



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Pulham Market and Pulham St Mary

Contents

GNLP0166.....	3
SN0363SL	11
SN0398	19
SN0407	27
SN0418	35
SN0430	43
SN0575	51
SN1024	59
SN1027	68
SN1053	76
SN2095	84
SN2096	93
SN4085SL	102

GNLP0166

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	GNLP0166
Site address	Gosmore, w/o Colegate End Lane, Pulham Market
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation (although see promoted numbers)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dph Promoted for allocation for 8-15 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Part greenfield/ part brownfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing in and out entrances. Potential access constraints but likely to be mitigated MISSING HIGHWAYS SCORE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school 850m walking distance (no footpath for first 220m) GP surgery Limited retail in settlement includes builders merchants. Farm shop & garden centre nearby but remote from settlement. Employment opportunities within settlement 2 bus operators run daytime services daily between settlement and Norwich (including peak time)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall 2 public houses within settlement 2 cafes in farm/garden centres which are remote from settlement Pre-school in village hall Recreation ground	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site. Overhead wires across part of western boundary	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified flood risk along Colegate End Road which would need to be taken into consideration	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E4: Great Moulton Plateau ALC Grade TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Existing residential frontage and site to north is enclosed by hedge so wider landscape impact limited	Green
Townscape	Amber	Would represent breakout to north, detrimental to existing pattern of development within CA including frontage. Could be mitigated through careful design but would constrain developable area	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Would have a detrimental impact on designated heritage assets. Could be mitigated through careful design but would constrain developable area HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow land but land available for improvements. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable and sufficient capacity in network CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Likely to have detrimental impact on character of CA and settings of LBs adjacent and to north east. Senior Heritage officer to confirm (if the site is considered appropriate to progress)	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing in/out access and propose single central access. Appears to be sufficient land. NCC to confirm visibility and impact on network	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential/grazing. Option to demolish existing dwelling.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential - development as promoted likely to have detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Existing residential frontage to road. Remaining boundaries enclosed by hedges	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power lines along western boundary	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 to existing residential frontage. Remaining site is visually contained	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Visually contained but development would represent breakout from existing pattern of settlement. Development would be likely to harm existing residential amenity. Do not consider that impacts on townscape and heritage assets could be mitigated so not suitable for allocation	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside (part)		
Development boundary (part)		
Conservation area (part)		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impacts on townscape, heritage assets and residential amenity.

Site Visit Observations

Site on edge of settlement but within reach of services although no footpath over significant distance. Development of site would be likely to have detrimental impacts on townscape, heritage assets and existing residential amenity. Not considered suitable for allocation.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundaries; no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

UNREASONABLE – due to the detrimental impacts on townscape and designated heritage assets which are not considered could be reasonably mitigated

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 08 June 2020

SN0363SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0363SL
Site address	The Maltings, Station Road, Pulham St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Possible land associated as open space with maltings development
Planning History	
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.27 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – 4 dwellings including re-use of stable block
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield except stable block to be re-used

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 through the Maltings development. Highways have raised concerns about this previously and it is difficult to see how this could be overcome.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school at Pulham Market 1.5 km away linked by footway Employment (local garage) 500 metres away linked by footway Village shop around 300 metres linked by footway Peak time public transport 200 metres linked by footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ café o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Community Hall (Pennoyers Centre) including café 200 metres linked by footway Recreation ground just over 500 metres linked by footway Public house within settlement has been closed for some years but remains last lawful use of building Pre-school in Pulham Market	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site. However, site is relatively close to sewerage treatment works	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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and there are no known 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	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4 Waveney tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is well contained within the landscape	Green
Townscape	Amber	Potentially adverse impact on setting of existing development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential adverse impact on conservation area HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Amber	Loss of open space for Maltings development	Amber
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained access	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Residential and agricultural with sewerage treatment works to south	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is within conservation area and would affect the setting of the Maltings. Development would extend the extent of development on the site southwards	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be through the existing development which highways have already raised concerns about	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Open space, that is of benefit to residents of the Maltings	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural which are compatible, but sewerage treatment works to south	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Slowly falls to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees on boundary covered by TPO	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Extensive trees and bushes on boundaries which provide 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)	Unlikely, unless any contamination connected for former maltings	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Relatively well contained	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable given access issues, possible loss of open space and extending development south of existing extent	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private 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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site would be suitable as an extension to the development boundary in terms of its size, and could include dwellings to the north not currently within the boundary.

