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Site remote from the highway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of restrict width and lack of footway provision. No safe continuous footway to catchment primary school. Site is remote from local services.	Red
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	Green	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 2.6km partly along footways but some restricted in size  Distance to bus service 540m largely without footway  Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in Swardeston.	

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>		Cricket club within settlement close to site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas 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  <b>NCC M&amp;W</b> - The site is within 400m of a consultation area for a safeguarded key Water Recycling Centre. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk 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	Not applicable

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Potential impact on character of common. Not high grade agricultural soil classification.	Amber
Townscape	Green	In between two existing clusters of dwellings which development would relate well to	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Swardeston Common CWS <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. Adjacent to Swardeston Common (registered common). Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Heritage assets nearby including grade II listed farmhouse to north <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Local road network relatively constrained between access and B1113 <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Site remote from the highway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of restrict width and lack of footway provision. No safe continuous footway to catchment primary school. Site is remote from local services.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Possible disturbance from sporting activities on the common	Amber



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development will infill between exiting clusters of dwellings on the western side of the common. However this would have an enclosing effect	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Development would use a soft surface private access that already serves a number of dwellings. NCC Highways would need to give a view on whether further dwellings being served from this access is acceptable.	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)	Common to east where sporting activities such as cricket occur, however it is considered that these are unlikely to result in such disturbance to make residential development on the site unacceptable. Residential to north and south	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on boundary with common, post and rail fence with private access	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Common to east likely to provide some habitat whilst further to the north there is a County Wildlife 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	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 relatively screened by hedge from common. Only other views are from private drive.	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)	Inclusion in settlement limit not considered appropriate due to impact on common	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?	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 not stated that affordable housing will be provided	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site could be suitable in size to be included in an extended settlement limit extension. Whilst the site would link two small groups of housing, those at the southern end of Chestnut Close (which is unadopted) were permitted as the redevelopment of a brownfield site. The site is also close to Swardeston Common CWS and a Grade II Listed farmhouse and has surface water flood risk along the eastern boundary.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is accessed by a private driveway (Chestnut Close) and Highways are concerned about the suitability of the local road network, which has few footways (although much of it is open to The Common). The site would have a potentially adverse impact on The Common in terms of the character of the area.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to 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:**

Not suitable for inclusion as a settlement limit extension due to impact on the character of the area, particularly The Common, and access constraints; the site has limited accessibility to local services and facilities, with many of the local roads having no footways.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

SN0426

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0426
Site address	Land to the west of Norwich Road, Swardeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation – approximately 25 dwellings  (NOTE: the site was previously promoted for 6.86ha/ 173 dwellings but was amended due to the emerging village clusters strategy. A contingency site of a further 1 ha/ 25 dwellings has also been promoted at this time)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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



### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<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	Existing field access. Access is likely to be achievable  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Access would require removal of frontage trees & hedges, along with provision of frontage footway widening. No safe walking route to catchment school/village facilities. Site remote from local services	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>Separated from settlement. Narrow footpath provides walking route 100m north to edge of settlement. 200m to bus stops and limited village services.</p> <p>Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in settlement. Expanded range of services in Mulbarton.</p> <p>2 km walking route to primary school and healthcare services in Mulbarton. Capacity of school could be constraint to development – NCC to confirm. Continuous footpath but narrow in sections creating hostile walking environment</p> <p>Hourly daytime bus service (including peak time) through settlement between Norwich and Mulbarton</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>Cricket club within settlement</p> <p>Village/community hall, pub, café and day nursery located in Mulbarton - 2km walking route</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	The sewerage capacity and waste water treatment plant are considered to be a constraint on the development of this site (further evidence required to determine whether these impacts could be mitigated)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No evidence of servicing by utilities	Amber



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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  <b>NCC M&amp;W</b> - The site is within 400m of a consultation area for a safeguarded key Water Recycling Centre. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is within flood zone 1. Small area of SW flood risk identified on northern boundary. Could be mitigated through layout	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	Amber	Would represent a breakout to south that would adversely impact on open character of southern approach to settlement	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would represent a breakout to south that would affect form and character of settlement	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any detrimental impacts are likely to be mitigated  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Red	Impact on setting of listed church to north (views of senior heritage officer sought)  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Red
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Significant constraints to the local road network and the ability to create a satisfactory footpath connection to the settlement  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access would require removal of frontage trees & hedges, along with provision of frontage footway widening. No safe walking route to catchment school/village facilities. Site remote from local services	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Low density residential in extensive grounds to north. Impact of development likely to be mitigated.	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would adversely affect setting of listed church. Separate from and poorly related to existing settlement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Highways view required. Would result in loss of hedgerow	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Low density residential to north. Likely to be compatible, subject to design	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	No significant changes	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with trees to northern boundary. Lower hedgerow to eastern boundary with highway.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant trees within northern hedgerow 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)	Greenfield - unlikely to be contaminated	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is part of larger area of land which contributes to open rural approach to settlement from south. These views limited by hedgerow further south beyond this site. Site prominent from highway along southern approach and, at density proposed, would introduce suburban estate development harmful to landscape character.	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 represent a breakout to south affecting form and character of settlement and landscape character. Poor pedestrian connectivity to settlement with highway and landscape considerations restricting improvements. Impact on setting of listed building.	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		
Open countryside		
Minerals policy CS16	Further investigation may be required.	
<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?	Private single ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated and is reasonably well located in terms of distance to services in Swardeston and Mulbarton. However, the site is not well related to the existing form/pattern of development and is within the setting of a collection of listed buildings including the Grade II\* St Mary's Church, as well as the Old Rectory, the Old Vicarage and the War Memorial.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site would represent a breakout to the south of Swardeston affecting form and character of settlement and landscape character. Poor pedestrian connectivity to the settlement and highway and landscape considerations would restrict improvements. Impact on setting of listed buildings.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside and separated from the development boundary for this settlement. Minerals policy CS16 applies.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available within the plan period.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is not considered suitable for allocation due to the separation from the main part of the settlement by the undeveloped grounds of Swardeston House; the site would impact adversely on both the landscape and townscape, an issue that would be emphasised by the loss of frontage vegetation to create a suitable access. Potential impact on the setting of the Grade II\* Listed church, and adjoining listed Old Rectory, Old Vicarage and War Memorial. Pedestrian connectivity is also poor.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 11 May 2020

SN0428

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0428
Site address	Land north of Rectory Road, East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – frontage development of 5 to 10 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	17 dwellings/ha as promoted. (Would be 15 dwellings at 25/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	Visibility may be constrained by vegetation on boundary  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Access subject to providing acceptable visibility, provision of carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m wide footway at the site frontage. 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



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 Mulbarton school and surgery 2km, large parts without footways</p> <p>Distance to bus service 1.6km, largely without footways</p> <p>Distance to Budes and post office in Mulbarton 2km, large parts without footways</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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 2.3km, large parts without footways</p> <p>Distance to Worlds End public house 1.5km, large parts without footways</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
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	Green	Some surface water flood risk on 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	Relatively contained in landscape given existing pattern of development and woodland. Would not result in loss of high grade agricultural soil	Green
Townscape	Amber	Site contributes positively to wooded character of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south-east	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential impact on setting of church to west; also listed cottage in relatively close proximity to west  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rectory Road is not overly constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access subject to providing acceptable visibility, provision of carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m wide footway at the site frontage. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and parkland	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Woodland on the site contributes positively to the character of the area which would be eroded if the site were to be developed	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Likely to be achievable if loss of woodland on site was deemed acceptable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Woodland with no likely abnormal financial costs from redevelopment or demolition	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Parkland to north and residential to south on opposite side of road. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Fence on highway boundary. Rear boundary is undefined within woodland	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site is wooded which is likely to provide good habitat	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 or adjacent to site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is wooded so views into site are limited. If woodland were to be cleared then would be views across site from Rectory 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)	Loss of woodland that contributes positively to character of area and for biodiversity.	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?	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 likely to be required	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site suitable in size for small allocation; however, it is at the margins of the acceptable distances to local/services and facilities along roads with very limited footway provision. Consideration would need to be given to the impact of removal of the trees on the site to the character of the settlement, including the Grade II\* listed Church of Sy Mary to the northwest of the site, and biodiversity.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is wooded, which contributes positively to the character of the area and to biodiversity.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and removed from any 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:**

