



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Spooner Row and Sutton

Contents

SN0227	3
SN0404	11
SN0445	19
SN0446	27
SN0447	36
SN0448	46
SN0568	54
SN0569	64
SN2157	72
SN2181	81
SN3022	89
SN4060	97
SN5030	105
SN5032	115

SN0227

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0227
Site address	Land at Eleven Mile Lane, Sutton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary - unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.67 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 18 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dwellings at 25dph 18 dwellings equates to 26dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Narrow access between existing dwellings NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to its restricted width and lack of footway. No footway to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 2km, with no footways</p> <p>Distance to bus service 375 metres</p> <p>Local employment 200 metres</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Spooner Row village hall 2km</p> <p>Distance to Three Boars public house 2.4km</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local sewerage networks likely to require upgrades	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some areas of surface water flooding on site but should not preclude development on site as the site design could reflect these areas	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>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland No loss of high grade agricultural land.	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Contained within existing pattern of development with little impact on wider landscape.	Green
Townscape	Green	Backland development, although there is some limited similar development. However, there is no precedent for estate scale development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential non-designated heritage assets nearby HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local highway network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to its restricted width and lack of footway. No footway to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Suton is a small settlement consisting of small scale mainly linear development. Development of this site would take the form of a small estate development which would not be in keeping with this existing pattern of development.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow access between dwellings which may not be able to accommodate an adoptable highway. Highways to advise on the local road network capacity.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential on all sides other than agricultural land to north. No compatibility issues – design of the site would need to consider existing residential amenities.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on most boundaries – some potentially significant trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is very contained with only glimpsed view of site through access	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to constrained access, nature of local road network and impact on form and character of rural settlement.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		
Conclusion	Site is in single private ownership	Green
	No – promoter advises that enquiries have been received	

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. Development on the site would result in a backland form of development that is not currently in evidence in Sutton. Access to the site would be between two dwellings and the local highway network is not considered to be sufficient to support development in this location. A small area of flood risk has been identified on the site although it is considered that with appropriate design this could be avoided.

Site Visit Observations

Backland site in rural settlement where there is no precedent for estate scale development. Access into site is narrow and constrained.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for allocation. A number of constraints have been identified, including highways concerns about creating an appropriate access into the site as well as the wider highway network. An estate form of development is also considered to be an inappropriate form and scale of development in this rural settlement which is characterised by a small scale mainly linear pattern of development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 November 2020

SN0404

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0404
Site address	Land to the south-east of Chapel Road, Spooner Row (rear of allocation SPO1)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history other than that linked with allocation to the front of the site
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.76 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation (Promoted for 12-15 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	19 dwellings at 25dph 19pdh at 15 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access would need to be through existing allocation (same site owner) SNC HIGHWAYS – Red. The site would appear remote from the highway with no defined means of access.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 850 metres, mainly with footway Distance to bus service and railway station 700 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 760 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 420 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local sewerage network is likely to require upgrades	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues HES – Amber	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Identified surface water flood risk along highway	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Site would be backland development in context of linear pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential impact on non-designated heritage assets	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Chapel Road is constrained SNC HIGHWAYS – Red. The site would appear remote from the highway with no defined means of access.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Creation of a second line of dwellings extending eastwards into the open countryside will erode the rural character of the approach to the village from the north and would not be a compatible form of development. Lack of boundaries around the site would increase the visibility of the development.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved through the allocation, however widening works may be required to Chapel Road which could result in loss of the hedgerow	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential allocation immediately to west with existing residential development on opposite side of Chapel Road to west. Existing residential development to south, with agricultural land to north and east. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Most boundaries are undefined as currently forms part of larger field. Trees and hedging on southern boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees and hedging on southern boundary contain potential habitat	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of site from north as approach village. Development would also be visible in longer views from Guilers Lane to east	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site would not be in keeping with form and character and would have adverse impact on rural approach to village. It may also lead to pressure to remove hedge for road widening.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and is adjacent to existing development. Development of this site would constitute backland development and would break out into the rural surroundings. Highways constraints have been identified, including a requirement for access via the existing planning consent adjacent to the site. Creation of a suitable access may also result in the loss of hedgerow.

Site Visit Observations

Site is to the rear of an as-yet unbuilt allocation. However, the existing allocation consists of a continuation of linear pattern of development where this would consist of backland or estate development that would be much more visible in the rural approach to the village from the north.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable. The site promoter advises a viability assessment has been undertaken and would be available on request (this would require updating).

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Development of the site would constitute backland development and would have an adverse impact on the form and character of the existing linear pattern of development. It would also have a detrimental impact on the approach to the village from the north. Access would be required through existing allocation and may require the loss of additional hedgerow.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 November 2020

