



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Saxlingham Nethergate

## Contents

SN0198 .....	3
SN4005 .....	11
SN4007SL .....	20
SN4043SL .....	28
SN5049 .....	36
SN5050 .....	46
SN5051 .....	56

SN0198

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0198
Site address	6 Kensington Close
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for single dwelling
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.34 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 10 dwellings = up to 29 dph (25 dph = 9 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	Red	No access. Would rely on access through adjacent property. Does not appear possible to create a safe access.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. Norwich Road in the vicinity of the site lacks footways & there is no safe walking route to school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	800m walk to primary school  Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m	

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B1: Tas tributary farmland  ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on HAS  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. Norwich Road in the vicinity of the site lacks footways & there is no safe walking route to school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No existing access and no opportunity to provide this. Promoter relying on access beside existing dwelling	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Garden/amenity	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/ residential – compatible uses	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow including trees and residential boundaries.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees along boundary and within site. Assessment required.	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 constraints. No evidence of contamination.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Not prominent in views. Screened by existing development and established hedgerow.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge in places and close to limited local services. Development as promoted would not reflect pattern and density of existing development. No separate access and does not appear feasible to provide. Development would also have significant impact on existing residential amenity.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Currently no separate access to site.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No. Not included in supporting statement	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for allocation due to lack of access and impacts on townscape and existing residential amenity.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge in places and close to limited local services. Development as promoted would not reflect pattern and density of existing development. No separate access and does not appear feasible to provide. Development would also have significant impact on existing residential amenity.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

Promoter has not commented.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE.** The site is adjacent to the settlement limit and existing modern residential properties however it is land-locked with no access into it. It would be contained within existing hedge boundaries but would be out of character with the surrounding development and would impact on residential amenity.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

## SN4005

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4005
Site address	North of Norwich Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 dwellings = 11 dph (25 dph = 27 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Field access at northern end. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Amber. No continuous f/w to village amenities & Norwich Road constrained in places.  <b>Highways Meeting</b> - Lack of continuous footpath back to the village. Would not be a safe walking route (alignment of the road is an issue), particularly as the school is located at the opposite end of the village. Highways not supportive.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>1000m walk to primary school</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site is within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1. No identified flood risk within site.</p> <p><b>LFFA</b> – Green. Surface water flooding.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B1: Tas tributary farmland  ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.  <b>SDC Landscape Officer</b> - Development of this site is not acceptable in landscape terms. Considerable hedgerow issues (conflicting with DM4.8) as well as landscape character issues.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.  <b>SDC Heritage Officer</b> - If linear development along road it would have more impact with large new development. Preferable in townscape terms to keep as much of hedge as possible and have a slightly deeper site even with smaller close with one point of access maybe.  To the east side to the south there is quite a lot of existing development – with Kensington Close.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated.  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No detrimental impact on HAs</p> <p><b>SDC Heritage Officer</b> - LBs are quite far to north, and CA to the south, so no real impact – all modern housing nearby.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Red. No continuous f/w to village amenities &amp; Norwich Road constrained in places.</p> <p><b>Highways Meeting</b> - Lack of continuous footpath back to the village. Would not be a safe walking route (alignment of the road is an issue), particularly as the school is located at the opposite end of the village. Highways not supportive.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Field access at northern end. NCC to confirm feasibility of new access as promoted due to proximity to bend.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential – compatible uses	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Northern part of site raised above adjacent highway. G/L falls to south, in line with highway	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow including trees. Open to farmland to north.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow and trees along boundary and hedgerow transecting the site.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles and O/H lines along highway boundary.	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 Norwich Road and from farmland to north.	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge in places. No opportunity to link into existing footpaths. Townscape and landscape impacts would be limited by development of southern section only with landscaped boundary on north eastern side. Need to reflect existing pattern of development would constrain numbers. Seek early comment regarding access.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Currently no separate access to site.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No. Not included in supporting statement	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for allocation as promoted due to lack of connectivity and landscape/townscape impacts. However, development of southern section only could limit these impacts but would not overcome other concerns.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge in places. No opportunity to link into existing footpaths. Townscape and landscape impacts would be limited by development of southern section only with landscaped boundary on north eastern side. Need to reflect existing pattern of development would constrain numbers. Seek early comment regarding access.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