East Carleton does not currently have a Settlement Limit to extend, and the site is at the margins of the acceptable distances to services, on roads that have very limited footway provision (and sections which are unlit and subject to the national speed limit). It is also not suitable due to harmful impact on the character of area that would result from the removal of the trees on site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

## SN0496REV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0496REV
Site address	Land north of Mulbarton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Refused application for up to 135 dwellings (planning application 2018/0872).
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	7.28 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation – approx. 60 dwellings with care home for elderly care and a doctor's surgery or up to 95 dwellings without the care home and doctor's surgery
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Density as promoted of approximately 13 dwellings/ha.  (would be 182 dwellings at 25/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	Constraints to be overcome to deliver safe access  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to safe access at Norwich Road. Provision of frontage footway with a minimum width of 2.0m and safe crossing facility at B1113. Footway improvements between site and Mulbarton village required. Improvement of PROW required at south boundary of site and between site and The Common.	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 Mulbarton school and surgery 700 metres (via unsurfaced footpath through churchyard) or 1.2km (via access roads and footways along B1113)</p> <p>Distance to bus service 375 metres</p> <p>Distance to Budgens and post office in Mulbarton 1km (via unsurfaced footpath through churchyard) or 1.5km (via access roads and footways along B1113)</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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 420 metres (via unsurfaced footpath through churchyard) or 920 metres (via access roads and footways along B1113)</p> <p>Distance to Worlds End public house 400 metres</p>	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 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 surface water flood risk on site but this would not prevent development of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland and Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Northern part of site is within C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland, southern part is within D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Erosion of rural character on network of public footpaths to the east of the site. No loss of high grade agricultural soil	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Poor relationship with main part of settlement due to lack of connectivity with existing development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Mulbarton Common to south is County Wildlife Site  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat -potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Adjacent to Mulbarton Common SSSI. Need to maintain connectivity for GCN using the common.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Close to heritage assets including conservation area and grade II* listed church, as well as other listed buildings  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Constraints in terms of footway provision and nature of B1113</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to safe access at Norwich Road. Provision of frontage footway with a minimum width of 2.0m and safe crossing facility at B1113. Footway improvements between site and Mulbarton village required. Improvement of PROW required at south boundary of site and between site and The Common.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural, residential and churchyard	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site has a poor relationship with the existing settlement due to the lack of connectivity. Furthermore, it would also have an adverse impact on the setting of the church and conservation area, particularly for users of the public footpath network to the east of the site	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	A safe access should be achievable from the site, although the currently proposed arrangements would need the views of the highway authority	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no potential 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 west, churchyard to south-west and agricultural to north and east. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Revised site is relatively level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow and trees on most boundaries, including field boundaries within revised site	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential adverse impact on great crested newts as well as mitigation would be required where hedgerows are lost	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)	Overhead power cables cross part of southern site. No evidence of 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 PROW from church to east of site and also from B1113 on approach to village of northern section 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)	Development of the site will have a significant impact on the setting of the church and conservation area by introducing development into currently undeveloped views of from the public footpath network to the east. The site also has poor connectivity to the village due to the lack of links other than the unsurfaced public footpath direct from the site to the centre of the village.	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?	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)	Improvements may be required to B1113 where access is proposed and footways into Mulbarton	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Yes, options include care home and doctor's surgery	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is too large for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings, unless an exception is made to allow for the delivery of a care home and doctor's surgery, although additional information would be needed to demonstrate that these are deliverable. It is also unclear what the access arrangements would be for a smaller site (circa 25 units). Other issues raised during the previous application on the site include the possible impact on Great Crested Newts and mitigation for the loss of hedgerows.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Development of the site will have a significant impact on the setting of the church and conservation area by introducing development into currently undeveloped views of from the public footpath network to the east. The site also has poor connectivity to the village due to the lack of links other than the unsurfaced public footpath direct from the site to the centre of the village

### **Local Plan Designations**

The site is outside, but close to, the development boundary for Mulbarton.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

95 dwellings is larger than being sought in the VCHAP and it is not clear whether the 60 dwellings with a doctors surgery and care home would be (a) deliverable, or (b) possible to require. In any event, the site is poorly related to the rest of the settlement, and has both heritage concerns (impact on the listed church, Paddock Farm, and the Conservation Area) and landscape concerns (erosion of rural character from the public footpaths to the east). In terms of accessibility the site requires footways improvements to the B1113 and also to the footpath via the churchyard; however, a significantly reduced scheme would be unlikely to connect to the churchyard footpath and it is not clear what the B1113 junction arrangement would be for a smaller scheme. and it is not clear what the B1113 junction arrangement would be for a smaller scheme.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

## SN0517SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0517SL
Site address	Land off The Common, Swardeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Site is linked to various previous planning applications for development to north
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.39 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Settlement limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10 dwellings at 25/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 via private drive  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Site remote from the highway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of restrict width and lack of footway provision. No safe continuous footway to catchment primary school. Site is remote from local services.	Red
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	Green	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 2.6km partly along footways but some restricted in size  Distance to bus service 540m largely without footway  Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in Swardeston.	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ café o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Cricket club within settlement close to site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas 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  <b>NCC M&amp;W</b> - The site is also within 400m of a consultation area for a safeguarded key Water Recycling Centre. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk identified around pond in north-east corner	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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Potential impact on character of common. Not high grade agricultural soil classification.	Amber
Townscape	Green	In between two existing clusters of dwellings which development would relate well to	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Swardeston Common CWS <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to Swardeston Common (registered common). Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Access passes listed building and other listed buildings to south <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Local road network relatively constrained between access and B1113 <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Site remote from the highway. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of restrict width and lack of footway provision. No safe continuous footway to catchment primary school. Site is remote from local services.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Possible disturbance from sporting activities on the common	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development will infill between exiting clusters of dwellings on the western side of the common. However this would have an enclosing effect	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Development would use a soft surface private access that already serves a number of dwellings. NCC Highways would need to give a view on whether further dwellings being served from this access is acceptable.	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)	Common to east where sporting activities such as cricket occur, however it is considered that these are unlikely to result in such disturbance to make residential development on the site unacceptable. Residential to north and south	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on boundary with common, post and rail fence with private access to south.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within site and pond in north-east corner	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 relatively screened by hedge from common other than from private drive to south where it passes into the common.	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)	Inclusion in settlement limit not considered appropriate due to impact on common	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?	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 not stated that affordable housing will be provided	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site could be suitable in size to be included in an extended settlement limit extension. Whilst the site would link two small groups of housing, those north of the site at the southern end of Chestnut Close were permitted as the redevelopment of a brownfield site. Neither of these groups of dwellings are themselves within the existing Settlement Limit.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is accessed by a lengthy private driveway already serving four houses and Highways are concerned about the suitability of the local road network, which has few footways (although much of it is open to The Common). The site would have a potentially adverse impact on The Common in terms of the character of the area.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside of, and not adjacent 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:**

Not suitable for inclusion as a settlement limit extension due to impact on the character of the area, particularly The Common, and access constraints. Neither of the adjoining small groups of dwellings are within the Settlement Limit. The site has limited accessibility to local services and facilities, with many of the local roads having no footways.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

SN0549

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0549
Site address	Barracks Meadow, Hawkes Lane, Bracon Ash
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusal for one dwelling on part of site; no recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.86 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – up to 9 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5 dwellings/ha as promoted. (would be 46 dwellings at 25/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 may require highway alterations to Hawkes Lane  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber.</b> The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision.	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 Mulbarton school and school 2.2km, partly with footways  Distance to bus service 860km, partly with footways  Distance to Co-op in Mulbarton 1.5km, partly with footways	