Site Visit Observations

Site appears to be used as open space that provides part of the setting of the maltings. Development would adversely affect this. Difficulties achieving access to the site.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside; no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

The site is available.

Achievability

No concerns – the site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** and is not suitable as an extension to development boundary due to the detrimental impact it would have on the townscape and the setting of The Maltings. Access to the site also appears problematic.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 10 June 2020

SN0398

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0398
Site address	Land south of The Street, Pulham St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	History of refusals for one or two dwellings at site frontage
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.77 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph – approximately 19 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	Narrow site onto street frontage	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Primary school at Pulham Market 1.5 km away linked by footway Employment (local garage) 475 metres away linked by footway Village shop around 100 metres linked by footway Peak time public transport 100 metres linked by footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Community Hall (Pennoyers Centre) including café 175 metres linked by footway Recreation ground just over 400 metres linked by footway Public house within settlement has been closed for some years but remains last lawful use of building Pre-school in Pulham Market	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter to confirm services are 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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and there are no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Parts of the site at risk of surface water flood risk however this could be mitigated	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>)		B4 Waveney tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Although the site is visually relatively contained it does break out from the line of development along the southern side of The Street which has the potential to be apparent from the south during the winter months	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would present a breakout from the linear pattern of development along the southern side of The Street	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is within conservation area with potential to have an adverse impact on its character. Also could have adverse impact on setting of church. Technical comments required if the site is considered appropriate to progress. HES score – Amber	Red
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential constraints on access that could have adverse impact on local highway network	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Likely to have an adverse impact as estate development would not respect the form and character of this part of the village and therefore could have an adverse impact on the conservation area. In addition, development of the site has the potential to impact on views of the church from the south	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow highway frontage. Highways view required	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)	Residential development along much of the northern boundary (other than highway boundary which is opposite church). Meadow land to west and south, with small amount of meadow before residential to east. Should not be any compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Falls gently from north to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedges on boundaries with meadow land to south and west	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant trees on western boundary. Meadowland to south includes watercourse	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

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	Site is relatively well contained visually. Views into the site from The Street are limited due to narrow highway frontage and existing development. Views from the south limited by trees and hedges along Dirty Lane but site may be more apparent during the winter months	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Impact on form and character with restricted highway frontage and possible heritage impacts make this site unsuitable for 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)
Part open countryside, part within settlement		
Within conservation area		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private 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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	No subject to access being achievable	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?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of sufficient size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Would result in a breakout from the existing linear development along the southern side of The Street to the detriment of the form and character of the settlement and to the detriment of the conservation area. Also has a potential impact on the setting of the church in views from the south.

Local Plan Designations

Partly within the development boundary for Pulham St Mary, but the majority of the site 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:

UNREASONABLE – The site is not considered to be suitable due to a detrimental impact on the form and character of the existing settlement, as well as an adverse impact on the setting of the church.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 10 June 2020