SN0445

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0445
Site address	Land south of Station Road, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Recently withdrawn application for up to 40 dwellings (2018/1950)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	4.08 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for between 39 to 54 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	18 – 25dph at the promoted scale of development
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Long frontage onto Station Road should enable access NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to providing acceptable visibility, frontage carriageway widening, frontage footway (2m wide), continuous footway to the village hall. Previous application 9/7/18/1950.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 160 metres Adjacent to railway station	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 60 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 100 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local sewerage network is likely to require upgrade	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	North-eastern corner is in flood zones 2 and 3a. All of the site bounding the highway and most of the eastern part of the site is at risk of surface water flooding resulting in significant areas of the site being at risk from flooding	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Would lead to removal of landscape gap between different clusters of settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Linear development to east but some more nucleated development to west.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed church to north-east of site HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Improvements to local road network may be required NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to providing acceptable visibility, frontage carriageway widening, frontage footway (2m wide), continuous footway to the village hall. Previous application 9/7/18/1950.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Adjacent to railway line which is a potential constraint. Otherwise residential and agricultural	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Unlikely to have significant impact on setting of church but would either erode or remove entirely the landscape gap between the cluster of development along Bunwell Road and Chapel Road to the east and around the station and school to the west.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable, although some off-site highway works are likely to be required	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east and agricultural to south and on opposite side of Station Road to north with no compatibility issues. Impact of railway line to west would need to be mitigated.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Highway boundary is largely open. Hedging and trees on boundaries to east and south, and also on boundary with railway	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line runs north-south across centre of site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Significant visual harm from erosion or complete removal of gap between different parts of settlement.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Frontage carriageway widening and footway, plus footway link to village hall would be required by NCC Highways	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

As promoted the site is of a scale that is incompatible with both the existing settlement and the objectives of the VCHAP. The site could be reduced in size to address this issue. A number of off-site highway works have been identified should this site be allocated and some significant areas of flood risk 2 and 3a have been identified within the site. These areas would impact upon the developable area and would result in development being located in areas of the site with a poorer relationship to the existing built form having an adverse impact on the townscape.

Site Visit Observations

Open field which provides gap in between area of settlement around the station and the area of settlement along Bunwell Road and Chapel Road.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable subject to a reduction in site area and avoidance of identified areas of flood risk 2 and 3a.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. As promoted the site is excessive in scale however it could be reduced in size. Notwithstanding this, development of the most logical areas of the site would be constrained by significant areas of flood zone 2 and 3a. Significant offsite highway works have also been identified as necessary to make this site acceptable in highway terms. There would also be a detrimental landscape impact associated with the development of this site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

SN0446

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0446
Site address	Land north of Guilers Lane and east of Chapel Road, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary - unallocated
Planning History	Part of recently withdrawn application to provide car park as public benefit associated with proposal for 40 dwellings on site SN0445 (2018/1950)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.94 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Both (The site has been promoted for a smaller number of dwellings – 4/5 on 0.45ha with an additional 0.49ha promoted for open space – but is of a scale that could be considered as an allocation site)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5dph at 5 dwellings 23 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options constrained by visibility and capacity of Guilers Lane NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to access from Chapel Road with localised carriageway widening to 5.5m and provision of 2.0m footway at frontage. Development should safeguard visibility at adjacent junction of Chapel Road / Guilers Lane. Footway improvements likely fronting the nearby PH to connect with existing footway to the south.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 420 metres</p> <p>Distance to railway station 300 metres</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Spooner Row village hall 340 metres</p> <p>Adjacent to Three Boars public house</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Identified surface water risk along Guilers Lane	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green
Townscape	Green	Estate form of development would not be characteristic of this part of the settlement. A linear pattern of development would be more compatible.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity however presence of nearby ponds suggests protected species may be an issue	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed church to west and Grade II listed Pilgrims Farmhouse to east – impact to be assessed further if the site progresses.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local highway network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to access from Chapel Road with localised carriageway widening to 5.5m and provision of 2.0m footway at frontage. Development should safeguard visibility at adjacent junction of Chapel Road / Guilers Lane. Footway improvements likely fronting the nearby PH to connect with existing footway to the south.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural, residential and place of worship.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site affects setting of two listed buildings – church to west and farmhouse to east along with former barns of farmhouse which can be considered non-designated heritage assets as can the public house to the south. Developing this site would therefore have an adverse impact on the relationship between all these buildings and the form and character of the area.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is possible from Chapel Road with some highway improvements although this is likely to lead to loss of part or all of hedgerow along this boundary and potentially some trees.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Converted barns to east, public house to south on opposite side of Guilders Lane and church to west. Not considered that there are compatibility issues which would preclude development.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with trees along Chapel Road boundary and partly along Guilders Lane.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging along boundaries. Ponds on adjacent land will need consideration	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site available both from Chapel Road and Guilers Lane	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of this site would have adverse impact on form and character of area and on setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Off-site highway works would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but as part of a larger strategic development. Confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Open space on the site	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site has been promoted as one of a number of sites within the settlement intended to form a larger strategic development. This would be outside the objectives of the VCHAP. Considered on its own merits the site would be of a suitable size for allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings that could be considered as an inefficient use of the land. A number of constraints have been identified including the impact of the development of this site on both designated and non-designated heritage assets as well as the form and character of this part of Spooner Row. A number of off-site highway works would be required.

