



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Seething and Mundham

## Contents

SN0405 .....	3
SN1035 .....	16
SN5006 .....	27
SN5031 .....	36

## SN0405

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0405
Site address	Land to North and South of Brooke Road, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	The 'Cart Shed' site: L/5630 Two dwellings for farm workers. Approved 1978/0535 Two Dwellings Together with Garages and Stores for Farm Workers. Approved 1985/2380 Conversion of Redundant Cart Shed and Store to A Single Dwelling for Private Use. Refused 2004/2367 Proposed conversion of barn to single dwelling. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.252ha (total of 3 sites) Site North of Brooke Road 0.772ha – 19 dwellings The site 'The Cart Shed' – 7 dwellings The site between Seething and Mundham School and Church Farmhouse will provide additional car parking for the school
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Residential development of approximately 26 dwellings (as well as additional car parking for the adjoining school)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield and part of the barn conversions garden

## Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

## Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

### **HELAA Score:**

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

### **Site Score:**

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

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

## SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. Potential access could be formed to the land to the north, subject to a frontage footway. Adoptable access unlikely to be achieved to the south area. The road bends and has the school access and other junctions in close proximity</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, access could be formed to the area north of Brooke Road subject to frontage footway. Adoptable standard access unlikely to be achievable to the area south of Brooke Road. Does not appear feasible to provide footway to nearby school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - very tight to get a footway on the School Road/Brooke Road junction (particularly with the pond on the corner). School access is currently arranged to separate vehicles and pedestrians, with vehicle access from Brooke Road and pedestrians from School Road. Likely to need a discussion with both the site promoter and the school about enhanced access arrangements and car parking, maybe accessing the school at the western end. Layout of the road means that speed limit compliance is likely to be good in this location, and a part-time 20mph outside the school may be beneficial.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Village Shop 575m</p> <p>Bus stop within 594m and is on the bus route for Anglian 86</p> <p>Primary School is within 122m</p> <p>No footpaths</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Village Hall 604m</p> <p>Recreational ground/play area next to village hall</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage, gas and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an 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 as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1 with surface water flooding depth of 1-1000 in the road and around the pond	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> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p><b>Landscape Meeting</b> - Particular concerns about the infilling of the 'Old Park' site as this would represent significant infill which could have a townscape impact. Consider this to be a difficult site however further consideration of this site is required.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	<p>The sites are located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even there hedgerows are a key feature.</p> <p>The cart shed site is located within/adjacent to a farm complex and the land to the north of the is located adjacent to a linear form of development to the east and an estate to the west.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The land north of Brooke Road is adjacent to the development boundary to the southeast.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB. St Margaret's Church is located to the east of School lane. Separated from the two housing sites by intervening land uses. Seething Old hall and Church Monument are located to the northwest of the 'land to north of Brooke Road' with the Seething Old Hall Park development between. The Cart Shed site is located within the Seething Conservation Area. The 'land to north of Brooke Road' is partly within and as is small part of the land proposed for parking.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of road network which may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, access could be formed to the area north of Brooke Road subject to frontage footway. Adoptable standard access unlikely to be achievable to the area south of Brooke Road. Does not appear feasible to provide footway to nearby school.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways Meeting</b> - very tight to get a footway on the School Road/Brooke Road junction (particularly with the pond on the corner). School access is currently arranged to separate vehicles and pedestrians, with vehicle access from Brooke Road and pedestrians from School Road. Likely to need a discussion with both the site promoter and the school about enhanced access arrangements and car parking, maybe accessing the school at the western end. Layout of the road means that speed limit compliance is likely to be good in this location, and a part-time 20mph outside the school may be beneficial.</p>	<p>Red</p> <p>Amber</p>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential and Seething and Mundham Primary School	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The land north of Brooke Road is adjacent to the development boundary to the southeast.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	<p>Potential access constraints existing hedge/trees to site frontage. Potential access could be formed to the land to the north, subject to a frontage footway. Adoptable access unlikely to be achieved to the south area. The road bends and has the school access and other junctions in close proximity.</p>	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	<p>Part of the Cart Shed site is domestic curtilage to the barn conversion granted consent in 2004.</p> <p>Agricultural grade 3</p>	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural/residential and Seething and Mundham Primary School	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)	Trees/hedgerows. Residential.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees. As land to north of Brooke Road is agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations.  Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	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)	None	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Sites are visible from the road network, The Cart Shed is clearly viewed across the open landscape. The land to the north is better screened. Public footpath runs east west to the south of Church Farmhouse from in front of the school	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)	Land to north is adjacent the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. Views of the sites are afforded from both the surrounding road network and the and public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	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		