SN0407

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0407
Site address	North of Colegate End Road, Pulham Market
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.91 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Promoted for allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 11 dph (Promoted for 6- 10 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Potential access constraints - narrow lane and close to bend. NCC to confirm if network is suitable and visibility achievable CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities Part 1: ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	1km walk to edge of settlement. Primary school approx. 2km walking route (no footpath for 1.5km). GP surgery Limited retail in settlement but includes builder's merchants. Farm shop & garden centre nearby but remote from this site Employment opportunities within settlement 2 bus operators run daytime services daily between settlement and Norwich (including peak time). 220m walk to nearest bus stop – no footpath	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ café o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall 2 public houses within settlement 2 cafes in farm/garden centres which are remote from settlement Pre-school in village hall Recreation ground	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW 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	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E4: Great Moulton Plateau ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Open boundaries so the site is prominent in wider views from east and north. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Small hamlet comprising linear historic development. Impacts of development could not be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development would cause harm to rural setting of surrounding LBs which could not be reasonably mitigated. Technical officer to assess if the site is considered appropriate to progress. HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow lane, poor visibility on bend. NCC to confirm if network would be adequate for increased capacity CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development likely to harm rural setting of scattered LBs. Seek comment from technical officer (if the site is considered as a Reasonable Alternative)	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm. Narrow lane and poor visibility due to alignment	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible – part of larger parcel of agricultural land and residential to west and south	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Intermittent trees/hedgerow separate residential development adjoining southern boundary. Part of larger parcel so open to north and east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along western boundary. Ditch along southern boundary with road.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles and wires along southern boundary with road	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from Colegate End Road to east and Harrys Lane to north.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Remote from and poorly connected to settlement and services. Likely to have detrimental impact on townscape and heritage assets. Not considered suitable for allocation.	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that 50% affordable housing contribution would be offered but policy would only require 33%.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site appears remote from the settlement and would not be in keeping with the linear form of the development in this location. Potential heritage and highways concerns.

Site Visit Observations

Site remote from settlement and services. Lack of footpath creating hostile walking environment. Development would be likely to have unacceptable impacts on townscape and heritage assets. Likely to impact on highways safety due to proximity to bend.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundaries; no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is separated from the main settlement and would have a detrimental impact on the form and character of the area (townscape). There are also highways concerns as it is situated on a narrow land and close to a bend in the road.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 05 June 2020

SN0418

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0418
Site address	Land at Cook's Field, n/o Jocelyn Close, Pulham Market
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.66 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Promoted for allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	22.7 dph (indicative layout submitted) (approximately 15 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	There are potential access constraints - narrow lane with shallow verges. NCC to confirm that adequate visibility achievable. CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Primary school approx. 1km walking route (no footpath for 90m). GP surgery Limited retail in settlement but includes builders merchants. Farm shop & garden centre nearby but remote from settlement. Employment opportunities within settlement 2 bus operators run daytime services daily between settlement and Norwich (including peak time)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village hall 2 public houses within settlement 2 cafes in farm/garden centres which are remote from settlement Pre-school in village hall Site close to recreation ground	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1 but identified flood risk along Mill Lane which would need to be considered. Wide ditch in verge along highway boundary.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E4: Great Moulton Plateau ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site visually contained in views from north and wider views from east however the site is of significant size	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would represent a breakout to north but a reduced scale and visual containment of site would limit its impact. Senior Conservation & Design Officer – Green. Straightforward extension of settlement, however starting to get quite far out from centre, in what is quite a clustered village.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ecology report submitted. Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development would not have detrimental impact on designated heritage assets Senior Conservation & Design Officer - Green HES score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow land with shallow verges. NCC to confirm where sufficient for increased capacity CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Very well separated from heritage assets to east. Unlikely to impact on character or setting subject to boundary treatments and overall heights. A reduced scale would reduce the townscape impact.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access at southern end. Narrow lane (observed that two vehicles cannot pass without mounting narrow verge). NCC to confirm if adequate for increased capacity and off-site improvements needed.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible - residential to south Agriculture	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to N, S & W. Open to larger parcel of farmland on E side	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Continuous hedgerow to N, W & S. No significant trees. Wide ditch between hedge and road frontage	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views along Mill Lane in both directions. Part of larger parcel which is then visually contained	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development would represent limited breakout to north but would be contained from wider views. Consider suitable for allocation subject to mitigation of constraints	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Footpath link to recreation ground is offered	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Promoted site is of significant size but could be reduced in scale and number reducing its impact within the landscape and on the townscape. Possible highways issues identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site on edge of settlement but within reach of services, subject to provision of footpath link to existing at Jocelyn Close. Site visible from road but wider landscape impacts could be mitigated. Overall, limited constraints and site likely to be acceptable, subject to clarifications as listed.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundary; no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered reasonable for an allocation of up to 15 dwellings, subject to highways considerations and landscape mitigation. Highways have raised concerns about the potential to form an acceptable access and the suitability of the local highway network. The site is not likely to be suitable for development at higher densities than promoted due to edge of settlement location.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 05 June 2020