Site Visit Observations

The site forms an important part of the setting of listed Pilgrims Farm and associated former barns and its relationship with the church to the west and the public house to the south. Development of the site would have an adverse impact on this and would also be likely to lead to the loss of hedgerows and possibly veteran trees.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for either an allocation or an extension to the settlement limit. Development of the site would impact on both designated and non-designated heritage assets and would also have a detrimental impact on the form and character of this part of the settlement. There would also be a likely landscape impact resulting from the loss of hedgerow and mature trees. A smaller area of development is not considered to address these concerns adequately due to the prominent location of the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

SN0447

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0447
Site address	Land west of Chapel Road, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential purposes on southern part of site
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	6.84 hectares (net developable area 2.93 hectares)
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation The site has been promoted for between 59 to 88 dwellings at 20 to 30 dph
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	73 dwellings at 25dph (restricted across the developable area)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access should be achievable, however some constraints depending on where it is proposed NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Site should be served by two points of access, one onto Station Road and the other onto Chapel Road. Access to Chapel Lane to require localised carriageway widening to 5.5m, confirmation of adequate forward visibility and 2m wide frontage footway connecting with existing provision. Access to Station Road to require road widening to 6m and widening of frontage footway to 2m. Likely to require removal of mature trees to achieve acceptable visibility. Widening of existing footway to village school and extension of footway up to school entrance.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 200 metres</p> <p>Adjacent to railway station</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Spooner Row village hall 100 metres</p> <p>Distance to Three Boars public house</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater network capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	Centre of site in flood zone 3a, with remainder of western part of site largely with flood zone 2. Significant parts of site are therefore at risk from flooding with only the eastern part of the site along Chapel Road not at risk. This would significantly reduce the developable areas of the site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Would lead to removal or erosion of landscape gap between different clusters of settlement unless development is concentrated along Chapel Road. No loss of high grade agricultural land</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER – Landscape concern. Development shown to the north of the site; access from Chapel Rd would result in both hedgerow and tree loss and would not be supported; access from Station Road unlikely to be an issue although the gap between the two sections along Station Road should be retained.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	<p>Linear development to east but some more nucleated development to west</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. This is quite a preserved landscape gap between the two main parts of the settlement. The west side of the site is best location for access to the school, railway station and the pub.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Site is adjacent to a Grade II listed church</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. Development would have an impact on the setting of the chapel – affecting its existing rural setting/context of the field its rear in which it is seen however there are trees around the chapel and is a 19th century building that does not have medieval towers/ trackways.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Improvements to local road network may be required</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Site should be served by two points of access, one onto Station Road and the other onto Chapel Road. Access to Chapel Lane to require localised carriageway widening to 5.5m, confirmation of adequate forward visibility and 2m wide frontage footway connecting with existing provision. Access to Station Road to require road widening to 6m and widening of frontage footway to 2m. Likely to require removal of mature trees to achieve acceptable visibility. Widening of existing footway to village school and extension of footway up to school entrance. NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING - no objection in principle to a single access off Chapel Road [confirmed reduced developable area of the site]. This access is on the outside of a bend and although footways are narrow they could be improved.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Adjacent to railway line which is a potential constraint. Otherwise residential and agricultural	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development along Station Road would have impact on setting of church and would erode or remove entirely the landscape gap between the cluster of development along Bunwell Road and Chapel Road to the east and around the station and school to the west. However, there is some potential for development along Chapel Road to integrate with the existing pattern of development along that road.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways require that if the whole site is to be developed it served by two points of access, one onto Station Road and the other onto Chapel Road. Both accesses are likely to require localised carriageway widening. Access onto Chapel Road would require removal of part or all of hedgerow along frontage and potentially some trees	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east and agricultural to north and on opposite side of Station Road to south with no compatibility issues. Impact of railway line to west would need to be mitigated	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow along Chapel Road boundary with a row of mature trees. Boundary with Station Road is more open with a fence and occasional trees. Trees on boundary with railway line.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line runs north-south across centre of site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road. Views available from Chapel Road though more restricted by vegetation	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Most of the site is not suitable for development due to form and character impact as well as flood risk issues. However, there is a possibility of development along Chapel Road although there are issues regarding trees and the setting of the church that will need to be considered further.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Road widening and the provision and/or extension of footways	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is excessive in scale and development in its entirety or at the scale promoted would not be compatible with the existing pattern of development in the settlement. However, the developable area of the site is significantly constrained by the identified areas of flood risk. The site could be reduced in area to accommodate a lower number of dwellings. Access to the site would be achieved via Chapel Road but would result in the loss of hedgerow and mature trees along the road frontage. Heritage, townscape and landscape concerns have been identified. The adjacent train line would also be a potential constrain on development to the west of the site.

Site Visit Observations

Open field which provides gap in between area of settlement around the station and the area of settlement along Bunwell Road and Chapel Road. Open boundary along Station Road, whilst the boundary with Chapel Road has a hedge with trees in it. In terms of form and character the frontage onto Chapel Road is of lesser important to the gap between the part of the village around the station and the part of the village along Bunwell Road / Chapel Road.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to the comments of the LLFA.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for allocation. Due to the identified areas of flood risk within the site, development would be concentrated to the north of the site, closest to the rear of existing properties along Chapel Road. This would lessen the erosion of the gap between the two distinct areas of the settlement but would impact on identified heritage assets and result in the loss of hedgerow and mature trees along Chapel Road. Off-site highway works would also be required.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

