



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

Surlingham, Bramerton and

Kirby Bedon

## Contents

SN0030 .....	3
SN0366REV.....	11
SN0374SL .....	19
SN2009SL .....	27
SN2010REV.....	35
SN2016 .....	43
SN2045SL .....	51
SN5017 .....	59

## SN0030

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0030
Site address	Land west of The Street and north of The Green, Surlingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary - unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.79 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation Housing and open space – numbers not specified  (adjacent to SN2009SL)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	44 dwellings at 25dph, although promoter suggests majority could be open space
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Red	Possibility of creating an access is severely constrained  <b>Highways score</b> - Red. Not possible to form acceptable access and no continuous footway to the village primary school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Primary School</li><li>○ Secondary school</li><li>○ Local healthcare services</li><li>○ Retail services</li><li>○ Local employment opportunities</li><li>○ Peak-time public transport</li></ul>	Amber	Distance to school, shop and employment at Surlingham garage 1 km mainly along verges (The Street and The Green) but with footway along School Lane  Bus service passes entrance to site with nearest bus stop 530 metres on The Green	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		The Ferry House (1.6km) and Colham Hall (1km) public houses are both within Surlingham  Distance to Parish Hall 1km mainly along verges (The Street and The Green) but with footway along School Lane	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	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	Some small area of surface water flood risk on access  <b>LLFA score (GNLP)</b> – Green (standard information required). The site may require infiltration. Access and egress arrangements to be considered.	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>		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland Agricultural soil classification not clear	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Does not respect the linear character of the settlement in the landscape.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would constitute backland development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close proximity to Broads. Within 3km buffer to National Nature Reserve, SAC, SPA and SSSI	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to north and west  HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained highway and lack of footways but mitigation may be possible  CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development is not considered to have a particular impact on the setting of the nearby listed buildings, however it would be incongruent with the existing pattern of development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Would appear unlikely that an adoptable highway could be provided to serve the site. Would also be close to existing dwelling raising amenity concerns	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Historically agricultural though with trees planted on it. No redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to north, residential on other boundaries. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and fences	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Planting on site may provide habitat	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of site limited as visually contained due to being behind existing pattern of development	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site should not be allocated due to constrained access and as development of the site would not respect the form and character of the area. Site would represent backland development.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site would be suitable for allocation if area for dwellings is reduced to no more than 1 hectare with remainder being open space.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Field that has a number of young trees going on it to the rear of existing linear development on The Green and The Street. Development of the site would therefore be backland development that does not respect the form and character of the settlement. Access is also highly constrained and unlikely to be achievable for estate scale development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as it would result in backland development that would be detrimental to the form and character of the settlement. Access to the site is also considered to be problematic, even if adjacent site SN2009SL was considered acceptable.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 21 July 2020

## SN0366REV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0366REV
Site address	Land north of Church Farm, Bramerton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Recent refusal of planning permission for residential schemes (2018/0968, 2016/1163, 2014/0025); permission granted for c/u to residential curtilage (2017/1668)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.7 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation of between 12 and 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 21 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	Possibility of creating an access is constrained  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to school and shop in Surlingham 3.3km along mainly rural roads often with very poor provision for pedestrians  Distance to bus service 250 metres with footways along The Street	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		The Ferry House and Colham Hall public houses in Surlingham are both over 3km away  Christadelphian Hall 380 metres away with footways along The Street	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	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	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would not respect historic linear pattern of development through village, however any intrusion into the landscape is mitigated by the new development on a brownfield site immediately to the south. Within higher agricultural soil classification	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would not be in keeping with historic built form, although this is mitigated to some extent by the development to the south	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Adjacent conservation area, listed buildings to west of site  HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained access route through new development  CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Inspector has previously found that development of this site for seven dwellings would harm the setting of Orchard House and there has been no change in circumstances from when that judgement was made. The development to the south reduces the landscape impact and any concerns that the site does not respect the linear character of the village	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is to be through new development. Would need clarification as to whether an adoptable road can be provided to the site	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site historically associated with Orchard House. 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 east with domestic garden space to north. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow and trees on northern and eastern boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedgerows and trees 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 on site. Any contamination on site to south should have been addressed prior to redevelopment	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is fairly contained in views due to position behind existing development	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not recommended to allocate as site in Surlingham is much better located for services such as the village school. If the site was to be considered then the views of the highway authority would be needed as to whether suitable access can be achieved and an assessment of the level of harm to the listed building by the Senior Heritage and Design Officer	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is located to the rear of existing development and would need to be accessed through the recently completed development to the south, which is constrained. Also would have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed Orchard House.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for allocation due to its constrained access, its adverse impact on a heritage asset and poor relationship with local services.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 21 July 2020