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 Bracon Ash village hall 340 metres with no footways  Distance to Worlds End public house 2.2km partly with footways	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
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	Identified surface water flood risk to south of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	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 landscape by existing development. No loss of high grade agricultural soil	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development of site as a whole would not respect existing pattern of development along Hawkes Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to two County Wildlife Sites	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Several listed buildings in the vicinity  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Hawkes Lane constrained with no footway provision  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural land residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on setting of Home Farm House and Mergate Farm which are both listed buildings as well as buildings which could be considered non-designated heritage assets would need to be considered and may be found to be unacceptable, however development of this field for nine dwellings would result in some form of small estate development that would not respect the pattern of development along Hawkes Lane	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Immediate access to be site should be achievable but Hawkes Lane is very constrained with previous highway concerns raised about other development in the vicinity	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no potential redevelopment or contamination 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 north and east on opposite side of Hawkes Lane, residential properties in large plots to west, common land to south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedges, with woodland on common land to south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in hedges and trees on boundaries, but main concern would be on common to south which is County Wildlife 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)	Overhead power lines run across site. No evidence of 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	Some views into site from Hawkes Lane and public footpath to west of 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)	Development of this site likely to have adverse impact on form and character of area and also constrained access down narrow lane	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?	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)	Possible improvements to Hawkes Lane may be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has not stated that affordable housing will be provided	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site suitable in size to be allocated. However the site would not respect the form and character of development on Hawkes Lane, even if limiting this large site to 9 dwellings would. Potential heritage impact on nearby listed buildings (including Home Farm House and Mergate Farm). Highways concerns about the narrowness of Hawkes Lane and also the ability to provide good quality pedestrian access to facilities in Mulbarton.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Field accessed down narrow lane with linear pattern of development on either side of the road. Development of the field as a whole would not be sympathetic to the character of Hawkes Lane.

### **Local Plan Designations**

The site is outside but adjacent 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:**

Not suitable for allocation or a settlement limit extension of the scale proposed, which would be out of keeping with the form and character of the location and have potential heritage concerns re Home Farm House and Mergate Farm. Access is along the narrow Hawkes Lane, with no footways and limited visibility at bends.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

## SN0551

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0551
Site address	Land to the rear of Almond Villa, Intwood Lane, Swardeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary (other than access)
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Settlement limit extension for undefined number of bungalows
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At 25dph this would equate to 25 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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



### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Red	Very constrained access  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its restricted width and lack of footway provision. No continuous footway to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red

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 Mulbarton school and surgery 3.3km partly along footways but some restricted in size</p> <p>Distance to bus service 650m largely without footway</p> <p>Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in Swardeston.</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>		Cricket club within settlement	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>NCC M&amp;W</b> – A site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some surface water flood risk 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	New development would protrude out of existing pattern of development. Not in higher agricultural soil classification	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Does not respect existing linear form of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Narrow constrained lane with no footways</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of its restricted width and lack of footway provision. No continuous footway to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p>	Red
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 not respect the form and character of the linear frontage development along Intwood Lane	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Very narrow access unlikely to be acceptable	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 to west, domestic garden to north, agricultural to east and south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Descending from north to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and some trees on agricultural boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedgerows and trees	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 very contained with few 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)	Development would not relate well to the existing form and character of this part of the settlement. It is also doubtful an adequate access can be provided and is over 3km from Mulbarton school.	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		
Southern Bypass Protection Zone		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Conflicts with objectives of southern bypass 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?		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)	Possible improvements to secure access	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	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. However the site is at limits in terms of distance to services and in townscape terms would be backland development out of keeping with the character of the area and with potential impacts on residential amenity. Highways do not consider it possible to create a suitable access.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Linear pattern of development which development of this site would not relate well to. It is also very doubtful an adequate access can be provided and is over 3km from Mulbarton school.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent 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 at the limits in terms of distances to services and the roads around the site are narrow, unlit, with no footways, making walking/cycling an unattractive option. The site would be backland development, out of keeping with the frontage only development at present and may also have amenity implications. The main concern with this site is the inability to create a suitable access.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020



## SN0600REV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0600REV  (NB: This site is a merged site, formerly comprising of: SN0600, SN2152 and SN2167)
Site address	Land to the east of Hethersett Road, East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.02 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – 10 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10 dwelling/ha as promoted.  (would be 25 dwellings at 25/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	Access can be obtained from Hethersett Road	Green
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	Red	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 3km, mainly without footways  Distance to bus service 2.3km, mainly without footways  Distance to Budgens and post office in Mulbarton 3km, mainly without footways  Local employment at business centre 200 metres with footways	

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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 3.3km, mainly without footways  Distance to Worlds End public house 2.5km, mainly without footways	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	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	Potential erosion of part of large open landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber

<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Townscape	Amber	Development would need to comprise of an estate form of development which would not been in keeping with largely linear settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential impact on setting of grade II* church to south-west	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Hethersett Road suitable for small additional amount of development	Green
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?	Existing pattern of development in much of village is linear which development of this site would not reflect although there is a small amount of more nucleated development to the south-west of the site at the junction of Hethersett Road and Wymondham Road. Impact on setting of church is listed, but would need confirmation from Senior Heritage and Design Officer	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no potential 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 and south-west. Agricultural on all other boundaries. 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)	Post and rail fencing on boundary with road with recently planted hedgerow.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited impact likely	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	Open views across site from road	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)	Given distance from services and intrusion into open countryside by extending development north of its current northern extent on Hethersett Road is not considered appropriate to allocate this 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)	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Proposal for village hall on adjacent site	



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for a small allocation. However the site would be out of keeping with the form and pattern of the largely linear/frontage development in this location (although Meadow Way has some development in-depth) . Only local employment is within the required distances, and the road network between East Carleton and Mulbarton is unlikely to be attractive for walking and cycling. Potential heritage impact on the Grade II\* Listed church to the south east of the site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site at northern edge of village. Forms part of wider open landscape. Estate development would not relate well to majority of linear pattern of development in village although there is a small nucleated development to south-west of site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and removed from any 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:**

This is not suitable as a settlement limit extension or allocation for housing, given the considerable distance from all of the main services and the intrusion into countryside, which would generally be out of keeping with this rural location.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

## SN1037

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1037
Site address	The Old Nursery, The Drift, Lower East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Housing – level not specified
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At 25dph this would be in excess of 75 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

## Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

### **HELAA Score:**

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

### **Site Score:**

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

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

### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access to site is constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. No access to the highway, network not suitable for development traffic, remote/unsustainable location, no walking route to school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 3.5km only partly with footways, some of which are very restricted in width.  Distance to bus service 1.3km with little footway provision  Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in Swardeston all over 1km away but within 1.8km.	

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>		Cricket club within settlement less than 1.8km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber		Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Area within planning delivery for fibre technology	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p><b>NCC M&amp;W</b> – A site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. The site is also within 400m of a consultation area for a safeguarded key Water Recycling Centre. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some areas of identified surface water flood risk but unlikely to prevent development of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Relatively contained within existing pattern of development. No loss of high grade agricultural soil	Green
Townscape	Amber	Linear pattern of development that site does not relate to	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat - potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained network of narrow country lanes  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. No access to the highway, network not suitable for development traffic, remote/unsustainable location, no walking route to school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	New dwellings on this site would not relate well to the existing linear character of development in the area and result in urbanisation to the local landscape	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access via constrained private tracks unlikely to be suitable for development of this site with potential amenity issues for adjoining properties	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Horticultural use. Some remnants of existing structures but unlikely to result in significant costs to remove them	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Historically linked former horticultural site to north (now permitted equestrian use). Some residential to east. Agricultural 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)	Belt of trees divides site from land to north. Trees and hedging on agricultural 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, hedging and grassland	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)	Possible contamination from former structures but should be able to be mitigated	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views of site relatively limited	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 would not relate well to the existing form and character of the area, and is also remote from services and in particular Mulbarton school which is over 3km away	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?	Within 5 years (part) 15-20 years (remainder)	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 but states that he does not intend to bring the whole site forward in the immediate future	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely to require improvements given scale of site	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potential for affordable housing at above policy requirement	