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

<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?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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?	Yes - the provision of a car park for the school	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The land to the north of Brooke Road is considered suitable subject to mitigation of constraints and confirmation from NCC Highways that the site is acceptable in highway terms and the heritage officer that the development would not harm the heritage assets, in particular views of the Church and listed building and monument.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Land to north is adjacent the existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated. Views of the sites are afforded from both the surrounding road network and the and public footpath. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside and adjacent to development boundary in part.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within 5 years.

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Three parcels of land have been promoted in this location. Of these two sites are preferred for allocation:

- (1) The land to the north of Brooke Road is considered reasonable subject to mitigation of the constraints particularly the highway impacts, impacts on the existing hedgerow/trees, landscape considerations and heritage terms; and,
- (2) Discussion needs to be undertaken with the school as to whether land between the school and the Church Farm buildings could provide (a) additional car-parking and/or (b) an alternative pedestrian access to the school.

The third parcel of land, 'the cart shed', immediately north of Church Farmhouse is not considered suitable for allocation as this forms part of the setting of a notable non-designated heritage asset within the Conservation Area, contributing significantly to this rural approach to the village.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

SN1035

Part 1 - Site Details



<b>Detail</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	SN1035
<b>Site address</b>	Land South of Wheelers Lane, Seething
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	<p>2017/2220 Variation of condition 2 of permission 2016/2882 (Proposed 3 no. new dwellings and garages) - Changes to external elevations to plots 1, 2 and 3 and revisions to garages. Approved</p> <p>2017/0749 Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2016/2882/F - Alteration to external elevations for plot 1 and plot 3. Approved</p> <p>2016/2882 Proposed 3 new dwellings and garages. Approved</p> <p>2013/1193 Demolition of existing industrial units and erection of 3 detached houses and associated works. Approved</p> <p>2006/0456 Stopping up of car repair use, removal of caravan and erection of eight affordable houses and five private market houses, associated landscaping, access and car parking. Refused</p> <p>2004/2451 Stopping up of all car repair use, removal of caravan and erection of 6no residential dwellings and 4no affordable dwellings with recreational areas, associated landscaping, car parking and access. Refused</p> <p>2004/0331 Stopping all car repair &amp; breaking use, removal of residential caravan and erection of 8no private dwellings &amp; 4no affordable dwellings with creation of 2no ponds, parking area &amp; landscape. Refused</p> <p>2003/0932 Stopping up of existing lawful car repair use and erection of 6no residential dwellings with recreational meadow &amp; nature reserve. Refused</p> <p>2002/1858 Erection of 12 two and three bedroomed houses and associated landscaped area. Refused</p> <p>L/1289 Erection of five dwellings. Refused</p>
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.87ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Allocation
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Residential development of unspecified number - 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

## Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access visibility restricted by the alignment of the carriageway and adjacent land. Would require complete removal of frontage hedge and trees. Wheeler Lane is narrow, has restricted visibility back onto Seething Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, access visibility restricted by the alignment of the carriageway and adjacent land. Would require complete removal of frontage hedge and trees. Wheeler Lane is narrow, has restricted visibility back onto Seething Road and has no footway.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Village Shop 344m</p> <p>Bus stop within 820m and is on the bus route for Anglian 86</p> <p>Primary School is within 500m</p> <p>No footpaths</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Village Hall next to the site</p> <p>Recreational ground/play area next to village hall</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. Adjacent site used a package treatment plant. So question if the site has mains sewage and this could have cost implications/viability	Amber/Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an 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 as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues. It did not form part of the Wheelers garage site.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1. Surface water flooding 1-1000 to the south, outside the promoted 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> )		B5 Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character incorporating a range of materials and styles, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains quite dominant along the streets, and relatively few buildings are located close to the back of the street except more toward the centre, but even there hedgerows are a key feature. This part is characterised by a linear form of development.</p> <p>Not adjacent to the development boundary.</p> <p>The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Especially given it is adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby group of listed buildings White Lodge, Mere House, Mereside barn and Mere Thatched barn are located to the southeast separated by agricultural fields. Site is adjacent to Seething Conservation area. The development of the site could adversely affect the views into the Conservation Area, which may not be reasonable mitigated.  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
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 functioning of road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and no footway. Under the adjoining site development NCC Highway could not support more than 3 dwellings due to the nature of the road and surrounding network, the existing traffic associated with Wheelers garage was taken into account.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, access visibility restricted by the alignment of the carriageway and adjacent land. Would require complete removal of frontage hedge and trees. Wheeler Lane is narrow, has restricted visibility back onto Seething Road and has no footway.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential and village hall/playpark	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB's and Conservation area.  The development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Especially given it is adjacent to the Conservation Area	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access visibility restricted by the alignment of the carriageway and adjacent land. Would require complete removal of frontage hedge and trees. Wheeler Lane is narrow, has restricted visibility back onto Seething Road.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural Grade 3	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural/residential and village hall/playpark	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)	Residential boundary to the west. Trees/hedges though sparse to the east. Substantial tree to the northeast.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant tree along the northern. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead line and telegraph poles on site frontage.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are clear views of the site across the open landscape and from the road network.	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)	Outside the development boundary but well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. The site is adjacent to the built environment. Views of the site are afforded from both the highway networks and across the open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	Amber/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>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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)	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  No mains sewage so alternatives could affect the viability of the site depending on numbers	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 landscape and highway safety.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Outside the development boundary but well related to services. It would represent a breakout of the village. The site is adjacent to the built environment. Views of the site are afforded from both the highway networks and across the open landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE** – Although located close to the centre of the village, the site is not considered reasonable principally due to the poor highway network, with visibility restricted by narrowness and alignment, and also at the junction with Seething Road. The adjoining former garage site has been redeveloped for three properties, and infilling this gap between those houses and the village hall playing fields would erode the rural character of Wheelers Lane.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 4 December 2020

## SN5006

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5006
Site address	Land south of The Fen, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No recent history. Promoter refers to an historic approval for a dwelling in 1973 ref: L\5283
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.3
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	50 82 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	Currently from a private road off Mill Lane. HA would need to consider if could achieve an adequate access off Mill Lane.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access would require carriageway widening, and significant hedge removal, along with frontage footway..	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>	Red	Village Shop/Post Office 1.5km  600m to the bus stops on Mill Lane; bus route for Anglian 86.  Primary School is 1.2km  No footpaths to any services.	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 recreation ground/play area 1.45km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises these are available.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Under consideration for further upgrades.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Promoter states has had buildings and has been used – would require investigation.  <b>Minerals &amp; Waste:</b> Safeguarding area (sand and gravel). site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1 Surface water flood risk very low - adjacent to north-east around buildings.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	<p>B5 Chet Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is well contained within its boundaries and because of the high roadside hedges/trees and the narrow Lane on the east side it does not encroach into views of the open countryside. However, these may need to be removed to create a suitable access.	Green
Townscape	Red	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District away from the village of Seething. The existing small group of dwellings here are low density with significant vegetation surrounding them, accessed off a track and with a very rural character.</p> <p>It would not be in keeping to add any number of dwellings in this remote location, but particularly in the quantity promoted. Nor would it be appropriate to extend the development boundary along Mill Lane to incorporate this outlying area.</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations.</p> <p>Close to substantial wooded areas to west and hedges surrounding which would have potential for habitat, would need investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. In GI Corridor and amber risk zone for great crested newts. Ponds within 250m .</p> <p><b>Norfolk Wildlife Trust:</b> Note that this site may be supporting species-rich grassland and this is possibly Priority Habitat. If site is to be taken forward this requires further investigation. Recommend ecological surveys for this site.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No designations.</p> <p>Not close to any listed buildings.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>Potential impact on functioning of road network which may not be reasonably mitigated. Very narrow carriage way and no footway.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Network - site remote from village with no feasibility of providing acceptable width road and footway</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture, no conflict.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated May 2011)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No heritage assets affected. Remote from the main developed area of village and separated from the closest development boundary at the council houses by countryside and vegetation. Not an appropriate location for new development.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access is off an unadopted private track so would need to be upgraded. Unlikely that it would be acceptable onto Mill Lane as it is single lane and narrow.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Promoter states this is garden land.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Dwellings along track to north and west. Agriculture to north and south, compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges surrounding, woodland belt to west. Large dwelling to north.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes, see above – potential for habitats and species – eg bats.	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)	None evident, some buildings on/adjacent to site.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Very limited due to presence of vegetation and high hedges.	N/A



Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated May 2011)	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)	The site is well contained and does not encroach into the countryside. But it is remote from village services due to lack of footpath and route along Mill Road which is very narrow with limited pedestrian visibility at this point. Also concerns about creating an adequate new access on to Mill Road and the impact on the local network.	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?	Within 5 years	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site itself has some constraints being in an amber zone for the potential for Great Crested Newts and within a wider GI corridor. The site is clearly detached from the main areas of Seething village and would form a large, isolated group of dwellings in an otherwise very rural location, out of keeping with the character of the area. Whilst the site is well contained at present, and access would be likely to open up the frontage and make development much more visible. In any event, the site is over 1km from the services/facilities in Seething, along narrow, unlit roads, with no footways and limited verges, as such the opportunities for walking to services/facilities are severely limited.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is well contained and does not encroach into the countryside. But it is remote from village services due to lack of footpath and route along Mill Road which is very narrow with limited pedestrian visibility at this point. Also concerns about creating an adequate new access on to Mill Road and the impact on the local network.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

### **Availability**

The site promoter has indicated the site would be available within 5 years.

### **Achievability**

The site promoter has indicated the site would be deliverable, but has not provided any supporting evidence.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Rejected – the site is clearly detached from the main parts of Seething village and would create a large, isolated group of dwellings in the countryside, out of keeping with the locality. Whilst the site is currently visually contained, creating a suitable access would open up the road frontage, increasing the negative impacts of developing the site. The site is more than 1km from the local services/facilities, which are accessed on along narrow, unlit rural roads with no footways and limited verges. There would also be a loss of established vegetation in a wider GI corridor, and the site is rated amber for the potential for Great Crested Newts.