SN0430

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0430
Site address	Land east of Station Road, Pulham St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural
Planning History	Refusal of planning permission some decades ago
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.89 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	26dph – approximately 23 dwellings with access and open space
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	Additional information provided with drawing showing access that will need to be discussed with the Highway Authority Highways score – Amber. Access with acceptable visibility may be achievable. No footway to local facilities. Visibility constraint at adjacent Station Rd junction with Mill Lane, resulting in highway safety concern.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school at Pulham Market 1.38 km away on route without continuous footway; 1.7 km away on route with continuous footway Employment opportunities (garage) 380 metres on route without continuous footway; 700 metres on route with footway Peak time public transport 380 metres to north linked by footway Shop 450 metres away linked by footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Community hall (Pennoyers Centre) including café 380 metres with footway Recreation ground 660 metres away linked by footway Public house within settlement has been closed for some years but remains last lawful use of building Pre-school in Pulham Market	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site. However, part of the site is likely to fall within cordon sanitaire of sewerage works	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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and there are no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Southern edge of the site within FZ 2 & 3	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>)		B4 Waveney tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would potentially be visible from the south however this could be mitigated by strengthening existing planting	Amber
Townscape	Green	Potential impact as the site is not well related to the character of the village	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Consultation with the Senior Heritage and Design Officer required if the site is considered appropriate to progress as the site is in a potentially sensitive location in respect of the adjoining CA which refers to the “rural setting and outlook especially to and from the south and east” as a key characteristic HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Would need Highway Authority view on whether access proposals are acceptable	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Odour issues may arise due to the proximity of the sewerage works to the south	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on setting of conservation area, particularly given views from south. Development would also not relate well to existing development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Constrained access, will need confirmation that the access solution they propose can be delivered	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)	Meadow land to south and dwellings to north and west. Sewage works to south-east may result in compatibility issues due to cordon sanitaire	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively flat, slight fall from north to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Existing development on north and west boundaries; hedges and trees on south and west	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes, see above. Watercourse also to south	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 behind existing development when viewed from Station Road but potential views from south during winter months	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Potential access issues, impact on character of area and conservation area, and cordon sanitaire may restrict developable area of site.	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private 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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	No subject to access being achievable	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?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Development of the site potentially visible in views from Dirty Lane to the south, and on land within the conservation area to the south which would impact on its character.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside 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:

UNREASONABLE - due to concerns over the suitability of the site access, the impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and the Cordon Sanitaire of the STW.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 10 June 2020

SN0575

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0575
Site address	Flanders Meadow, Station Road, Pulham St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural with equestrian use on site. Unallocated
Planning History	Historic applications for the erection of dwelling(s)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15dph - 8 -10 houses at 75% affordable
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing field access. Access is likely to be achievable.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Primary school at Pulham Market 1.65 km away; footway link from main part of village but no footway link from site to main part of village Employment (local garage) 650 metres away not linked by footway Village shop around 760 metres not linked by footway until within main part of village Peak time public transport 650 metres not linked by footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ café o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Community Hall (Pennoyers Centre) including café 715 metres not linked by footway until in main part of village Recreation ground just over 1 km away not linked by footway until in main part of village Public house within settlement has been closed for some years but remains last lawful use of building Pre-school in Pulham Market	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity likely available to site	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	This site is unlikely to be contaminated and there are no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 but almost of all the site is identified as at risk of surface water flood risk making mitigation difficult	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>)		B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Although site is relatively well contained with existing planting introducing estate development would still have an urbanising effect on the rural landscape	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Removed from main part of settlement with only dispersed linear pattern of development connecting it to main settlement	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any potential impact could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to east and north HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network consists of rural roads with no footways	Amber
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?	Listed buildings on opposite side of Station Road which estate-scale of development could affect the setting of. Main issue is separation from main part of the settlement.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access would need upgrading which would require removal of hedging but subject to this it is likely to be achievable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land used in connection immediately to north of site	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential dwellings to the north and south, open farmland to the west. Partly residential and partly agricultural on opposite side of Station Road. No apparent compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedgerows on highway boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Extensive hedging on Station Road boundary should be retained	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	Public views contained by extensive hedging onto Station Road	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site should not be allocated due to separation from main part of settlement which would make any development here other than one or two dwellings incompatible with the form and character of the immediate vicinity	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private 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. No identified developer.	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Comments from promoter but no developer (or RSL for high level of affordable housing) identified	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible off-site improvements to improve pedestrian connectivity may be required by NCC but could be difficult to achieve without affecting viability	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has indicated that the site would be majority affordable housing (75%) but no assessment to demonstrate viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	High level of affordable housing provision (up to 75%)	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not suitable for allocation as under 12 dwellings and detached from main settlement.