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is too large to allocate for 12 to 25 dwellings but could potentially be reduced in size. However, even a reduced scale, development of this site would be poorly related to existing development in this location, which generally fronts Low Common and Swardeston Lane. Development would effectively be an isolated group of dwellings in the countryside. The site is at the margins of acceptable distances to services, and beyond 3km to Mulbarton School. Roads in the immediate vicinity are generally narrow with no footways and likely to be unattractive for walk and cycling. Highways are concerned that the site has no direct access to the highway, but uses unadopted roads such as The Drift.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Former horticultural site relatively well contained in landscape by trees and hedging on boundaries. Existing dwellings in the vicinity take the form of linear development along narrow country lanes with no footways.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and removed from development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states that part of the site is available, but part would not be available for the immediate future.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site not suitable for allocation or inclusion in settlement limit due to remoteness from key services and facilities and the narrow roads with no footways between the site and Swardeston/Mulbarton (including stretches under the national speed limit). The site does not appear to have direct access to the adopted highway, instead being accessed via the unadopted The Drift. Even at a reduced site size, development in this location would form a largely isolated group of dwellings in the countryside.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

## SN1058

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1058
Site address	Land east of Swallow Barn, Wymondham Road, East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Refusal for detached dwelling on site (2019/2031)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	No information provided
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15 dwellings at 25/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	Red	Existing access into site, but may require improvements  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Frontage appears to be too constrained to provide acceptable visibility splays in perpetuity. Location considered to be remote with no safe walking route to local facilities including catchment school. Visibility concern at nearby Wymondham Rd junction with Hethersett Road.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 3.3km, mainly without footways  Distance to bus service 2.6km, mainly without footways  Distance to Budgens and post office in Mulbarton 3.2km, mainly without footways  Local employment in business centre in village 500 metres, mainly without footways	

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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 3.5km, mainly without footways  Distance to Worlds End public house 2.7km, mainly without footways	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Further information required	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Information not available	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	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	Would not relate to settlement in open landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Removed from settlement	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to west	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed Whitehouse Farmhouse to west  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Constrained rural lane with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Frontage appears to be too constrained to provide acceptable visibility splays in perpetuity. Location considered to be remote with no safe walking route to local facilities including catchment school. Visibility concern at nearby Wymondham Rd junction with Hethersett Road.	Red
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?	Site is detached from main part of settlement and although close to a small cluster of buildings is remote and does not relate well to existing settlements. Development unlikely to have an adverse impact on the setting of the nearby listed building	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Safe access Has been shown to be achievable in planning application. However, accessibility to services is very poor	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or contamination 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 west, agricultural on all other boundaries. 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 hedging	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in trees and hedging, plus trees 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)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on or adjacent to the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site limited by vegetation on highway boundary.	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 is not suitable due to its detached location from the main part of the settlement of East Carleton and eroding effect on the rural character of the area.	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?	No information provided	

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No information provided	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely to be required	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No information provided	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 but is not connected to an area of settlement that is suitable to create a settlement limit around. Site is also remote from services and facilities, other than local employment, which are accessed via routes with no footways and including sections under the national speed limit.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is well screened from road with a number of trees within the site. It is located down a rural road with no footways and is detached from the main area of settlement in East Carleton.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside and removed from any development boundary.

### **Availability**

Site has been promoted but with no supporting information.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

A previous refused application has demonstrated that the site has limited constraints and that a suitable access could be achieved; however the site is beyond the required distance to services for everything other than local employment, and the routes to Mulbarton generally have no footways and sections at the national speed limit. The site is part of a small group of buildings, detached from East Carleton village, and not suitable for a Settlement Limit as intensifying development here would erode the rural character of the area.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

## SN1059SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1059SL
Site address	Land at Paddock Cottage, Swardeston Lane, East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Planning permission granted for dwelling on site (2017/1760)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.35 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	Settlement limit extension for additional dwelling
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	3 dwellings/ha as promoted.  (would be 9 dwellings at 25/ha)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield (excluding part of site where new dwelling has been constructed)

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Red	Access has been achieved for new dwelling; constrained for remainder of land  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Unlikely to be able to provide safe/acceptable access, network not suitable for development traffic, remote/unsustainable location, no walking route to school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 3.6km only partly with footways, some of which are very restricted in width.  Distance to bus service 1.65km with little footway provision  Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in Swardeston all over 1km away but within 1.8km.	

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		Cricket club within settlement less than 1.8km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green		Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		In area for planned delivery of 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	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	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	Green	Contained within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Amber	Site to rear of new dwelling would not relate well to existing development	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No identified sites in close proximity  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat - potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No identified heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Constrained rural lane with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Unlikely to be able to provide safe/acceptable access, network not suitable for development traffic, remote/unsustainable location, no walking route to school.	Red
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?	Site has already been partly developed with a new dwelling to the front of the site, creating a further new dwelling to the rear of the site would not relate well to existing development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Likely to achievable using shared access with new dwelling	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Equestrian use 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 east and west, domestic garden 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 on boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat in hedging	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 or adjacent to site	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 visually, particularly with new dwelling	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)	Applicant has achieved their stated aim of a new dwelling on the site; a further dwelling is not considered appropriate as this would be backland development and it is also not considered appropriate to draw a settlement limit around this detached cluster of dwellings that are remote from services	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?	Site has been developed	

<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)	Site has been developed for the one dwelling they proposed	n/a
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None required	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No affordable housing 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 suitable size for a settlement limit extension but is not adjacent to an existing development boundary. Site was put forward for a single dwelling and this has already been permitted and constructed and now makes development of the remainder of the site difficult to achieve in terms of access and the form of development.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site has been partly developed. Further development of the site would be inappropriate backland development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside and remote from any development boundary.

### **Availability**

Site has been partly developed, unclear if remainder of land is still being promoted.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

A previous permission for a single dwelling on this plot has been implemented, which now makes further development difficult to achieve in terms of access and form of development (which would be piecemeal backland). Notwithstanding this, the site is at the limit in terms of distance to services/facilities, and beyond 3km from Mulbarton Primary School. This location currently does not have a settlement limit, and is not considered appropriate for a new settlement limit, which would encourage intensification of development in a rural location with generally poor access to services/facilities.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

## SN2039

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2039
Site address	Land north of Rectory Lane, Mulbarton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	4.654 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (ee) Allocated site (ff) SL extension	Allocation of market housing, affordable housing, recreation and leisure, community use and public open space
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Max 40dph
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>Potential constraints on access</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site has adequate highway frontage to form an access but the highway network is not suitable for development traffic. Rectory Road is not sufficient c/w width, or footway, no scope for improvement.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> – Access to this site is inappropriate. Rectory Road is narrow, with no footways (and no opportunity to provide them), no lighting and is used as an access between Mulbarton and the A140.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 Mulbarton school and surgery 530 metres</p> <p>Distance to bus service 475 metres</p> <p>Distance to shops in Mulbarton – Budgens / post office 800 metres</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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 620 metres</p> <p>Distance to Worlds End public house 1.1km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Capacity TBC AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas 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	Eastern part of site at risk of surface water flooding as is Rectory Lane	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Close to settlement but with potential harm to rural character of area around Rectory Lane. No loss of high grade agricultural lane</p> <p><b>LANDSCAPE MEETING</b> – would be concerned about the loss of the intact hedgerows on the parts of the site closest to the village, to create and access/visibility splays.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Development would not immediately relate to estate development</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Amber. Development to the north is not a ‘good fit’ in urban design terms. If allocated for frontage development the spacing and character of the existing streetscene which includes the listed Rectory Cottage and Barns will need to be considered. A smaller development with a more spacious street frontage would work better.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No protected sites in close proximity</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. Orange DLL habitat risk zone for great crested newts. SSSI IRZ.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Listed buildings to east and west</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Amber. Would need to consider the spacing and character of the existing streetscene which includes the listed Rectory Cottage and Barns</p> <p><b>NCC HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Rural road with no footways</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site has adequate highway frontage to form an access but the highway network is not suitable for development traffic. Rectory Road is not sufficient c/w width, or footway, no scope for improvement.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> – Access to this site is inappropriate. Rectory Road is narrow, with no footways (and no opportunity to provide them), no lighting and is used as an access between Mulbarton and the A140.</p>	Red
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 does not immediately relate to estate development but is still connected to settlement. Potential impacts on listed building would also need to be considered	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access onto Rectory Lane could be achieved but at loss of at least part of hedgerow. Also would need views of highway authority as well as LLFA given surface water flood risk on road	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)	Agricultural to north, residential to east, west and on opposite side of road 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)	Hedges and trees on all 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 hedges	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	Some views across site from Rectory Lane. Public footpath crosses eastern part 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)	Some potential for reduced site to be developed for 25 dwellings within the western part of the site, given the identified surface water flooding in the eastern part.	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		
<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	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)	Some improvements may be required to Rectory Lane	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potential for community enhancements including open space and areas for recreation	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Reduced site could be suitable for allocation for 25 dwellings. The site is well located in terms of the distance to services and facilities. Some concerns about 'estate' style development in terms of the rural character of Rectory Lane and the nearby listed buildings (Rectory Cottage and barns). Also potential loss of the hedge due to create an access. Considered inappropriate in highways terms as Rectory Lane is narrow, unlit, with no footways and no way to achieve them within the highway. Flood risk to Rectory Lane may also need to be addressed.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site connected to settlement, although does not relate well to existing estate development. Would result in some harm to rural character of Rectory Lane from likely loss of largely intact hedgerow to achieve access, including footway provision, although footway provision from the site into the village would not be possible within the existing highway. Potential heritage impacts in terms the nearby listed Rectory Cottage and barns.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to existing 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 well located in terms of distance to services and facilities. However, the access using Rectory Lane is not appropriate (narrow, unlit, lack of footways). In townscape/heritage terms, estate style development would be out of keeping with the rural character of Rectory Lane with potential impacts on the setting of nearby listed properties. Loss of the intact hedge closest to the village to create any access/visibility would also be a concern.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