SN0448

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0448
Site address	Land west of School Lane and north of the school
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Site frontage on School Lane is allocated for residential development in the Local Plan (SPO2); remainder of site is outside the development boundary
Planning History	Planning permission granted on allocated site for seven dwellings (2016/0627, with subsequent amendments)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	4.13 hectares (including allotments and land for the school) (net developable area 1.50 hectares)
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for between 27 to 38 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	(The site has been promoted for between 27 to 38 dwellings at 18 to 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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access is constrained by nature of School Lane NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access into the site likely to be subject to 2m footway and localised carriageway widening to 5.5m. School Lane is inadequate for additional development by reason of restricted carriageway width, lack of footway and no continuous footway to the adjacent school. All development traffic would be in conflict with school at School Lane / Station Road junction.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Adjacent to Spooner Row Primary School</p> <p>Distance to railway station 250 metres</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Spooner Row village hall 200 metres</p> <p>Distance to Three Boars public house 550 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk in east of site and along School Lane	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Estate development would not be characteristic of development along School Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road and footpath capacity is unsuitable NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access into the site likely to be subject to 2m footway and localised carriageway widening to 5.5m. School Lane is inadequate for additional development by reason of restricted carriageway width, lack of footway and no continuous footway to the adjacent school. All development traffic would be in conflict with school at School Lane / Station Road junction.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	School, recreation facilities, residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The creation of an estate scale development would not be in keeping with the character of School Lane, although could be acceptable if access was able to be secured from elsewhere	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	School Lane is very constrained and NCC Highways have commented that it is inadequate for additional development	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	School and recreation area to south. Residential properties to east on opposite side of School Lane. Residential properties to north. Agricultural land to west. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on highway boundary, with hedging and trees on other boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from School Lane	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable for any further development than that already allocated due to constrained access along School Lane.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Improvements would be likely to be required but may not be deliverable due to constraints along School Lane	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

As promoted the site is excessive in size but could be reduced in size to accommodate a smaller number of dwellings. Concerns have been raised by highways about creating a safe access to the site as well as School Lane. An estate form of development would not be compatible with the form and character of the existing development along School Lane.

Site Visit Observations

Field to the rear of school and recreation area. Access along School Lane is highly constrained. Landscape impact of estate development.

Local Plan Designations

Site frontage on School Lane is allocated for residential development in the Local Plan (SPO2); no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

The promoter advises that the site is achievable however this is based on a larger site area and access constraints may mean that delivery of the site can not be achieved.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for allocation. School Lane has been identified as being constrained in highways terms and is not considered to be appropriate for further development (following development of the existing allocation site SCO2). Although the site relates reasonably well to the settlement, development of the scale proposed and/ or of an estate form is not considered to be compatible in either form or character with the existing linear pattern of development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 November 2020

SN0568

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0568
Site address	Land to south of Station Road and west of Top Common, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Both (The site has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings – 10 – but is of suitable size to be considered as an allocation)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10 dwellings would equate to 11dph 25dph would equate to 22 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	<p>Access would be onto rural road with 60mph speed limit</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Site boundary remote from highway. Unclear how it would be accessed. Subject to demonstrating the frontage abuts Top Common it is likely an access could be provided subject to frontage development, localised carriageway widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway, extension of local speed limit on Top Common and Station Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Top Common / Station Road junction. No existing footway to village school. Would need to provide one.</p> <p><i>(NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING - Top Common itself is narrow with no footways and a poor junction with Station Road. In isolation this site would not be supported. However, the development at The Bungalow, Station Road will provide a footpath back to the school and if allocated with the development opposite, could provide more substantial improvements to Top Common/the junction.)</i></p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 200 metres</p> <p>Distance to railway station 350 metres</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 300 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 650 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk in northern part of site and along Top Common but this area could be excluded from the developable area	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>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Development would have poor relationship with existing settlement in landscape when approaching the settlement from the west along Station Road. No loss of high grade agricultural land</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - Not acceptable in landscape terms as development in this location results in further breakout into the surrounding countryside and would adversely impact on the landscape</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	Potential to continue existing pattern of linear development along Top Common but this would appear detached from the main areas of development along Station Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets in close proximity</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Road is constrained with no footways</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Site boundary remote from highway. Unclear how it would be accessed. Subject to demonstrating the frontage abuts Top Common it is likely an access could be provided subject to frontage development, localised carriageway widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway, extension of local speed limit on Top Common and Station Road and demonstration of adequate visibility at Top Common / Station Road junction. No existing footway to village school. Would need to provide one.</p> <p><i>(NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING - Top Common itself is narrow with no footways and a poor junction with Station Road. In isolation this site would not be supported. However, the development at The Bungalow, Station Road will provide a footpath back to the school and if allocated with the development opposite, could provide more substantial improvements to Top Common/the junction.)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Some potential to link to development along Top Common, however as a standalone site this development would largely appear detached from the main settlement when approaching from the west along Station Road, protruding into the open countryside	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable from Top Common, although this would result in loss of hedgerow. NCC to advise about suitability of local roads.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land on all sides other than dwellings to south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges along highway boundaries. No defined boundary to west as part of wider field.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges on boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line running north – south on western part of site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road and Top Common	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is detached from main settlement and would protrude into open countryside to west	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	The promoter advises that enquiries have been received	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and is adjacent to an existing settlement limit boundary. A small area of flood risk has been identified to the north of the site and would reduce the developable area of the site. Linear development on the site would be compatible with the existing pattern of development along Top Common however a significant landscape impact has been identified and the site would appear detached from the main areas of the settlement when viewed from Station Road. Access to the site would need to be demonstrated as being achievable and off-site highway works have been identified. Development of the site would likely result in the loss of frontage hedgerow.