Site Visit Observations

Site very poorly related to main part of village. Any development will have an urbanising effect on the rural landscape, particularly if on a scale for allocation.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and removed from 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:

UNREASONABLE - Not suitable for allocation or extension to development boundary as relates poorly to main settlement and impact on rural character of area.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 10 June 2020

SN1024

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1024
Site address	Ladbrookes, Tattlepot Lane, Pulham Market
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	1975/2761 5 bungalows APPROVED Adjoins PUL 1 – 10 dwellings (2018/0598)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	19.2 dph (approximately 25 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	There are potential access constraints - NCC to confirm adequate visibility achievable without detriment to significant oak on front boundary Highways score – Amber. Access subject to satisfactory visibility. Subject to providing a continuous frontage footway linking with facility to tie in with provision at PUL1. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Primary school. 750m safe walking route.</p> <p>GP surgery</p> <p>Limited retail in settlement but includes builder's merchants. Farm shop & garden centre nearby but remote from settlement.</p> <p>Employment opportunities within settlement</p> <p>2 bus operators run daytime services daily between settlement and Norwich (including peak time)</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village hall</p> <p>2 public houses within settlement</p> <p>2 cafes in farm/garden centres which are remote from settlement</p> <p>Pre-school in village hall</p> <p>Recreation ground in settlement</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Utilities infrastructure present on the site that could affect development potential. Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage to site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1 but small area of identified flood risk in SE quadrant which will constrain 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	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E4: Great Moulton Plateau ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Impact on landscape character could be mitigated through design, landscaped treatment of southern site boundary and tree protection	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would respect existing form and character of settlement. Site prominent within street but impact on townscape could be mitigated through design. Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green. Could be similar sort of development to the existing site to the east recently developed. This site fit in better with existing development already having taken place on the north side of the road.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Potential impact on protected species (bats?) but it is expected that this can be mitigated. No assessment submitted to date.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could impact on setting of LB to east but could be mitigated through design Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green HES score – Amber	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Potential impact on local road network (but it is expected that this can be mitigated). No assessments submitted to date.</p> <p>Highways score - Access subject to satisfactory visibility. Subject to providing a continuous frontage footway linking with facility to tie in with provision at PUL1. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Site adjacent to residential development site and small scale commercial. Potential impact on amenity can be mitigated through design	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on the townscape and historic environment could be mitigated	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to existing dwelling. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable without impacting on oak on front boundary. No verge available to extend footpath link approved as part of PUL 1	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible – residential/small scale commercial	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat. Gradual fall in G/L from south to north across site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Established hedgerow along N and W boundaries. Not enclosed on S side, part of larger parcel	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant trees along N and W boundaries. Also established hedgerow. Requires TPO assessment if the site progresses	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles north-south inside E boundary. No other evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from both directions along Tattlepot Road. Open views towards site from Guildhall Lane to south	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Prominent site which would allow extension of approved development while respecting existing pattern of settlement, subject to mitigation of constraints	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	In form of comments from promoter. No significant constraints identified	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered to be suitable as identified constraints could be mitigated. The site relates well to the settlement and the adjacent allocation.