## SN0374SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0374SL
Site address	Builder's Yard, Beerlick's Close, Surlingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Previous refusals for prior notification for c/u of building to residential (2018/0389) and for redevelopment of site for four dwellings (2016/0430)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.25 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – 2 to 4 bungalows
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 16 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	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	Red	Possibility of creating an access is constrained  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Distance to school, shop and employment at Surlingham garage 1.2 km mainly along verges (The Street and The Green) but with footway along School Lane  Distance to bus service 275 metres along road with no footway but has verges	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		The Ferry House (1.5km) and Colham Hall (900m) public houses are both within Surlingham  Distance to Parish Hall 1km mainly along verges (The Street and The Green) but with footway along School Lane	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	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	Amber	Potential contamination from former use as a builder's yard and manufacture of play equipment  <b>Minerals &amp; Waste</b> – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, it should be included within any allocation policy.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Half of site is in Flood Risk Zone 2 and access is in Flood Risk Zone 3	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland  Lower grade agricultural soil classification	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	Does not respect the linear character of the settlement resulting in development that may erode the setting of The Broads.	Amber
Townscape	Red	Backland development that does not respect the linear character of the settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Adjacent to Broads. Close to National Nature Reserve, Ramsar suite, SAC and SSSI	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No identified heritage assets affected  <b>HES Score – Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Beerlicks Loke is constrained  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Red	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 be backland development that would not respect the linear pattern of development along The Street	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Constrained access, however NCC Highways have previously accepted access for four dwellings on a planning application	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Site is a brownfield site with structures on it resulting in potential redevelopment / 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 use to west, agricultural / marshland to east. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees on eastern boundary which further constrain development given its restricted dimensions. Domestic boundary treatment to west	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees, plus protected sites in close proximity	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)	Likely contamination issues to be addressed	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Relatively contained given backland nature of site but visible across site from Beerlicks Loke	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Settlement limit should not be extended to include this site due to flood risk and would also be difficult to achieve satisfactory pattern of development that relates to the existing character of the area	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size for an extension to the settlement limit.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is brownfield site to the rear of existing linear pattern of development along The Street. Trees on eastern boundary help screen the site from The Broads but further constrain the potential for development on the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** extension to the settlement limit due to the impact development would have on the townscape. Concerns also arising relating to the access to the site and flood risk on the site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 21 July 2020

## SN2009SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2009SL
Site address	Land west of The Street and north of The Green, Surlingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Settlement limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Red	Possibility of creating an access is severely constrained	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Local healthcare services <input type="checkbox"/> Retail services <input type="checkbox"/> Local employment opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Peak-time public transport	Amber	Distance to school, shop and employment at Surlingham garage 1 km mainly along verges (The Street and The Green) but with footway along School Lane  Bus service passes entrance to site with nearest bus stop 530 metres on The Green	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		The Ferry House (1.6km) and Colham Hall (1km) public houses are both within Surlingham  Distance to Parish Hall 1km mainly along verges (The Street and The Green) but with footway along School Lane	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some small area of surface water flood risk on access	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> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland  ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Does not respect the linear character of the settlement in the landscape. Agricultural soil classification not clear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would constitute backland development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close proximity to Broads. Within 3km buffer to National Nature Reserve, SAC, SPA and SSSI	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to north	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained highway and lack of footways but mitigation may be possible	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development is not considered to have a particular impact on the setting of the nearby listed building, however it would be incongruent with the existing pattern of development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Would appear unlikely that an adoptable highway could be provided to serve the site. Would also be close to existing dwelling raising amenity concerns	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Historically agricultural though with trees planted on it. No redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to north, residential on other boundaries. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and fences	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Planting on site may provide habitat	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of site limited as visually contained due to being behind existing pattern of development	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site should not be included in settlement limit due to constrained access and as development of the site would not respect the form and character of the area	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Field that has a number of young trees going on it to the rear of existing linear development on The Green and The Street. Development of the site would therefore be backland development that does not respect the form and character of the settlement. Access is also highly constrained with potential neighbour amenity issues.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE** - Development of the site would represent backland development that does not respect the form and character of the settlement. Access is also highly constrained with potential neighbour amenity issues.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 30 October 2020