## SN2087

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2087
Site address	South of Cuckooofield Lane, Bracon Ash
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Access on original plan is within development boundary, but developable area is outside
Planning History	Withdrawn planning application for 14 dwellings (2019/0014)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.7 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (gg) Allocated site (hh) SL extension	Allocation of approx. 15 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	9 dwellings/ha as promoted.
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	Site is constrained due to backland nature of site. Access in the Local Plan submission is different to the withdrawn application, which shows a less constrained access to the east of Park Nook.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. ok subject to access being wide enough to construct road of adequate width and footway as well as forming junction onto Cuckoofield Lane, which would appear to require third party land.	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 Mulbarton school and surgery 1.3km with footway</p> <p>Bus service available from adjacent to site access</p> <p>Distance to Co-op in Mulbarton 650 metres with footway</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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 1.6km with footways</p> <p>Distance to Worlds End public house 1.43km, largely with footways</p>	
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
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 but should not prevent development on 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	Erodes landscape gap between settlements. A number of the trees in site were made subject to TPOs in response to the withdrawn application.  No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Backland development contrary to general form and character of settlement.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Listed Bracon Lodge to east, although impact is not likely to be significant.  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Cuckoofield Lane has reasonable capacity with roundabout access onto B1113. It also has good footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green. ok subject to access being wide enough to construct road of adequate width and footway as well as forming junction onto Cuckoofield Lane, which would appear to require third party land.	Green
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?	Site does not relate well to the existing settlement due to the lack of integration and connectivity with the existing settlement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is convoluted but should be possible	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 to east, residential to west. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level but levels drop to east of site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and some trees	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	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 or adjacent to site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views are limited from public viewpoints due to backland nature of site, however some views into site from agricultural landscape and Bracon Lodge to east	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)	Poorly relates to existing settlement and would erode landscape gap between two settlements and therefore not considered to be a good 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)	Some footway improvements may be required to link to existing footway provision	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of suitable size to be allocated. However the site sits within the relatively small gap on Cuckoofield Lane between Bracon Ash and Mulbarton and would be a concern in townscape terms. The access arrangements agreed through the withdrawn planning application involve taking a road through the boundary hedge into the agricultural field to the east of Park Nook, which would have a further urbanising effect on this part of Bracon Ash.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is to rear of properties fronting The Street in Bracon Ash with no direct connectivity. Also located in gap between Bracon Ash and Mulbarton. There are a number of mature trees on site covered by TPOs.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Access on original plan is within development boundary, but developable area is outside.

### **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 relatively well located in terms of the distance to local services and facilities. However, the site would diminish the small gap separating the settlements of Bracon Ash and Mulbarton. The irregular shape of the site, and the presence of TPO trees would constrain development. The access as proposed via the Local Plan submission is very narrow and would have amenity implications for occupiers of the adjoining properties. An alternative access was proposed via the withdrawn application; however this would involve taking a road through the boundary hedge into the agricultural field to the east of Park Nook, which would have a further urbanising effect.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

## SN2087REVA

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2087REVA
Site address	Land south of Cuckooofield Lane, Bracon Ash
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside Development Boundary. One of the accesses is in the development boundary.
Planning History	2019/0014/O for 14 dwellings, withdrawn 15/10/2019.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.40Ha
Promoted Site Use, including (ii) Allocated site (jj) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Density at 25 dwelling/ha over 50 units, although the shape of the site would significantly limit this in practice.
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access shown to the east of Park Nook is the same as the withdrawn application and the Highway Authority considered the revised plans acceptable in terms of safety.</p> <p>Second access shown appears too constrained and unacceptable.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green. No objection subject to detail.</p>	Green
<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 Mulbarton school and surgery 1.3km with footway</p> <p>Bus service available from adjacent to site access</p> <p>Distance to Co-op in Mulbarton 650 metres with footway</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Distance to Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 1.6km with footways  Distance to Worlds End public house 1.43km, largely with footways	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	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 but should not prevent development on site  <b>LLFA</b> - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland  No loss of high grade agricultural land	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Erodes landscape gap between settlements. It would be very visible in the landscape, particularly when approaching from the east. The inclusion of the additional land for the access accentuates this concern.</p> <p>A number of the trees on site were made subject of TPOs in response to the withdrawn application.</p>	Red
Townscape	Amber	Backland development contrary to general form and character of settlement.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Close to Street Plantation and Bracon Ash Common CWSs.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ - residential and water discharge does not require NE consultation. In amber risk zone for GCN (ponds within 250m) and adjacent to priority habitat. No PROW.</p> <p><b>Norfolk Wildlife Trust:</b> Any application to review any potential indirect disturbance impacts on the CWS, policy wording should be added to highlight the need for this to be included in any application ecological assessment.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Listed Bracon Lodge to east, although impact is not likely to be significant.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Cuckoofield Lane has reasonable capacity with roundabout access onto B1113. It also has good footways.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to minor accommodation/footway works to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority, along with provision of Real Time Passenger Information equipment to bus shelters at both sides of Cuckoofield Lane.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (from previous SA)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site does not relate well to the existing settlement due to the lack of integration and connectivity	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access has been amended to reflect the planning application which the Highway Authority did not object to.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to east, residential to west. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level, but levels drop to east of site	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and some trees. Trees along the access boundary to the west have TPOs.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedges	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination or adjacent to site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views are limited from public viewpoints to west due to backland nature of site, however are views into site over agricultural landscape from Bracon Lodge to east and from public vantage point on Cukoofield Lane.	N/A



Site Visit Observations	Comments (from previous SA)	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)	Poorly related to existing settlement, being to the rear of properties fronting The Street in Bracon Ash with no direct connectivity, and would significantly erode the landscape gap between Bracon Ash and Mulbarton. The inclusion of additional land to create an acceptable access in highways terms accentuates this by breaking through a hedgerow onto agricultural land, creating a more urbanising effect. There are a number of mature trees on site covered by TPOs.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
<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	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	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)	Some footway improvements may be required to link to existing footway provision	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of suitable size to be allocated and is well located in terms of distance to services. However, the site sits within the relatively small gap on Cuckoofield Lane between Bracon Ash and Mulbarton and would be a concern in landscape and townscape terms. The access arrangements in the withdrawn planning application involve taking a road through the boundary hedge into the agricultural field to the east of Park Nook, which would have a further urbanising effect on this part of Bracon Ash and a negative impact on the landscape. A number of the trees on the site were made the subject of TPOs as a result of the previous withdrawn planning application.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Poorly related to existing settlement, being to the rear of properties fronting The Street in Bracon Ash with no direct connectivity, and would significantly erode the landscape gap between Bracon Ash and Mulbarton. The inclusion of additional land to create an acceptable access in highways terms accentuates this by breaking through a hedgerow onto agricultural land, creating a more urbanising effect. There are a number of mature trees on site covered by TPOs.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Developable area is in the Open Countryside, but otherwise no conflicts with the Local Plan; however, there are potentially conflicts with the Mulbarton Neighbourhood Plan.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being deliverable, so work was undertaken to support the withdrawn planning application.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Rejected - The site is relatively well located in terms of the distance to local services and facilities. However, the site would diminish the small gap separating the settlements of Bracon Ash and Mulbarton. The irregular shape of the site, and the presence of TPO trees would constrain development and the backland nature of the site means it would have no relationship with Bracon Ash village. The access is the same as was proposed via the withdrawn application; however, this would involve taking a road through the boundary hedge into the agricultural field to the east of Park Nook, which would have a further urbanising effect and a negative impact on the landscape.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 02/05/2022