Site Visit Observations

Well related to existing settlement and within easy reach of services. Prominent site but landscape impacts could be mitigated. Overall, limited constraints and site likely to be acceptable, subject to clarifications as listed.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundary; no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

Adjacent to existing development site where construction underway.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered suitable for allocation. The site relates well to the existing settlement and services and facilities within it. The site is prominent within the landscape but impacts could be mitigated with appropriate landscaping. A continuous frontage footway linking to tie in with provision at PUL1 would be required.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 03 June 2020

SN1027

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1027
Site address	Land east of Goldsmith Way, Pulham St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural – unallocated
Planning History	Refused applications for residential development in 1976 and earlier
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.27ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15dph – approximately 20 dwellings and open space
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	Highway concerns that there is no possible access into the site however this may have been addressed – clarification needed from the promoter of the site Highways score – Green. Access feasible if land ownership extends to the highway at Goldsmith Way. Poppy's lane constrained, improvement to acceptable standard not feasible within highway.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school at Pulham Market 1.33 km away linked with footway Employment opportunities (garage) 330 metres on route linked by footway Peak time public transport 330 metres linked by footway Shop 725 metres away linked by footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Community hall (Pennoyers Centre) including café 665 metres with footway Recreation ground adjoins site Public house within settlement has been closed for some years but remains last lawful use of building Pre-school in Pulham Market	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and there are no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No known flood risk issues	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4 Waveney tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Contained site that does not intrude into wider landscape	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development of site could be designed to integrate with existing development Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Continues suburban development of this part of the village	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Conservation Area has been amended since HEELA; no impact on heritage assets Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Heritage impact amber as Roseville to the east – but not significant impact and can be mitigated against HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of open space and potential to add to existing recreation space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Clarification required over whether access can be achieved by Goldsmith Way as there are footway links along Goldsmith Way and Poppy's Lane to the centre of the village and public transport CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Little impact on setting of conservation area due to intervening modern development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Depends on whether access to adopted highway on Goldsmith Way can be achieved?	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)	Compatible neighbouring uses – residential to south and west, playground to east and agricultural to north	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively level site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedges on southern, western and northern boundaries, should be able to be retained if access achievable from Goldsmith Way	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in trees and hedges on boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	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	Contained by existing trees and hedges on northern and eastern boundaries. Only views into site are from end of Goldsmith Way.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is well contained and does not intrude into the countryside. However, clarification is needed that the applicant does control the land up to the public highway as if not then there are significant doubts as to the deliverability of the site.	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)
Local Plan map shows Conservation Area on part of site	New Conservation Area Character Appraisal adopted Dec 2019 amended the Conservation Area boundary so site is not within, or adjacent, to the CA.	
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private 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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery if access is achievable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	No subject to access being achievable	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?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well contained and does not intrude into the open countryside.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside 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 well related to the existing settlement and a range of services and facilities. However, whilst the Highway authority have indicated that a suitable access could be formed to the site, Poppy Lane is constrained and would require improvement. Allocation of the site would include an area for Public Open Space (POS).

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 10 June 2020

SN1053

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1053
Site address	Land west of Mill Lane, Pulham St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.76 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocation (but see number of dwelling below)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	13dph - 10 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Site has long highway frontage, albeit with some level difference</p> <p>Highways score – Amber. Access visibility requirement likely to result in removal of mature tree. Subject to provision of 2.0m frontage f/w to link with existing facility to west. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p>Part 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Primary school at Pulham Market 1.1 km away linked by footway</p> <p>Employment opportunities (garage) 125 metres to north with footway</p> <p>Peak time public transport 130 metres to north linked by footway</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Community hall (Pennoyers Centre) including café 430 metres with footway Recreation ground 750 metres away linked by footway Public house within settlement has been closed for some years but remains last lawful use of building Pre-school in Pulham Market	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and there are no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	HEELA identifies surface water flood risk	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4 Waveney tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	With the existing linear development to the north it is not considered that development of this site would intrude into the wider landscape	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	<p>Whilst there is development fronting onto Mill Lane on both sides to the north of the site, the southern portion of Mill Lane has no development fronting onto it with existing development to the east fronting onto Station Road. There are also level differences between the site and the road which could lead to some difficulties in integrating development into the townscape</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer – Green</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impact should be able to be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Listed building to south but should be able to mitigate impact on setting</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer – Green</p> <p>HES score – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Mill Lane is a narrow road with level differences to the site	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Integration of development of this would be more difficult to integrate into the townscape than a look at a plan would suggest. Existing development to the east of the southern portion of Mill Lane does not front onto the land and has no relationship with it, whilst the higher level of the land from the lane also raises issues.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Would need confirmation from highways given levels difference however it should be achievable	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)	Remainder of existing field to west, dwellings to north and south and on opposite side of Mill lane to east. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is higher than lane	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No western boundary as the site currently forms part of the same field. Partly vegetated highway boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	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 visible from the road but wider landscape impact relatively contained as development would be in line with existing dwellings to north.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Despite appearing as a logical infill on plan the site would have an uneasy relationship with the existing townscape on the opposite side of Mill Lane	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private 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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	No subject to access being achievable	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?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Promoted for ten dwellings but 12 could be achieved on the site to allow for the site to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Would be relatively contained within the landscape given existing dwellings but would have poor relationship with the townscape due to the orientation of the dwellings on the opposite side of Mill Lane to the east.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside 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:

UNREASONABLE - The site has an acceptable relationship with local services and is relatively contained within the landscape. However, the site would have poor relationship with the townscape due to the orientation of the dwellings on the opposite side of Mill Lane to the east.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 10 June 2020

SN2095

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2095
Site address	East of Colegate End Road, Pulham Market
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2019/1361 – 7 dwellings - REFUSED
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.66 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Promoted for allocation <i>(the site has been promoted for 10 dwellings therefore below an allocation but is of a size that would be considered as an allocation as it could accommodate a higher number of dwellings, subject to site constraints. The site has therefore been considered as a both an allocation and a settlement limit extension)</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15 dph (Promoted for 10x 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	Narrow lane so NCC to confirm suitability of road network and that adequate visibility achievable. Highways score – Site has sufficient frontage to provide an acceptable access but would require carriageway widening, frontage footway and removal of frontage trees.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school approx. 850m walking route (no footpath for 200m). GP surgery Limited retail in settlement but includes builder's merchants. Farm shop & garden centre nearby but remote from settlement. Employment opportunities within settlement 2 bus operators run daytime services daily between settlement and Norwich (including peak time)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village hall 2 public houses within settlement 2 cafes in farm/garden centres which are remote from settlement Pre-school in village hall Recreation ground	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site. Foul sewer rising main running through site set back from frontage	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1 and identified SW flow path crossing southern 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	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E4: Great Moulton Plateau ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site prominent in views along this road but wider landscape impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development would infill gap between residential and agricultural uses to north. Would reinforce ribbon development leading out of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development likely to harm designated heritage assets. Loss of rural setting of adjacent LBs and urbanising of character of CA. Technical comments required if the site is considered appropriate to progress. HES score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow lane so NCC to confirm suitability of road network for increased capacity CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Detrimental impact on character of CA and setting of LBs which could not be mitigated through design. Seek view of technical officer if the site is considered to be appropriate to progress	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access at northern end. NCC to confirm if adequate for increased capacity and if off-site improvements needed. Adequate visibility likely to be achieved.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible – part of larger parcel of agricultural land and residential to south	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to north and west (sections only). Eastern side open to larger parcel of farmland	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along northern boundary. Ditch along western boundary with road.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles and wires along western boundary with road	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views along Colegate End Road in both directions. Part of larger parcel of land so open in views to and from east.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development would reinforce ribbon development along this road and would have a detrimental impact on adjacent heritage assets, especially through loss of open setting of LBs opposite.	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Potential access issues have been identified as well as a surface water flow path across part of the site which would constrain development. Potential harm to designated heritage assets however development would appear to reinforce the linear pattern of the settlement.

Site Visit Observations

Site on edge of settlement and within reach of services but without continuous footpath provision. Development would have unacceptable impact on townscape and heritage assets that could not be mitigated. Not considered suitable for allocation.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundaries.