## SN2010REV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2010REV
Site address	Land east of Mill Road, Surlingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Just over 12dph (12 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Site frontage with Mill Road so access should be achievable  <b>Highways score</b> - Amber. (up to 10 dwellings) Subject to providing adequate visibility which will require removal of mature trees. Frontage footway required along with crossing point to connect with existing facility at west side of Mill Road. Carriageway widening to 5.5m min required at frontage. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	Amber

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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Distance to school, shop and employment at Surlingham garage 500 metres with footways along entire route  Bus service passes site but nearest bus stop is 500 metres away	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		The Ferry House and Colham Hall public houses are within Surlingham, both 2km from the site  Distance to Parish Hall 500 metres with footway along entire route	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	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	Surface water ponding risk to rear of site but should not prevent development of site  <b>LLFA score (GNLP)</b> – Green (standard information required)	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland Agricultural soil classification unclear	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Respects linear pattern of development but extends into open landscape to south.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Would respect linear pattern of development  <b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green. Continues linear development which is characteristic of Surlingham. The only issue with continuing linear settlement pattern is where do you stop however these site are still relatively close to village centre/primary school so no objection.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	900 metres from the Broads and within the 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve  <b>NCC Ecology score</b> – SSSI IRZ Potential for protected species, habitats and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to a registered common.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in vicinity  <b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green. No heritage assets affected.  <b>HES Score</b> – Amber	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>Rural road past site though mitigation should be possible</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> – Amber. (up to 10 dwellings) Subject to providing adequate visibility which will require removal of mature trees. Frontage footway required along with crossing point to connect with existing facility at west side of Mill Road. Carriageway widening to 5.5m min required at frontage. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</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?	Linear pattern of development that this site could replicate extending to the south	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable from Mill Road	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north and partly to west on opposite side of Mill Road. Partly also agricultural to west and agricultural to east and south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Mill Road rises to the south. Depression to the rear of No40 Mill Road that may need to be addressed	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Some trees on site frontage. Other boundaries are undefined as part of open field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat potential in 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 on site	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 road	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site could be suitable to allocate for 12 dwellings continuing linear pattern of development. Need to check that access arrangements can accommodate trees	Amber



## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is suitable size for allocation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site consists of part of field on land along Mill Road projecting away from the existing village. Development along Mill Road to the north is linear, which development of this site is likely to replicate.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Development of the site would extend the linear pattern of development into the countryside, to the detriment of the landscape. There would be a significant impact on trees on the site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 21 July 2020

## SN2016

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2016
Site address	Land west of The Covey, Surlingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal and withdrawn applications for residential development but no recent history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Settlement limit extension for six new dwellings <i>but due to the size of the site it has been considered for allocation and as an extension to the settlement limit</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6dph
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	Part in Flood Zone 3 – would need to be demonstrated not in Flood Zone 3b
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Ability to create access is constrained  <b>Highways score</b> – Amber. An access could be provided into this site subject to localised carriageway widening to 5.5m and frontage 2m wide footway. However the local road network is considered to be unsuitable for further development by reason of its restricted width and lack of footpath provision. No continuous footway to the village primary school. Would require complete removal of existing frontage hedge.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Distance to school, shop and employment at Surlingham garage 1 km mainly along verges (The Covey and The Green) but with footway along School Lane</p> <p>Distance to bus service 550 metres with no footways</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>The Ferry House and Colham Hall public houses</p> <p>Distance to Parish Hall 1km mainly along verges (The Covey and The Green) but with footway along School Lane</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	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