## SN2165

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2165
Site address	Land south of Wymondham Road, East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated – outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.15 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (kk) Allocated site (ll) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	28 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<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 access constraints  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green. No school. 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.	Green

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>	Red	<p>Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 3.2km, mainly without footways</p> <p>Distance to bus service 2.5km, mainly without footways</p> <p>Distance to Budgens and post office in Mulbarton 3.1km, mainly without footways</p> <p>Local employment in business centre in village 400 metres, mainly without footways</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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 3.4km, mainly without footways</p> <p>Distance to Worlds End public house 2.6km, mainly without footways</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Applicant has stated that electricity and mains water supply are available, but unsure about sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Information not available	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	Green	<p>No identified flood risk</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Would not relate to settlement in open landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detached from settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to west  <b>NCC ECOLOGY</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed Whitehouse Farmhouse to west  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Constrained rural lane with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. No school. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green





#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is detached from main part of settlement and from small cluster of buildings to west. The site is remote and does not relate well to existing settlements. Development unlikely to have an adverse impact on the setting of the nearby listed building	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Safe access may be achievable but would require removal of part or all of hedgerow. However, accessibility to services is very poor	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or contamination 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 with 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 along highway boundary with trees and hedges on other 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.	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 or adjacent to the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site limited by vegetation on highway boundary.	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 is not suitable due to its detached location from the main part of the settlement of East Carleton and eroding effect on the rural character of the area.	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?	No information provided	

<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)	Carriageway widening and footway provision may be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence	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 an allocation and has relatively few known constraints. However the site is detached from any adjoining development and would therefore be an isolated group of houses in the open countryside. The site is also remote from services and facilities, other than local employment, which are accessed via routes with no footways and including sections under the national speed limit.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is located down a rural road with no footways and is detached from the main area of settlement in East Carleton. Access would require loss of part or all of hedgerow on highway boundary.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside and removed from any development boundary.

### **Availability**

Site has been promoted but with no supporting information.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Not suitable for an allocation due to remote location beyond the required distance to services for everything other than local employment, and the routes to Mulbarton generally have no footways or lighting and sections at the national speed limit. Development would represent an isolated group of dwellings in the countryside, eroding the rural character, which would be further diminished by the loss of hedgerow to create an access.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 9 December 2020

## SN4032

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4032
Site address	Land east of Norwich Road, Bracon Ash
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Refused planning application (2016/0713) covering both this site and adjoining allocation
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.57 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (mm) Allocated site (nn) SL extension	Allocation of up to 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dwellings/ha as promoted.
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>Potential access constraints due to speed of traffic along B1113</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Not feasible to form acceptable access, stopping/turning movements to dev unacceptable. Not feasible to provide safe walking route to local facilities.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> – concerns remain about the suitability of this site. Despite negotiations in relation to the previously refused application (2016/0713) it was not possible to satisfactorily address the highways concerns, particularly re accessibility to services and facilities in Mulbarton.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 Mulbarton school and surgery 2km, largely with footways</p> <p>Distance to bus service 750 metres, largely with footways</p> <p>Distance to Co-op in Mulbarton 785 metres, largely with footways</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>Bracon Ash Village Hall adjacent to site</p> <p>Distance to Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 2.3km, largely with footways</p> <p>Distance to Worlds End public house 2km, largely with footways</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity will need to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available; unsure about sewerage and gas.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Identified surface water flood risk at southern end of site</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Few or no constraints. Standard information required.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Open field that protrudes out from nucleated centre of settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural soil  <b>LANDSCAPE MEETING</b> – note the TPO trees on the access drive to Home Fam House, at the southern end of the site.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site has no relationship with the existing built-up settlement, however consideration needs to be given to the presence of the existing allocated land that links it to the settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south-east  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Amber. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to Bracon Ash Common CWS/Registered Common. Potential for impacts, protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Listed Home Farm House adjoins site to east. Other nearby listed buildings include Grade II* listed Mergate Hall</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Amber. – issues with harm to setting of Home Farm to east. Being a listed former farmhouse and barn in rural setting, estate development to west would not preserve setting and result in a degree of harm to the significance of the listed building.</p> <p><b>NCC HES</b> – Amber. We have commented on a previous application for the is site (2016/0713). Geophysical survey already undertaken, trial trenching required.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>B1113 passing site is rural road with fast vehicular speeds and no footway</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Not feasible to form acceptable access, stopping/turning movements to dev unacceptable. Not feasible to provide safe walking route to local facilities.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> – concerns remain about the suitability of this site. Despite negotiations in relation to the previously refused application (2016/0713) it was not possible to satisfactorily address the highways concerns, particularly re accessibility to services and facilities in Mulbarton.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses		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 heavily erode rural character of Home Farm House. Would also have poor relationship with existing settlement unless it forms part of combined development approach with allocated site to north	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potentially can be achieved with measures on B1113 to reduce traffic speeds and provide footway	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, 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)	Land allocated for residential development to north, residential in large plots to east, agricultural on opposite side of B1113 to 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)	Some hedging on highway boundary, trees on southern boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat on site and boundaries but main concern would be impact relating to nearby CWS	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 site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site highly visible from B1113 including on approach to village from south	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 would only be potentially suitable if linked to delivery of allocation. However there are significant access and heritage concerns.	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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		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)	Likely to require off-site highway works	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Improved footpath and village hall car park extension	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is suitable in size for allocation. However, the site extends the existing allocation further into the open countryside, beyond the extent of the development on Poorhouse Lane. It would also extend development into the setting of the listed Home Farm House, which has a number of TPOs on the driveway which forms the southern extent of the site. Highways would have significant concerns about any further development this in this location, beyond the currently allocated site, due to the limitations on pedestrian/cycle access to facilities and services in Mulbarton.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site forms part of field that is highly visible on the approach from the B1113 to the village. On its own, development of the site would not be suitable as it would be detached from the main part of the village with a poor relationship to the settlement. However, the remaining part of the field is allocated. Nonetheless, there would be an adverse impact on the listed Home Farm House which needs to be considered.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary (including allocation in current Local Plan).

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Although the site could potentially form an extension to the existing BRA1 Local Plan allocation, it would become significantly more intrusive in the open landscape and encroach into the rural setting of the listed Home Farm House. There would also be significant highways concerns about further development in this location, including safe non-car access to local services and facilities in Mulbarton.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

SN4059

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4059
Site address	Corner of Brick Kiln Lane, Mulbarton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No recent planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (oo) Allocated site (pp) SL extension	Allocation – housing
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Not specified. Up to 200 dwellings at 25/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 from rural lane would be constrained  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> Substandard highway network.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 1.2km away, partly with footways  Distance to bus service 800 metres away, partly with footways  Distance to Co-op in Mulbarton 800 metres, partly with footways	

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 Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 1.3km, partly with footways  Distance to Worlds End public house 1.75km, partly with footways	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity would need to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas 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	Green	No identified flood risk  <b>LLFA</b> – No constraints identified. Standard information required.	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	