### **Preferred Site:**

### **Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 04/05/2022

## SN5031

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5031
Site address	Land at Brooke Road and Seething Road, Seething
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.75
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6 single storey passivhus with open space and public parking 44 at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	No existing vehicular access. Would need to be created – possibly from Seething Street which would require removal of hedge.  Public footpath runs east-west through the site.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access. Highway improvement required including to carriageway widening, road alignment/forward visibility, footway improvements at whole site frontage. Hedge removal likely to be required.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Village Shop 400m, not continuous path but road has verge for pedestrians.</p> <p>Bus stop within 150-300m to north, depending on site access and is on the bus route for Anglian 86.</p> <p>Primary School is within 180m with a footpath, a path would be required to link to a new site access.</p>	N/A
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village Hall with recreational ground/play area - 330m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>No known constraints.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises; Gas not required. Mains and Foul water can be dealt with on site if required. Adjacent properties have electricity supplies.	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	None evident, agricultural field so unlikely.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1 Surface Water Flood Risk; very small area of low risk to south-east corner where there is a pond on adjacent land, also opposite.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints, on-site flood risk is localised ponding. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	<p>B5 Chet Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>This is an exposed site and despite the hedgerows on the roadside it would be very visible in an area of the village which has remained undeveloped and part of the countryside landscape.</p> <p>The site is at a higher point where the landscape undulates and there are long views from the Grade II* Listed church to the east which would be interrupted if it were developed. Similarly views back to the church from the east would be undermined.</p> <p>In addition a new access would require substantial removal of the hedge which is part of the character of the landscape and the Conservation Area.</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Red	<p>The site is located in a distinctly rural part of the District on the edge of Seething and opposite the Gade II* Listed church. Existing buildings in the wider context are of mixed architectural character, with village ponds also a feature. The grain in Seething is generally quite spacious especially the more peripheral areas and vegetation remains dominant along the road here.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the development boundary on two corners and would link two separate parts of the development boundary at Mill Lane and Seething Street. The development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the townscape which could not be reasonably mitigated.</p>	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations within the site. On opposite side of road is a row of TPOs, there are substantial hedges along the boundaries and to the south and west are ponds off site. These all have potential habitat which would need investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber.          PROW Seething FP68 runs through the site - PROW should be consulted.          SSSI IRZ - if any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream Natural England should be consulted. No priority habitat onsite. Amber risk zone for great crested newt. Not in GI corridor.</p>	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on the identified heritage assets. Most significantly, the setting of St Margaret's Church opposite, a Grade II* LB. It currently has open views towards it from the east which would be compromised by development on this corner even if it is single storey as it would be visible above the hedge line.</p> <p>It is also adjacent to the conservation area, to north-east, south and west, and would have a harmful effect in terms of its rural setting and the clear separation and spatial rural character between the original settlement to the west and the new buildings on Mill Lane.</p> <p>Site of Archaeological Interest within the centre of most of the site as well as adjacent to south-east and south-west. The likely historic location of the Old Hall has been identified adjacent to the south. Would need investigation.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber. Adjacent to earthworks of medieval hall. Some minor earthworks on site. Will require investigation to determine if would be affected of if either 'preservation by record' or a change to the development layout enabling 'preservation in situ' would be most appropriate.</p>	Red
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of road network which may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow carriage way and limited footway connections.</p> <p>In Seething Aerodrome Zone.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access. Highway improvement required including to carriageway widening, road alignment/forward visibility, footway improvements at whole site frontage. Hedge removal likely to be required.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Agriculture to east, south. Church to west, some housing to north-east. Compatible uses.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated July 2009 & August 2011)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	There would be a significant impact as it is directly opposite the listed church which is currently seen within a wider green setting with the allotments and green area to the south. There is no other development on this corner, and it would encroach into the undeveloped countryside.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is no existing access. Likely that the preferred option would be from Seething Street as it is more integral to the village and slower traffic.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture with some residential close by and the church, compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level with a slight fall away in the landscape to the east, travelling along Loddon Road. This site is at a higher point in the landscape, along with the church.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges along the road frontages.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Agriculture so relatively monoculture although potential habitat in hedges and on adjacent land, nearby pond.	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)	None evident, no buildings present. Telegraph lines to north.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated July 2009 & August 2011)	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	Close views into the site are limited by the hedges surrounding it. However, any dwellings would be visible above this, and views would not be mitigated by other buildings but rather the development would be seen against the open landscape. Views out would also be wide, particularly to the east.	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>Whilst it is relatively close to village facilities, this is an open area of countryside and is on the very edge of the settlement where nearby development is sporadic and where the site would not relate well to that development.</p> <p>It is close to the historic elements of the village which define the character here and a new residential area would not be a sympathetic addition in this location.</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)
Adjacent Conservation Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Harmful impact to the setting of the Conservation Area	Red

## 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 – but enquiries received.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Indicated that it is but no evidence submitted.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, a new access, possible footpath improvements and links. Suggesting re-routing of FP8.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No, indicated that it will be provided but promoting 6 passivhaus.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Open space, public car parking on site to alleviate congestion associated with the school.	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is within a short distance of the local services and facilities. There are few on-site constraints, although a PRow runs through the site and amber risk for Great Crested Newts has been identified. The site sits between two parts of Seething, the main historic core of the village around Seething Road and more modern housing on Mill Road. The main concern with the site that it clearly falls within the rural setting of the adjacent and Grade II\* Listed Church, and of the Conservation Area to the south, and would have a detrimental impact on both. The impact is likely to be exacerbated by the need to create a suitable access for the site, with likely hedge removal, wider footways and carriageway realignment.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Whilst it is relatively close to village facilities, this is an open area of countryside and is on the very edge of the settlement where nearby development is sporadic and where the site would not relate well to that development.

It is close to the historic elements of the village which define the character here and a new residential area would not be a sympathetic addition in this location.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside, adjacent to, and in conflict with the Conservation Area.

### **Availability**

The site promoter has indicated the site would be available immediately.

### **Achievability**

The site promoter has indicated that the site would be deliverable for 6 passivhaus dwellings, but no supporting evidence has been submitted.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Rejected – the site is close to local services and facilities. However, the site would erode a clear open gap between the historic core of the village on Seething Road and more modern housing on Mill Road; this gap provides part of the rural setting of both the Grade II\* listed church and the Conservation Area. The impacts of development would be exacerbated by the need to provide suitable access, with consequent hedge removal, footway widening and possible carriageway realignment adding to the urbanising effect. A PRow crosses the site, and it has been identified as an amber risk for Great Crested Newts.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 04/05/2022