Site Visit Observations

Site that is detached from existing settlement on approach from west along Station Road and would therefore be intrusive into open landscape on this approach.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation and also as an extension to the existing settlement limit. Due to identified on-site constraints development would be to the south of the site and would appear detached from the main body of the settlement when viewed from Station Road. Development of the site would have an adverse landscape impact and would also likely result in the loss of frontage hedgerow. A suite of off-site highways works have been identified and it would need to be confirmed that access into the site could be achieved.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN0569

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0569
Site address	Land west of Bunwell Road and south of Queens Street, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.68 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Both (The site has been submitted for 5 to 8 dwellings but is large enough to be considered as an allocation)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8 dwellings would equate to 11dph 25dph would equate to 17 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options constrained by rural nature of road and hedgerow NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Bunwell Road in the vicinity of the site subject to a 40mph. Visibility of 2.4m x 120m unlikely to be achievable. No footway and/or continuous footway to the village school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 1km Distance to railway station 850 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 900 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 550 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk			

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>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site does not relate well to main areas of settlement within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Area of sporadic development which development of this site would consolidate	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed building to north of site HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Bunwell Road in the vicinity of the site subject to a 40mph. Visibility of 2.4m x 120m unlikely to be achievable. No footway and/or continuous footway to the village school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would have an urbanising effect on the surrounding area which is characterised more by sporadic development south of the junction of Bunwell Road and Hill Road. Development would also have an adverse impact on the rural setting of the listed building to the north, the principle elevation of which faces into the site.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways raise doubts about likelihood of adequate visibility being achievable. Also pedestrian access to site is poor.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and south and on opposite side of Bunwell Road. Agricultural land otherwise. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along boundary with Bunwell Road and Queens Street. Hedge and trees along boundary with south. Western boundary is undefined as part of larger field.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedges on site boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from Bunwell Road and Queens Street.	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable for development as would lead to a loss of rural character and harm setting of listed building.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The site is not adjacent to an existing settlement limit. Development of the site would have an urbanising effect and would erode the rural character by further extending the settlement. Highways constraints have been identified, including the difficulties of creating a safe access to the site. The adverse impact of development on the adjacent listed building has also been identified as a significant constraint.

Site Visit Observations

Bunwell Road has rural character south of its junction with Hill Road with only sporadic development. Infill development on sites such as this would erode that rural character resulting in an urbanising effect. The site also forms part of the setting to the listed building to the north, the principle elevation of which faces onto the site.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

The promoter has confirmed that development of the site is achievable however a number of significant constraints have been identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation, as well as UNREASONABLE as an extension to the existing settlement limit. Development of the site would erode the rural character that is in evidence, particularly on the approach to the settlement along Bunwell Road. Furthermore, the adjacent listed building faces into the site and development of the site would have a detrimental impact on its setting. Highways have also raised significant concerns about the ability to achieve appropriate visibility splays if developing this site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN2157

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2157
Site address	Land at Great Expectations, London Road, Sutton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Planning permissions for uses on the site including rope climbing activity (2013/1409), model aircraft flying (1998/1361 and 2016/0721), preschool nursery (2015/1399) and auction house / salesrooms (2010/2171)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	10 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation (the site has been promoted for housing development of up to 12 to 25 dwellings with consideration for potentially larger development in the future)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 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	Access would be onto main road with 60mph speed limit NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Site unidentifiable on current plan. Earlier Comments: The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 2.1km, mainly with no footways Bus service passes sites Local employment 300 metres away	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 2.4km Distance to Three Boars public house 2.8km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Western part of site at risk of surface water flooding	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Open landscape that does not relate to an existing settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Site would be detached from existing patterns of development.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	Potential loss of flying school	Amber
Transport and Roads	Amber	No footways along road NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Site unidentifiable on current plan. Earlier Comments: The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Primarily agricultural but also flying school, pre-school and soft play centre within the proposed site boundaries and proposed for retention. Potential conflict with the flying school.	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is detached from existing settlement, although Sutton is close by. Development would therefore be an isolated development in a rural landscape	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be achievable subject to adequate visibility but pedestrian access is poor	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Primarily agricultural land however development to the south east of the site include leisure (flying school), a pre-school and a soft play centre.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land surrounds the site. No compatibility issues. Existing on-site uses: preschool nursery, soft play centre and flying school.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows with trees along most boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows on boundaries.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site from access off B1172. Otherwise very limited public views	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is remote from existing settlements and would result in isolated development in a rural landscape	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

As promoted the site is excessive in scale and does not meet the objectives of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in size to accommodate a smaller number of dwellings. The site is primarily a greenfield site however it does include some commercial tenants and a leisure use. There are some identified areas of flood risk within the site. Landscape and highways concerns have been raised due to the remote location of the site.

Site Visit Observations

Site detached from any settlement in a rural landscape accessed directly off fast section of single carriageway road.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. The site is excessive in size however it could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP however it is remote from the main centres of development with poor connectivity and it would have an adverse landscape impact. The site currently has a number of commercial tenants as well as a leisure school which may be affected by residential development on the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN2181