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Potential harm to open nature of countryside away from settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Poor relationship with existing settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected site in close proximity  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Priority habitat adjacent to site.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed Kenningham Hall (Grade II) to east  <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow country lanes with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Substandard highway network.	Red
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?	Poor relationship to existing settlement as although close to existing development on The Rosery it would feel detached	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be off narrow country lane that is unlikely to be acceptable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no potential 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 north-west and west. Agricultural on other boundaries. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Some changes in levels but not significant to prevent development	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and trees on all boundaries, though with some gaps	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in hedges and trees	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)	Overhead power cables in west 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 from public highway and also some limited views from public footpath to west	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 does not relate well to settlement and accessed via narrow country lane that is unlikely to be acceptable and therefore not considered suitable	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 in multiple 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)	Likely to require off-site highway improvements	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is too large to allocate in the context of the VCHAP, but there are options for reducing in size to a site for 25 dwellings. However, even for small scale development access via The Rosery would not be possible, as this road is narrow, unlit, with no footways, is heavily used as a link between Mulbarton and the A140, and the junction of The Rosery/Long Lane/Cuckoofield Lane is already constrained. Development in this location would not relate well to the main build area and there is no obvious connectivity with the recent Hopkins Homes development off Long Lane.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site does not relate well to existing development and is accessed along narrow country lane.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to 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 reasonably well located in terms of distance to services and facilities and has few on-site constraints. However, access using The Rosery is not appropriate as the road is narrow, unlit, lacks footways, and has a constrained junction with Long Lane/Cuckoofield Lane. The site would also have a poor relationship with existing development, particularly as there is no obvious connectivity with the recently completed housing off Long Lane.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

SN4082

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4082
Site address	Land at Intwood Lane, Swardeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	8.2 hectares (6.2 hectares for possible housing land)
Promoted Site Use, including (qq) Allocated site (rr) SL extension	Allocation – residential (number not specified)
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 onto narrow lane  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery 3.6km partly along footways but some restricted in size  Distance to bus service 950m largely without footway  Limited retail (home bakery, animal feed store) and local employment in Swardeston.	

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>o Village/ community hall</li> <li>o Public house/ café</li> <li>o Preschool facilities</li> <li>o Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Cricket club within settlement	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Clarification over wastewater capacity would be required	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Clarification required	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is partly within identified cable route	Amber
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>NCC M&amp;W</b> – A site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some small areas of surface water flood risk but would not prevent development of site  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints identified. Standard information required.	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	Will erode character of rural network of lanes and impact on higher plateau landscape. Not high grade agricultural soil.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Remote from main part of settlement although adjacent to liner line of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat. Hornsea 3 cable route passes across the site.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity <b>NCC HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow rural lane links site <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Red
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?	Remote from main settlement. A small linear extension could be possible, however it would take development around a corner in the road which currently acts as a boundary between the partly built-up section of lane to the south and the entirely undeveloped lane to the north.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Intwood Lane is a narrow lane with no footways that would not be suitable for anything more than a very limited number of dwellings. In addition, access to the site would require removal of sections of hedgerow and possibly also of significant trees on the highway boundary	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no potential 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, agricultural on other boundaries with area of woodland to north. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site descends to north	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with avenue of significant trees on highway boundary. Hedge on eastern boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in hedgerows and trees. Also habitat in woodland to north.	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)	Overhead power line crosses southern part of site	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from Intwood Lane	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 is remotest from main area of settlement even if adjacent to development boundary including most services. Also within Bypass Protection Zone in landscape terms and Orsted cable route. Would result in erosion of open and rural character of area and therefore should not be progressed	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		
Southern Bypass Protection Zone		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Conflicts with objectives of southern bypass 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?	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 information 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)	Off-site highway improvements may well be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence	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. However, even limited frontage development would be an encroachment into the higher plateau landscape and would erode the largely rural character of the area. The site is also within the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. The site is at the limits of distances to most services/facilities, and over 3km from the school.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is remote from main part of village and on section of narrow, rural lane with an open and undeveloped character.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to existing 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 at the limits in terms of distances to services and the roads around the site are narrow, unlit, with no footways, making walking/cycling an unattractive option. Development of the site would erode the rural character of the area, impacting on the higher plateau landscape and encroaching into an undeveloped part of the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

SN4086

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4086
Site address	Land south of Rectory Road, East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (ss) Allocated site (tt) SL extension	Residential (no numbers specified). At 25dph, 25 dwellings could be accommodated
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None specified
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access should be achievable from Rectory Road  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> – possible to access the site, but the roads between East Carleton and Mulbarton would not be attractive for walking/cycling.	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Distance to Mulbarton school and surgery is 2.5km, though little of this route has footways  Distance to bus service is 2km, of which little of the route has footways  Local employment site adjacent	

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 Mulbarton over 2.5km, of which little of the route has footways  Distance to Worlds End public house over 2km  Distance to sports facilities at Mulbarton over 2.5km	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity would need to be demonstrated	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that 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 identified surface water flood risk on Rectory Road to east of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	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 would be within landscape envelope of village. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Would relate well to linear pattern of development on site  <b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Green	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets in close proximity  <b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Green	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rectory Road is of a reasonable standard for the local area. Limited footway provision  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> – possible to access the site, but the roads between East Carleton and Mulbarton would not be attractive for walking/cycling.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Business use to west	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site forms gap within linear pattern of development. As such, development of site would relate well to existing pattern of development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access appears achievable but would need to be confirmed by highway authority	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Equestrian use 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 to south and residential to north and east. Business use to west but does not appear to have incompatible uses and appears to co-exist successfully with other residential properties in close proximity	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and fence on highway boundary. Hedging and trees 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 hedging	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 or adjacent to site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is visible from Rectory Road	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 is potentially acceptable in terms of form and character but is distance from services.	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		
<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?	Not specified, but likely to be deliverable within five years.	

<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)	Site is being promoted. 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)	Some minor works may be required; clarification would be needed from the highway authority	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has not stated that affordable housing will be provided. Clarification would be required	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. Unlikely to be suitable for 25 houses if frontage development only is provided but can provide at least 12 dwellings. However, the site is beyond the required distances to all services/facilities except local employment and the roads between East Carleton and Mulbarton would not encourage walking and cycling.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site forms gap in linear pattern of development so development of the site could relate well to form and character of services. Line of trees along site frontage which would be needed to be considered. Long walking distance to school and services with little footway provision on roads subject to the national speed limit and without lighting.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside and removed from any 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 itself has few constraints and frontage development would be in keeping with the form and character of the settlement, subject to assessment of the trees along Rectory Road. However, the site is beyond of the required distances to most services/facilities, on roads that have very limited footway provision (and sections which are unlit and subject to the national speed limit).

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 5 August 2020

## SN5000SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5000SL
Site address	Land to the north of Eversley, Rectory Road, East Carleton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.05
Promoted Site Use, including (uu) Allocated site (vv) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1 bungalow 1 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Along Rectory Loke, a private road with access in from the east.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access.	Green
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 Mulbarton school and surgery 2km, large parts without footways.  Distance to bus service 1.6km, largely without footways  Distance to Budgens and post office in Mulbarton 2km, large parts without footways	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Distance to Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 2.3km, large parts without footways  Distance to Worlds End public house 1.5km, large parts without footways.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Unknown  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Intermediate Pressure Pipeline running along the track to the east boundary. This has a 3m buffer and other restrictions apply to work.  Mains electricity and water nearby. No gas in the village.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within the identified route.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues, unlikely as currently garden land.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No flood risk identified.  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. No surface water flooding. Standard information required at planning stage.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Settled Plateau Farmland	N/A



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	D1 Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is tucked away to the rear of residential properties along a private road. It is contained and does not encroach into the landscape.	Green
Townscape	Green	The site is to the rear of residential properties accessed along a private drive. There are already properties off this drive and the site would reflect this form of development with minimal impact.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Limited as currently residential garden but are trees so is potential for habitat.  <b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI ISZ - but residential and discharge of water not identified for NE consultation. Amber risk zone for GCN and ponds onsite and within 250m. No priority habitats and not in GI corridor. No PROW.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	St Mary's Church – LB to east, potential impact on setting to be assessed.  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	East Carleton FP4 to east.  Rectory Road is not overly constrained but has no footpath.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Dwelling to south and east, garden to west. Church further to east and agriculture to north.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Listed Church to the east but there is a dwelling in between therefore impact is limited. The site is to the rear of a dwelling but would mirror a similar situation opposite, it is visible from the footpath but not from the adopted road and will not have a detrimental impact on the townscape.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	It is only for one dwelling therefore the increase in traffic would be minimal. There is a footpath along Rectory Loke on east.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Garden, no issues.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	It is compatible with the surrounding residential uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Domestic boundaries to existing garden.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Unknown – trees and hedges on boundaries.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence to suggest contamination, garden so unlikely.  There is a high pressure gas pipeline along Rectory Loke.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Very limited and localised.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p><b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>The site is tucked away surrounded by residential development and would mirror the dwelling opposite in terms of built form. It is well contained and would not encroach into the open countryside.</p> <p>The presence of the gas pipeline needs to be investigated.</p>	<p>Amber</p>