Supporting statement submitted.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE.** The site is adjacent to the settlement limit but there is no continuous footpath back to the village and there would not be a safe walking route. The site is out of scale with the village and would extend into the landscape and wider views to the north, elongating the village. Access from Norwich Road would require the removal of substantial mature hedging.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

## SN4007SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4007SL
Site address	Land south of Norwich Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.37 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	SL extension for affordable housing
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	3 dwellings = 8 dph (25 dph = 9 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing field access. Potential constraints but these could be overcome through development.  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Red. Visibility at frontage limited by road layout. No continuous f/w to village amenities & Norwich Road constrained in places.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	1200 m walk to primary school  Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) 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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within a proposed fibre installation area	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified flood risk within site.  <b>LFFA</b> – Green.	Green

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated.  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on HAs  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated.  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Red. Visibility at frontage limited by road layout. No continuous f/w to village amenities & Norwich Road constrained in places.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable as site near bend	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Amenity land	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/ residential – compatible uses	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow including trees. Fence to southern boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees along eastern and western boundaries.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No constraints. No evidence of contamination.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views along Norwich Road.	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Walking route to school lacks footpath provision but wide verges in places. Improved access would require loss of hedgerow.	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)
Within development boundary		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Access improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoted for affordable housing only	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Affordable housing in rural area	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for allocation as site is within existing SL. Proposals should be assessed against current DM policies. Access, design/layout and landscaping would be main considerations.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Walking route to school lacks footpath provision but wide verges in places. Improved access would require loss of hedgerow.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

As confirmed by promoter.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**NOT REASONABLE FOR ALLOCATION AS SITE ALREADY WITHIN SL.** The site is already located within the Settlement Boundary. Proposals would be assessed against current DM policies which already support development here in principle. Access, design, layout and landscaping would be the main considerations to be dealt with through a planning application.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

## SN4043SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4034SL
Site address	Land west of sandpit Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2017/0360 single dwelling – refused and dismissed at appeal
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 5 dwellings = 50 dph (25 dph = 2.5 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	Red	Existing access. Potential constraints but these could be overcome through development.  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Red. Access & safe walking route not achievable.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	1400 m walk to primary school  Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) 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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within a proposed fibre installation area	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues.  <b>NCC Minerals</b> - site within the 400m consultation area for safeguarded key Water Recycling Centres. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the mineral and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified flood risk within site.  <b>LIFFA</b> – Green.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B1: Tas tributary farmland  ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated.  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. Potential for protected species/ habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on HAs  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated.  <b>NCC Highways</b> - Red. Access & safe walking route not achievable.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access onto track off Sandpit Lane which is very narrow, no verge and enclosed by high hedgerow. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Garden/amenity	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/ residential – compatible uses	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow including trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees along boundary and within site. Assessment required.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles and O/H lines along southern boundary. No evidence of contamination.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Not prominent in views. Screened by existing development and established hedgerow.	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Walking route to school lacks footpath provision along very narrow lane with limited visibility. Also impacts on connectivity to other local services which would rely on private car. Development as proposed would not reflect existing scattered pattern of 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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not suitable for extension to settlement limit due to lack of connectivity to school and other local services and townscape impacts.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Walking route to school lacks footpath provision along very narrow lane with limited visibility. Also impacts on connectivity to other local services which would rely on private car. Development as proposed would not reflect existing scattered pattern of development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

### **Achievability**

As confirmed by promoter.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE.** It is detached from the village and remote from the school and other services with poor connectivity along very narrow, single track, unlit roads with no footpaths. The site is visually contained but development here is sporadic and this type of consolidation would be out of character. It would require the removal of established frontage hedging which would significantly add to this impact.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