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2181
Site address	Land east of School Lane, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Site is outside the development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Recent refusal for five dwellings (2019/0483) and dismissed at appeal as well as more historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access is narrow and visibility would need to be demonstrated. The site promoter notes that Anglian Water own access to the site but the site owner has a right of access to the land. Site promoter advises agreement in principle has been reached with AW. AW also own the frontage hedgerow – possible issues re. visibility.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Limited frontage onto the highway with little opportunity for adoptable standard access. School Lane is inadequate for additional development by reason of restricted carriageway width, lack of footway and no continuous footway to the adjacent school. All development traffic would be in conflict with school at School Lane / Station Road junction.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 150 metres</p> <p>Distance to railway station 300 metres</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Spooner Row village hall 250 metres</p> <p>Distance to Three Boars public house 600 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Northern part of site is within Flood Zones 3a and 2 as well as 1. Identified surface water flood risk along School Lane	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Contained within existing pattern of development with little impact on wider landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Backland development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	School Lane is very constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Limited frontage onto the highway with little opportunity for adoptable standard access. School Lane is inadequate for additional development by reason of restricted carriageway width, lack of footway and no continuous footway to the adjacent school. All development traffic would be in conflict with school at School Lane / Station Road junction.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would have only limited harm to the character and appearance of the area given the contained nature of the site and other development in the vicinity but it would constitute backland development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	In dismissing the appeal for the site, the Planning Inspector was not satisfied that the information provided demonstrates that adequate access and visibility can be provided without third party land. School Lane is also very constrained with NCC Highways stating that is inadequate for further development	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south and west. Agricultural to north. Railway line to east may need to be mitigated against but would not preclude development of the site	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows and trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibility of common reptiles being present however this could be mitigated against. Potential habitat in hedging and trees	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site relatively well contained, though with possible glimpsed views from those travelling on trains	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to access and flood risk issue, also backland development.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is suitable in size for a settlement limit extension or possibly a small allocation of around 12 dwellings. Development of the site would be considered as backland development. Constrained view into the site so a limited townscape impact. Identified areas of flood risk are located to the north of the site and would reduce the developable area of the site. Highways constraints have been identified, specifically relating to the creation of a safe access into the site. School Lane is also considered to be inadequate for additional traffic movements.

Site Visit Observations

Visually contained site that could be considered backland development. Given mixed character of immediate area this could be acceptable, however the access is highly constrained.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable however note earlier concerns about achieving a satisfactory access to the site as well as the third party land ownership of the access.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site has been assessed as both an allocation site and an extension to the existing settlement limit and is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. Significant highways constraints have been identified, including concerns about the possibility of creating a suitable access to the site and the impact on School Lane. An identified area of flood risk to the north of the site would reduce the developable area. Development on this parcel of land would constitute backland development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN3022

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3022
Site address	Land to south of Station Road and west of Top Common, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.75 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Both (The site has been promoted for 5-10 dwellings, though the site may be able to accommodate an allocation of 12 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10 dwellings equates to 13dph 12 dwellings equates to 16dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access would be onto rural road with 60mph speed limit NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access likely onto Station Road subject to frontage footway and extension of local speed restriction. Visibility likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Footway works required to link the site to the existing village school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 200 metres Distance to railway station 350 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 300 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 650 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk in northern part of site and along Top Common	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>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have poor relationship with existing settlement in landscape when approaching the settlement from the west along Station Road. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Disconnected from other parts of settlement but linear development would be similar to existing pattern of development in evidence	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road is constrained with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access likely onto Station Road subject to frontage footway and extension of local speed restriction. Visibility likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Footway works required to link the site to the existing village school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would largely appear detached from the main settlement when approaching from the west along Station Road, protruding into the open countryside	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable, although this would result in loss of hedgerow. NCC Highways advise that footway works would be required to link to the site to the school	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land on all sides. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges along highway boundaries. No defined boundaries to west or south as the site is part of a larger land parcel	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges on boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line running north – south through site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Station Road and Top Common	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is detached from the main settlement and would protrude into open countryside to west.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated however it has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings (5-10 dwellings). The site is remote from the existing settlement limits. The site is detached from the main areas of the settlement and would extend further into the landscape to the west of Spooner Row. There are some identified areas of surface water flooding within the site. Access to the site would be achievable however it would require the loss of frontage hedgerow and trees resulting in landscape concerns.

Site Visit Observations

The site is detached from the existing settlement on approach from the west along Station Road and would therefore be intrusive into open landscape on this approach.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for either an allocation or an extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is detached from the main areas of the settlement and is not adjacent to any existing settlement boundaries. Development of this site would result in encroachment into the countryside, beyond the existing boundaries of the settlement and would have a landscape impact as a result. Development of the site would also result in the loss of frontage hedgerow and trees.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN4060

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4060
Site address	Land south of Hill House, Bunwell Road, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary - unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Both (The site has been promoted for 8 dwellings but is of sufficient size to be considered as an allocation)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8 dwellings equates to 1.6dph Up to 75 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options constrained by rural nature of road and hedgerow NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access requires removal of frontage trees & hedges. No available walking route to school/village facilities.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 1.2km Distance to railway station 1km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 1.1km Distance to Three Boars public house 750 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk on Bunwell Road, Slutshole Lane and in northern part of site LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required. The site is adjacent to minor/ moderate flooding (flowpath).	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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site does not relate well to main areas of settlement within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Area of sporadic development which development of this site would not be in keeping	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential undesignated heritage asset to north of site	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access requires removal of frontage trees & hedges. No available walking route to school/village facilities.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would have an urbanising effect on the surrounding area which is characterised more by sporadic development south of the junction of Bunwell Road and Hill Road and from which this site protrudes into open countryside	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potentially achievable but with loss of sections of hedgerows and possibly trees. Pedestrian access to site is poor	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and opposite side of Bunwell Road from northern part of site. Agricultural land otherwise. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along boundaries with Bunwell Road and Slutshole Lane with trees particularly on boundaries with southern portion of site. Hedge and trees along other boundaries.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedges on site boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across the site from Bunwell Road and Slutshole Lane	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable for development as would lead to loss rural character and intrude into open countryside	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is excessive in scale but it could be reduced in size to accommodate an appropriately sized allocation. The site has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings. The site is remote from the main areas of the settlement resulting in poor connectivity of the site. Potential loss of trees and hedgerows along the boundaries to create an access into the site would result in landscape harm.