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score</b> <b>(R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately – for the owners.	Green
Comments:	The landowners wish to build a single storey property for their own use; therefore it would not be available to a developer.	N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score</b> <b>(R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No, but unnecessary as the dwelling would be for the owners.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	No, just an adequate access point.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site proposes a Settlement Limit extension at a location where no Limit exists and there are currently no plans to designate one. The site is also remote from services and facilities, other than local employment, and these are accessed via routes which are unlit, with no footways and including sections under the national speed limit. Amber concern re Great Crested Newts.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is tucked away surrounded by residential development and would mirror the dwelling opposite in terms of built form. It is well contained and would not encroach into the open countryside.

The presence of the gas pipeline needs to be investigated.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, otherwise no constraints identified.

### **Availability**

The site is available to the owner/promoter.

### **Achievability**

The site promoter has not provided evidence of commercial deliverability; however, the site is proposed for the promoter's personal use.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** UNREASONABLE – whilst the site has few immediate impacts, it proposes a Settlement Limit extension at a location where no Limit exists and there are currently no plans to designate one. The site is also at the upper end of distances to services, which are accessed along unlit rural roads with very limited footways and large sections at the national speed limit. Investigation would also be required re the intermediate pressure pipeline along Rectory Loke and the potential for Great Crested Newts.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 02/05/2022

## SN5005

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5005
Site address	Land north of East Carleton Road, Mulbarton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Largely outside development boundary (very small area to east within)
Planning History	2017/0822/O for 4 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 19/12/2018. Previous application 2016/1775/O for 6 dwellings withdrawn.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.02
Promoted Site Use, including (ww) Allocated site (xx) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6 detached 25 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 – Absolute Constraints

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

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



### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Existing gated access on East Carelton Road within 30mph. Would need up-grading and, given that it would be frontage development there would need to be more than one access. There are significant mature trees along the frontage which would need to be removed.</p> <p>The verge to the front is Highway land which would need to be crossed for access.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access subject to providing acceptable vis, would require removal of frontage trees. Network - subject to demonstrating feasibility of and providing East Carleton Road widening, footway provision between site &amp; Forge Orchards and link to bus stop, including acceptable crossing of Norwich Road and demonstrating / providing acceptable visibility at E Carlton Road / Norwich Road junction.</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>	Green	<p>All within 1,200m and walking distance</p> <p>Mulbarton School – 675m</p> <p>Doctor’s surgery – 700m</p> <p>Budgens/Post Office – 700m</p> <p>Co-Op – 1km</p> <p>Boot Pharmacy – 900m</p> <p>Various local businesses within 3km</p> <p>Regular bus service – various stops in Mulbarton within 1,800m</p>	N/A
<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>	N/A	<p>Mulbarton village hall and sports facilities 1.1km</p> <p>Nursery 740m</p> <p>World’s End public house 900m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water is available.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Red	<p>Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3 through central area and to rear of site.</p> <p>Surface Water Flooding; Medium through large central area and High risk from tributary to north &amp; north-west and along East Carleton Road.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Red. Surface water flooding would prevent development. The site is affected by minor localised ponding in the 3.33% AEP event. The site is affected by a moderate flow path in the 1.0% AEP event and a major flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The 0.1% AEP event flow path covers most of the site. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows northwest through the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Access to the site may be heavily affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk in the 1.0% and 0.1% AEP events.</p> <p>We would advise that inclusion of this site in the plan is reassessed and potentially removed.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Amber In Flood Zone 2 and 3. This site would require a site specific Flood Risk Assessment at application stage. Any proposal should follow the sequential approach for site layout, and any possible mitigation required for areas other than Flood Zone 1. There is an adjacent watercourse that may also require consideration to Flood Risk Activity Environmental Permitting.</p> <p><i>(taken info from Appeal)</i></p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	C1 Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	There is a clear distinction between the built form and rural open countryside. Development would significantly harm the special rural characteristics within this Tributary Farmland landscape at this key vantage point as you leave the village.  The likely loss of any trees or hedge, particularly along the frontage would exacerbate this impact.	Red
Townscape	Amber	There is a line of dwellings along the northern frontage of the road and linear development would be most appropriate to continue this. It would also lessen the density at this edge of village location.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. County Wildlife Sites in vicinity but unaffected.</p> <p>The land has been grazed with stabling, there are mature trees and boundary hedges and water close by which means there is potential for habitat and possibly protected species. This would require investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI ISZ - but residential and discharge of water not identified for NE consultation. No PROW. Not in GI corridor. Partially amber zone for great crested newts. No priority habitat onsite.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets. LB to the north-east unaffected.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>East Carleton Road is a narrow rural road however it is directly off the B1113 and is connected to Mulbarton as well as the wider network, with the A140 to the east and close to Norwich.</p> <p>Would require an adoptable footpath link.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access subject to providing acceptable vis, would require removal of frontage trees. Network - subject to demonstrating feasibility of and providing East Carleton Road widening, footway provision between site &amp; Forge Orchards and link to bus stop, including acceptable crossing of Norwich Road and demonstrating / providing acceptable visibility at E Carlton Road / Norwich Road junction.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to east, fields to north, west and part south, two properties to south-east. Compatible uses.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated Sept 2009, also Google Earth 2021 and local knowledge)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on historic environment. It would add a site which would change the way the village is growing by elongating it to the west.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears achievable but would have a significant impact on the frontage through loss of any trees/hedges.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock/grazing	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Dwellings to east, across the road. Open undeveloped land to north and west.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level with a slope south-north.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes – this would need surveying, various potential habitats.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence on site. Building which would need to be removed.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are views into the site from the road where it changes from built-up to countryside. This site is an important visual break.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated Sept 2009, also Google Earth 2021 and local knowledge)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p><b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>The site is well located in terms of access to services and facilities. However, there are constraints on the site, the main one being flooding.</p> <p>In addition, it would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and gaining access for frontage development would mean that the majority of the mature trees would be lost.</p>	Red



## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Neighbourhood Plan: ENV3: Protecting Frontage Hedges ENV4: Flooding		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>		

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is well located in terms of distance to services; however, there are a number of concerns. The site includes Zone 3 flood risk running diagonally across the site (north-west to south-east), making the identification of a suitable parcel for development problematic. In addition, the highway authority would require a number of improvements in the local area to both the carriageways and footways, including a suitable crossing point on the B1113. Access to the site itself would be likely to result in the loss of frontage trees on this rural approach to the village. Part of the site rated amber for the potential for Great Crested Newts.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is well located in terms of access to services and facilities. However, there are constraints on the site, the main one being flooding.

In addition, it would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and gaining access for frontage development would mean that the majority of the mature trees would be lost.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, otherwise no conflicts with the Local Plan; however, there are potential conflicts with Mulbarton Neighbourhood Plan

### **Availability**

The site promoter indicates the site is available immediately (and previous planning applications have been made).

### **Achievability**

The site promoter indicates the site is deliverable; however, no evidence has been provided to show how the multiple issues with the site (flood risk, highways requirements and impact of vegetation loss) can be addressed/balanced.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Rejected - Whilst the site is well located in terms of distance to services, a combination of other issues affect the potential and deliverability of the site. The concerns centre on the Zone 3 flood risk that runs through the site, the multiple highways improvements needed to both the carriageway and the footways, and the negative impact the loss of trees would have on this rural approach to Mulbarton. In addition, part of the site is rated amber in terms of potential for Great Crested Newts.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 02/05/2022