SN5049

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5049
Site address	Land west of The Street (Green), Saxlingham Nethergate
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5.6
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None specified 140 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing field access to south-east corner which has a large informal lay-by. Also serves as the entrance to footpath network and used for parking. On outside of bend –  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Access - Limited forward visibility to south east. Network - no feasibility of safe walking route to village / school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School; under 500m along road but there is no footpath and would be dangerous to walk. It is 380m along public footpath from north of site to back of school but this would not be a realistic, all-weather alternative or accessible to all.  Bus Service (including peak) along frontage. Bus stop 300-400m depending on direction from The Green but no footpaths.  Limited employment opportunities within 3000m.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village Hall (with groups – including a nursery) – 830m  Playing Field/Recreation Ground – 35metres across the road and via Saxlingham Meadow. But crossing the road.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Red	<b>Environment Agency:</b> Amber The serving Saxlingham Water Recycling Centre (WRC) treatment works for foul drainage and waste water are very close to current permitted capacity, this is shown to be at 91.3 % capacity and has limited capacity to accept further flows (less than 30 houses estimated). Any proposals coming forward will need to engage with Anglian Water, and also submit a Foul Drainage Methodology assessing the constraints and demonstrating that there will be sufficient capacity.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. Gas unknown.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated, existing agricultural land, and no known stability issues.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 Some risk of surface water flooding on the boundaries and a smaller area of low risk into the site along the northern boundary. Due to ditches on boundaries.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints, on-site flood risk is localised ponding. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Saxlingham Water Recycling Centre discharges to the Tas, a tributary of the River Yare. This river is likely to be in the Nutrient Neutrality area, where off-setting of development is required for development to protect the European sites of Yare Broad &amp; Marshes.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B1 Tas Tributary Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Does not encroach into the wider landscape as is contained by strong boundaries however it would significantly change the approach to the village from some distance. Some detrimental impacts may be mitigated with additional native planting along the frontage but it would still have a negative impact on the landscape.	Red
Townscape	Red	The promoted site area is very large and it would be an uncharacteristic addition away from the concentration of the village around The Street. Even if the site were significantly reduced in numbers, it would be separate and not part of the existing village fabric.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations.</p> <p>Significant potential for species as a variety of habitats surround the site. Investigation, mitigation and enhancement would be required.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber.  PROW should be consulted - Saxlingham Nethergate RB17, FP13 and FP 14 surround the site. No priority habitats onsite (MAGIC). Residential and water discharge do not trigger NE consultation need. GCN amber zone -ponds within 250m.</p>	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>No effect on conservation area. Grade II listed buildings to the north separated by a track and to the north-east across the road so that there would be not significant impact on either. Also Grade II* remains of St Mary's Church to north-west but not immediately adjacent and within a copse so unlikely to have a significant impact.</p> <p>Site of Archaeological Interest along road frontage and also adjacent to north-west so may also be interest here.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>NCC to confirm if there is any significant impact on the local network. Relatively well connected to wider network, A140 to west. However no safe pedestrian access to the school or other services.</p> <p>Close to PRow network (with a Restricted Byway to the southern boundary); FP13,14 &amp; 15 and RB17.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Access - Limited forward visibility to south east. Network - no feasibility of safe walking route to village / school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Agriculture/residential. Public footpath on each boundary with road to frontage.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No evident impact on heritage assets. Is an historic interest in vicinity to north-west.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The existing access is open and to this field as well as the adjacent field and a track which is a PRow. It has a setback front the road on the corner which appears to be used by walkers/dog walkers to park and use the footpath route here.  The road is busy with no footpaths linking it to the rest of the village.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture – arable.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to south and west. Across the road to east and to the north is low density residential.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No hedge to frontage. Strong field boundaries on all sides with native hedging and trees, an attractive small block of woodland to rear (west) boundary reinforced by a line of Poplars.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Monoculture within the site but woodland and strong hedge lines with water present in ditches provide good habitat.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination, no building to demolish.  Telegraph poles along front and electricity cables centrally crossing site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	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	<p>Views into the site as approach from south these are contained in the medium view by the strong hedge to the south and the backdrop of significant trees behind along the north and west boundaries.</p> <p>There will also be public views from the footpaths around the site. Similar views out of the site, mainly to the east (front) as there is no hedge.</p>	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>The site is physically very well contained on all boundaries, by ditches, footpaths and vegetation. This serves to delineate the site so that it doesn't encroach into the open landscape but it would dominate the nearer landscape views on the approach to the village from the east.</p> <p>The site is out of scale with the village and even if it were reduced it would be a separate parcel of land which is not well connected to the village along The Green. It would be unlikely that the village services, (school, village hall) would be accessed by foot.</p>	Red