Availability

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

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

UNREASONABLE - development would have unacceptable impact on townscape and heritage assets that could not be mitigated, either as an allocation or as an extension to the settlement limit.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 05 June 2020

SN2096

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2096
Site address	West of Mill Lane, Pulham Market
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.95 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Promoted for allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	17 dph (The site has been promoted for approximately 50 dwellings across 2 phases of development)
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	Potential access constraints - narrow lane with shallow verges. NCC to confirm that adequate visibility achievable. CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school approx. 1km walking route (no footpath for 90m). GP surgery Limited retail in settlement but includes builders merchants. Farm shop & garden centre nearby but remote from settlement. Employment opportunities within settlement 2 bus operators run daytime services daily between settlement and Norwich (including peak time)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village hall 2 public houses within settlement 2 cafes in farm/garden centres which are remote from settlement Pre-school in village hall Recreation ground	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage likely available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1 with two small areas of identified flood risk in northern half of site. Also along Mill Lane. Ditches along northern and eastern site boundaries.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E4: Great Moulton Plateau ALC Grade TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Due to scale, site prominent in views along Mill Lane and in wider views from north and west.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would represent a significant breakout to north Senior Heritage & Design Officer – This is starting to get quite far from the centre of the village. Also concern at the size of the allocation and potentially estate like development of some size, which the village could consider overwhelming.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Due to scale, development may have detrimental impact on setting designated heritage assets further to west Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green HES score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Narrow lane with shallow verges. NCC to confirm if adequate for increased capacity CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Well separated from CA but seek technical comment re impact on setting of LBs further to west	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access at midpoint along eastern boundary. Narrow lane (observed that two vehicles cannot pass without mounting narrow verge). NCC to confirm if adequate for increased capacity and if off-site improvements needed. Visibility may be constrained by significant oak trees along boundary with highway.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible – part of larger parcel of agricultural land and residential to south	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to north and east (containing trees). Western side open to larger parcel of farmland	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant trees along boundary with highway. Seek comment from technical officer. Ditches behind hedge line along northern and eastern boundaries.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views along Mill Lane, especially from northern approach. Also open views into site from west	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of whole site would be likely to have significant detrimental impacts on landscape, townscape, highway network and heritage assets. Development of south eastern section only (similar in scale to SN0418, opposite) would be likely to have similar impacts that could be more easily mitigated.	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site has potential access constraints and small areas of flood risk identified within its boundaries. It would be a significant addition to the townscape and would be prominent within the landscape.

Site Visit Observations

Site on edge of settlement but within reach of services, subject to provision of footpath link to existing. Development of whole site would be likely to have unacceptable impacts on landscape, townscape, highway network and heritage assets. Development of south eastern corner only likely to acceptable, subject to mitigation of constraints and clarifications as listed.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundaries.

Availability

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

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The scale of the submitted site is **UNREASONABLE** due to the impact it would have on both the townscape and landscape. A reduced scale site may be more acceptable but due to the constraints identified should only be considered further if alternative sites within the settlement are not considered to be reasonable options.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 05 June 2020

SN4085SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4085SL
Site address	Land adjacent Orchard Court, Station Road, Pulham Market
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.25 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 1 dwelling (4 dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Single access from Station Road CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	1 km walk to primary – no footpath for 600m GP surgery, retail, local employment And bus services within 1800m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Pub, village hall and recreation facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Areas of identified SW flood risk at southern end of site. Large SW flow path identified immediately south of site LLFA score – Green (LLFA note surface water flowpath adjacent to the site and advise this will need to be considered within a site assessment)	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E4: Great Moulton Plateau ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact that could be mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact that could be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated NCC Ecology score – Green. Potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	No detrimental impact on designated heritage assets HES score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on network could be reasonably mitigated CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm visibility achievable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential garden	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agriculture – no conflict	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Substantial hedge with trees along highway boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees within site. Pond at southern end. Improved access likely to result in loss of hedge	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views contained by established planting along boundaries	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Separated from and poorly connected to services – no footpath. Development would harm rural character of this road. Developable area constrained by trees/ecology. Not suitable for SL extension.	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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Potential access issues have been identified, as well as areas of flood risk both within and adjacent to the site. Development of the site could have an impact on both the landscape and the townscape which may prove difficult to mitigate.

Site Visit Observations

Remote from and poorly connected to services. Development would harm rural character of this road. Developable area constrained by trees/ecology. Not suitable for extension.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside – no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** extension to the settlement limit due to its poor connectivity and the impact it would have on the landscape and the character of the local environment.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 June 2020