Site Visit Observations

Bunwell Road has a rural character south of its junction with Hill Road with only sporadic development which this development is at the southern extent of. Development of the site would erode that rural character resulting in an urbanising effect and would also protrude into the open countryside to the south.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation and has also been assessed as an UNREASONABLE extension to the settlement limits. The site is excessive in scale but has been promoted for a small number of dwellings. The site is detached from the settlement and is poorly connected. Development of the site at any scale would result in an intrusion into the rural landscape. Development of the site would also result in the loss of the frontage trees and hedgerows, altering the rural approach towards the settlement.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 November 2020

SN5030

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5030
Site address	Land at Holme Farm, Sutton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 10-12 dwellings (22 dwellings at 25dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Existing access is to Holme Farm and house which runs through the centre dividing the site east-west. It is restricted onto the road by mature trees. However there are opportunities to take alternative accesses along the frontage of Sutton Road, visibility is good and there is no hedge to remove.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green. Access achievable subject to frontage widening and footways. Network concerns re road widths and junction visibility back to London Road along with access to local facilities, particularly walking route to school.</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 1,900m, with very few footways and crossing the A11 Local employment 190 metres Bus stop 400m	N/A
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Hummingbirds Pre-school; 550m Distance to Spooner Row village hall 2km Distance to Three Boars public house 2.4km	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local sewerage networks may require upgrades; overall utility capacity to be confirmed Environment Agency: Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises; Water, Electric, Telephone available in Highway. Foul drainage likely by individual or shared private package treatment, no mains in vicinity according to records search.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Very small areas of low and very low risk of surface water flooding to perimeters which can be investigated and avoided.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. On-site flood risk is localised flooding around existing on-site road. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green (Flood Risk)</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>B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>The landscape is very flat and open but it is relatively well contained in the medium distance with limited longer views. This is due to it being very linear with intermittent residential development and large trees around the perimeter. Although development will be visible, some amount may be able to be accommodated without a significant impact on the wider landscape.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Suton is a small hamlet with a grid form of roads shaping the linear development. Whilst it is sporadic there is a uniformity, with single-depth detached larger plots, and some linear frontage development could be assimilated into this pattern without a detrimental impact. Estate scale development or cul-de-sacs would not be in keeping. There are no heritage assets affected.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity and limited immediate habitat. NCC Ecologist: Amber. Located within GI corridor and amber risk zone for great crested newts. No PROW nearby. No priority habitat onsite. SSSI IRZ residential and discharge of water are not identified by NE as requiring their consultation. Pond nearby and in amber risk zone for great crested newts.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets nearby. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Well located in terms of wider road access to Wymondham and Norwich with train links. Local highway network is constrained, and lacking footpath connections to services, would need the Highway Authority advice. NCC Highways – Red. Access achievable subject to frontage widening and footways. Network concerns re road widths and junction visibility back to London Road along with access to local facilities, particularly walking route to school.	Red

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

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 09/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on the historic environment and a relatively limited impact on the townscape providing it is not a large amount of development and is restricted to frontage only. This would reflect the form of development opposite. The landscape is relatively sparse.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	It appears that individual/shared accesses could be achieved as it is a long straight section of road making visibility good in both directions.	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 and residential, compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Very flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open, very few hedges, mature trees at existing access.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Appears limited, although it is grassland and undeveloped and it does link areas of trees.	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	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are views across the site but no long views in the landscape as these are truncated by a backdrop of trees and some buildings. Views out are also limited because of the proximity of the A11.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 09/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>If development was limited to the frontage, it would reflect the established linear pattern of the settlement with very little impact on the wider area. However, the site is relatively remote from services with no footpaths to safely link to Spooner Row, and it does feel remote although it benefits from proximity to Wymondham and the A11 to Norwich with higher level facilities.</p>	<p>Amber</p>

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		N/A
Conclusion	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 – but enquiries received.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Indicated 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)	Additional access points from Sutton Street.	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 is of a suitable size for allocation and is opposite existing residential development in Sutton. Linear development would be the most appropriate pattern of development in this location however overall the hamlet of Sutton is remote from existing facilities and services and disconnected from Spooner Row. The landscape and visual impact of development in this location would be limited by existing development, established vegetation and the A11. Acceptable vehicular access into the site is likely to be achievable however the wider road network has been identified as a constraint to development in this location, in particular the poor pedestrian connectivity to services and facilities, including the local primary school.

Site Visit Observations

Development of the site should be restricted to the site frontage to avoid harm to the existing characteristics of the settlement which is predominantly comprised of linear development. The visual impact of the site would be limited due to a number of landscape features (noted above) however Sutton does feel disconnected from Spooner Row and connectivity between the two settlements is poor.

Local Plan Designations

Norwich Policy Area.

Availability

The site is considered to be available for development.