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No but indicated it is deliverable.	Amber
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. A footpath along frontage could be achieved but would not link northwards.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided. It would be required given the size of site.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is excessive in size and would not meet the objectives of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in scale to meet the identified criteria and reduce some of the visual impact of development in this location. The Highway Authority have highlighted concerns with the access to the site where there is limited forward visibility to the south each way which would create a safety issue and also with regards to the lack of safe walking route to the school. There are also issues relating to wastewater capacity and heritage impacts.

### Site Visit Observations

The site is physically very well contained on all boundaries, by ditches, footpaths and vegetation. This serves to delineate the site so that it doesn't encroach into the open landscape but it would dominate the nearer landscape views on the approach to the village from the east.

The site is out of scale with the village and even if it were reduced it would be a separate parcel of land which is not well connected to the village along The Green. It would be unlikely that the village services, (school, village hall) would be accessed by foot.

### Local Plan Designations

None

### Availability

The site is considered to be available.

### Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable but would require highways mitigation measures which may impact on the viability of the site

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The site has been considered both at the larger scale it was originally promoted for and a smaller scale development that would meet the objectives of the VCHAP. However, the site is not considered appropriate as it would appear separate and not part of the existing village fabric. In addition, the highways concerns that have been raised are unreasonably mitigated. The site would also be reliant on a road network that does not benefit from pedestrian links. Development of the site would also have an impact on the Site of Archaeological Interest located along the road frontage.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 28/04/22

## SN5050

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5050
Site address	Land north of The Street (Green), Saxlingham Nethergate
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.1
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None specified 52 at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Existing open, informal field access centrally to south onto The Green. Also an informal access to south-east corner onto The Green adjacent to/shared with a cottage.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access - Subject to acceptable visibility, would require hedge removal. Network - no feasibility of safe walking route to village / school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School; 680m along road without a footpath and would be dangerous to walk. There are PRoW to rear to school.  Bus Service (including peak) along frontage. Bus stop 120-220m depending on direction from The Green but no footpaths.  Limited employment opportunities within 3000m.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village Hall (with groups – including a nursery) – 1,080m  Playing Field/Recreation Ground – around 120m via Saxlingham Meadow but along the road with no footpath and poor visibility around the bend.	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Red	Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. Gas unknown.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated, existing agricultural land, and no known stability issues.	Green



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1 No identified risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints, on-site flood risk is localised ponding. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Amber The serving Saxlingham Water Recycling Centre (WRC) treatment works for foul drainage and waste water are very close to current permitted capacity, this is shown to be at 91.3 % capacity and has limited capacity to accept further flows (less than 30 houses estimated). Any proposals coming forward will need to engage with Anglian Water, and also submit a Foul Drainage Methodology assessing the constraints and demonstrating that there will be sufficient capacity.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Saxlingham Water Recycling Centre discharges to the Tas, a tributary of the River Yare. This river is likely to be in the Nutrient Neutrality area, where off-setting of development is required for development to protect the European sites of Yare Broad &amp; Marshes.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	B1 Tas Tributary Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	It is fairly well contained either side, but it is part of the wider landscape and has long views northwards over to Hall Lane. The frontage is also long and runs along the road on a concave bend which makes it more prominent. It would be detrimental to the rural landscape in this location.	Red
Townscape	Amber	The promoted site area is large and it would be an uncharacteristic addition away from the concentration of the village around The Street. It would be contained between two areas of much lower density housing however this gap is important in the setting of the conservation area and intense development would be out of character.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations.</p> <p>Limited potential for species as a monoculture site with some limited hedge/tree habitat to east and north-east of the site. Investigation, mitigation and enhancement would be required.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ - residential and water discharge do not require NE consultation. GI corridor and amber risk zone for great crested newts - ponds within 250m. No PROW onsite/adjacent. Saxlingham Green registered common land on spur between Dairy Farm Cottage and the road. No priority habitats.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>No designations on site.</p> <p>On edge of conservation area to east boundary, check with Heritage Officer relating to setting. Also, Site of Archaeological Interest adjacent so potential for archaeology here.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Relatively well connected to wider network, A140 to west.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Access - Subject to acceptable visibility, would require hedge removal. Network - no feasibility of safe walking route to village / school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No evident impact on heritage assets, would need to consider the location adjacent to the conservation area.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears to be a shared access with the adjacent cottage to east. Also opening in hedge directly onto The Green. Both would need to be checked for visibility.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture. No buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to south and north. To east and to the west is low density residential.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Strong hedge line along frontage, broken for a small length for access. Hedges and trees to east and west and small section to north with an open area as it is part of a larger field.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedge habitats surrounding.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination, no building to demolish, no evident utilities.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Wide views into the site as drive along the long boundary to the south. Similar views out of site to south and north.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	This is a large site away from the main part of the village with no footpath along the road or alternative route to village. It would be prominent along the frontage, although there is a native hedge, and it would significantly change the rural character in this location.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No, promoter has indicated is deliverable as surplus to needs.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. A footpath along frontage could be achieved but would not currently link northwards which would be ideal.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided. It would be required given size of site.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is considered to be a suitable size for allocation.

### Site Visit Observations

This is a large site away from the main part of the village with no footpath along the road or alternative route to village. It would be prominent along the frontage, although there is a native hedge, and it would significantly change the rural character in this location.

### Local Plan Designations

### Availability

The site is considered available.

### Achievability

No further constraints have been identified.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. Whilst the site is well contained, it forms part of the wider landscape which has long open views towards Hall Lane to the north. The site is positioned in-between 2 bends which would make the site appear prominent in an east and west direction. Development of the site would also require the removal of large parts of existing hedgerow to provide a sufficient visibility splay, the removal of the hedgerow is not considered appropriate as it would open the site to the south which would alter the rural characteristics of the area. The site is also located between two areas of much lower density housing which provides an important setting of the conservation area and intense development would be out of character. In summary, the combined impacts would be detrimental to the rural landscape in this location. In addition, the Environment Agency have raised concerns with foul water capacity.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 28/04/22

## SN5051

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5051
Site address	Land east of Broaden Lane, Saxlingham Nethergate
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.96ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None specified 72 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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



### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	No access from The Green. Existing informal field access to south off Broaden Lane. Highway Authority to advise on visibility.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access - Subject to acceptable visibility, would require hedge removal. Network - no feasibility of safe walking route to village / school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School; 1,000m along road but there is no footpath and would be dangerous to walk.  Bus Service (including peak) along frontage. Bus stop 40-60 depending on direction from The Green but no footpaths.  Limited employment opportunities within 3000m.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village Hall (with groups – including a nursery) – 1,400m  Playing Field/Recreation Ground – around 470m via Saxlingham Meadow but along the road with no footpath and poor visibility around the bend.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Red	Promoter advises electricity, water and foul drainage to site. Gas unknown  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Amber The serving Saxlingham Water Recycling Centre (WRC) treatment works for foul drainage and waste water are very close to current permitted capacity, this is shown to be at 91.3 % capacity and has limited capacity to accept further flows (less than 30 houses estimated). Any proposals coming forward will need to engage with Anglian Water, and also submit a Foul Drainage Methodology assessing the constraints and demonstrating that there will be sufficient capacity.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated, existing agricultural land, and no known stability issues.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Small area of surface water flooding at high risk along boundary to south and some risk through the site – would need checking.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>On-site flood risk is mostly localised ponding with an area forming part of a flow path in the north of the site in the 0.1% AEP event.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Saxlingham Water Recycling Centre discharges to the Tas, a tributary of the River Yare. This river is likely to be in the Nutrient Neutrality area, where off-setting of development is required for development to protect the European sites of Yare Broad &amp; Marshes.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	<p>B1 Tas Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3</p>	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	A large site which is contained to the east and there is a hedge line along some of the southern boundary. However, it would be highly visible in the open landscape when approaching The Green along the straight Broaden Lane and it would be incongruous.	Red
Townscape	Red	It would be out of character with this part of the village which is the setting of the conservation area to the north. Glimpses would also be seen from the conservation area along The Street which would detract from the low density and rural nature of the designation.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations. Open grassed site with hedges and trees around the perimeter with potential for habitat. Would require investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ - residential and water discharge do not require NE consultation. GI corridor and amber risk zone for great crested newts - ponds within 250m . PROW Saxlingham Nethergate FP10 along eastern boundary. adjacent to Saxlingham Green registered common land . No priority habitats.</p> <p><b>Norfolk Wildlife Trust:</b> the eastern section of this site would isolate the section of woodland to the south from the wooded area to the north. If this site is progressed to the next stage of the plan, it may be beneficial for any assessment of on-site Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) delivery for this site to focus development on the arable element and assess the potential to connect the existing woodland areas to the east as part of BNG delivery.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Area of site to north is within the conservation area.</p> <p>2 listed buildings to north-west - Manor Farm/Manor Barn. Manor Farm is also a Site of Archaeological Interest, therefore potential for archaeology at this site.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Relatively well connected to wider network, A140 to west.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Access - Subject to acceptable visibility, would require hedge removal. Network - no feasibility of safe walking route to village / school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Need to consider the impact on the adjacent conservation area and particularly the area to the north which is specifically within the designation. Also, the setting of the listed buildings on the corner of the site. Development would have an impact on the heritage assets as it would significantly change the character here.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Field access currently from Broaden Lane which would need to be assessed by the Highway Authority.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture. No buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to south and west. Woodland to east and some low density residential along The Green.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Strong hedge line along road frontage, broken for a small length for access to the south. Hedges and trees to east and west and north.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedge habitats surrounding.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination, no building to demolish, no evident utilities.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	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	There are significant views of the site when driving towards the village from the south. The landscape is very open, and the views are wider here. The public views from the conservation area are limited although there are views through the trees on The Green where development would be visible. Views out of the site would be mainly to the west and south.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	This is a large site away from the main part of the village with no footpath along the road or alternative route to village. It would be prominent along the frontage and in the wider views, although there is a native hedge. It would significantly change the rural character in this location and would impact on the setting of the conservation area and the adjacent listed buildings. Need landscape and heritage consultation.	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 in Conservation Area		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Will impact on the Conservation Area	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No, promoter indicated that it is deliverable.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. A footpath along frontage could be achieved but would not currently link northwards which would be ideal.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided. It would be required given size of site.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is larger in size and would not meet the objectives of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in scale to meet the identified criteria and reduce the landscape and visual impact of development in this location. The site is also subject to highway constraints.

### **Site Visit Observations**

This is a large site away from the main part of the village with no footpath along the road or alternative route to village. It would be prominent along the frontage and in the wider views, although there is a native hedge. It would significantly change the rural character in this location and would impact on the setting of the conservation area and the adjacent listed buildings

### **Local Plan Designations**

The northern part of the site falls within the Conservation Area.

### **Availability**

The site is considered to be available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. The site has been considered both at the larger scale it was originally promoted for and a smaller scale development that would meet the objectives of the VCHAP. However, the site is not considered appropriate in either form due the landscape and townscape, with specific regard to the impact on the conservation area. Development of the site would also be subject to creating a safe and suitable access with sufficient visibility. The site is currently accessed via an informal field gate where a significant amount of hedgerow would require removal in order to achieve visibility.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 28/04/2022