Achievability

Development of the site is considered to be achievable subject to highway mitigation measures which may impact on viability.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. It relates well to the existing development in Sutton and a linear form of frontage development on the site would replicate the established pattern of development in evidence. However both the site and the settlement are poorly connected to existing facilities and services with connectivity via pedestrian footways and a poor road network around the site identified as particular constraints to development in this location. The site is relatively well screened within the landscape and therefore the visual impact of SN5030 would be limited.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 3 May 2022

SN5032

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5032
Site address	Land between Hill Road and Bunwell Road, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2020/2108/CUQ for COU from barn to dwelling approved 29/01/21. Extant and unimplemented.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.53ha
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 3 dwellings (inclusive of 1 extant permission) and flood mitigation (13 dwellings 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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Two existing accesses, proposing using one from Hill Road, rather than from Bunwell Road. NCC Highways – Red. Access does not appear achievable within frontage. No footway connection to local facilities.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 1,100m Distance to railway station 900m No footway and/or continuous footway to the village school or station.	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"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Distance to Spooner Row village hall 950 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 600 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utility capacity to be confirmed Environment Agency: Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises; all required services are available (gas not required).	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1. Some identified surface water flood risk in previous planning application. Additional areas on larger site due to ponds and drain; risk from very low to medium and needs to be investigated as could restrict development.</p> <p>LLFA – Amber. Significant mitigation required.</p> <p>The on-site flood risk develops from ponding in the 3.33% and 1.0% AEP events to form a minor to moderate flow path in the 0.1% AEP event, cutting the site southwest-northeast. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows northeast off the site.</p> <p>Access to the site may be affected by flood risk depending on where it's placed but development has the potential to mitigate the on-site flood risk issues through appropriate engineering and improve flood risk downstream.</p> <p>The site is within proximity of known records of internal flooding on Bunwell Road. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green (Flood Risk)</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	B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is relatively contained by defined boundaries relating to existing development and does not encroach into the open countryside. However, the site is an attractive landscape break characteristic of the edge of the settlement. Potential removal of hedge along Bunwell Road for access would not be acceptable.	Amber
Townscape	Green	The site does not relate well to the main areas of the settlement. It is adjacent to an existing site currently subject to development as well as a small area of sporadic development which marks the transition to the countryside. Further development to the south of 2016/2424 would consolidate this and impact on the transition into the village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity. Habitat potential on site, old barn, trees and a pond – would require survey. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ residential and discharge of water are not identified by NE as requiring their consultation. Pond onsite and in amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in GI corridor.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets affected, need to consider farmhouse and barn, which could be viewed as undesignated heritage assets, and The Orchard Grade II listed building to the northeast. The barn is proposed for demolition and advice from the Senior Heritage and Design Officer should be sought if this site is to progress further.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is constrained.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Access does not appear achievable within frontage. No footway connection to local facilities.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated March & August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would create a more intense group of dwellings in an area which historically would not have consolidated development as it has grown out of sporadic farmsteads.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears to be a pedestrian access to Hill Road, there is an existing access onto Bunwell Road and may be potential to create a new access if visibility can be achieved, but removal of hedge along Bunwell Road for access unlikely to be acceptable.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Small area of unused grassland with a barn to be converted to the south within the site.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agriculture. No compatibility issues.	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)	Significant hedges with mature trees surrounding the site and between the farmhouse.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential for habitat with existing brick barn – particularly bats. Also trees and hedges and pond present on north-east boundary. Would require a species survey.	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)	Would need investigation as the barn will have been used for agricultural storage. Unlikely to prevent development.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated March & August 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	Limited views into the site from Hill Road as it is on the corner and is well treed. Some views along Bunwell Road of the site when travelling in either direction. No wider views in the landscape. Limited views out of the site.	N/A
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Would create a more intense group of dwellings in an area which only has sporadic development south of the junction of Bunwell Road and Hill Road. Resulting in a loss of rural character. Potential removal of hedge along Bunwell Road for access would not be acceptable. Surface water flooding needs to be investigated as does potential for species.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		
Conclusion	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 – owned by a developer.	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – owned by a developer.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Indicated it would be deliverable 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)	Access improvement.	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. Stated private benefits; provision of attenuated drainage to alleviate flooding, including digging of a large attenuation pond and improvement of existing swale.	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation but is promoted for fewer dwellings (which would also include an extant permission for 1 residential unit on the site). The site is in proximity to the existing settlement limit but has the strongest relationship with the sporadic development that has occurred at the Bunwell Road / Hill Road junction. Hill Road is of narrow width and is constrained whilst access via the Bunwell Road site frontage would result in an unacceptable visual impact due to the loss of the established boundary hedgerow. Potential non-designated heritage assets may also constrain development of this site.

Site Visit Observations

The site contributes to the character of the area, reinforcing the historic pattern of development that marks the transition between the rural edge of the settlement and the more developed areas of the settlement slightly further to the north of the site. Development of the settlement would erode this character and have a harmful visual impact. Loss of the hedgerow along Bunwell Road would not be supported due to the landscape harm that would arise in the immediate environs of the site.

Local Plan Designations

Norwich Policy Area.

Availability

The site is considered to be available for development.

Achievability

The site may be achievable however highway constraints have been identified that may impact on the viability of the site. Additional drainage works have also been proposed as part of the development of this site which would also impact on the delivery costs of the site. Viability evidence may be required to support the delivery of this site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for development. The site is of a suitable scale for allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings more suitable for a settlement limit extension. However, in both scenarios development on this site is considered to be inappropriate and would result in a harmful visual impact on the landscape due to the consolidation of the built form that would result. This would adversely impact on the transition between the rural surroundings and the approach into Spooner Row, particularly along Bunwell Road. Loss of the hedgerow along Bunwell Road would also not be acceptable and access via Hill Road is severely constrained by the single width carriageway. The presence of potential non-designated heritage assets on the site is also considered to be a development constraint.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 3 May 2022