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste comment</b> – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Red	Over half the site within flood zones 3 or 2 preventing appropriate development	Red

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> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland Agricultural soil classification unclear	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Rural landscape with development not relating well to existing settlement.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would relate poorly to existing settlement form and character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	350 metres from the Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed farm buildings to south  HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained local highway network  CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site has poor relation to main part of settlement.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	In order to achieve access there may need to be a loss of hedgerows and trees to gain visibility.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to west and on opposite of road to east. Sporadic residential to north and south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and trees on site boundary. Hedge line bisects site. No defined western boundary as forms part of wider field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in trees and hedgerows. Close to Broads and protected sites	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 and across site from gaps in hedgerow	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable for allocation or inclusion in settlement limit due to flood risk and poor relationship with main part 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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	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 in single 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/ promoter	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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	Green (n/a if only for settlement limit extension)
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site would need to be reduced in size if only for a settlement limit extension to a strip along the highway boundary. As promoted, it is of a size suitable for allocation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Removed from main part of settlement down rural lane. Consists of part of larger field and then smaller parcel of land adjacent to the north. Boundary with highway is partly vegetated with sections of hedgerow and trees.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and detached from development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE** - Not suitable for allocation or for inclusion in settlement limit due to both the identified flood risk on the site and the poor relationship between the site and the settlement.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 21 July 2020

## SN2045SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2045SL
Site address	Land west of Mill Road, Surlingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.28 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Settlement limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5 dwellings – approximately 18 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Site frontage with Mill Road so access should be achievable</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> – Amber.  Subject to frontage 2m wide footway linking with existing provision to the north, localised carriageway widening to 5.5m and extension of the local speed restriction. Likely to require loss of existing frontage trees.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><b>Part 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Distance to school, shop and employment at Surlingham garage 500 metres with footways along entire route</p> <p>Bus service passes site but nearest bus stop is 500 metres away</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		The Ferry House and Coldham Hall public houses are within Surlingham, both 2km from the site  Distance to Parish Hall 500 metres with footway along entire route	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	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		Information not available on map	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland  Agricultural soil classification unclear	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Respects linear pattern of development but extends into open landscape to south.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	<p>Would respect linear pattern of development</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green. Continues linear development which is characteristic of Surlingham. The only issue with continuing linear settlement pattern is where do you stop however these site are still relatively close to village centre/primary school so no objection.</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	900 metres from Broads. Within 3km buffer distance of SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets in vicinity</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green. No heritage assets affected.</p> <p><b>HES Score</b> – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Rural road past site though mitigation should be possible</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> – Amber.</p> <p>Subject to frontage 2m wide footway linking with existing provision to the north, localised carriageway widening to 5.5m and extension of the local speed restriction. Likely to require loss of existing frontage trees.</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?	Linear pattern of development that this site could replicate extending to the south	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable from Mill Road	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north. Agricultural to west and south, and to east on opposite side of Mill Road. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Mill Road rises to the south.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open boundary with road other than two trees. Western and southern boundaries undefined as part of larger field. Planting on boundary with dwellings to north	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possible habitat in trees and verge	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from road	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Potential for settlement limit extension to allow extension of linear pattern of development, particularly if land opposite is to be allocated	Amber

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is suitably size to be an extension to the settlement limit.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site forms part of open field to south of linear pattern of development. An avenue of trees line the road.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is not considered to be suitable for a settlement limit extension without SN2010REV opposite, which has been rejected. It would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape by extending the built-up area in to the open countryside.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 21 July 2020

## SN5017

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5017
Site address	Land north of East Hill Lane, Bramerton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.18
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	9-13 dwellings 28 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Promoter proposing using the two existing accesses from Easthill Lane one for 6-10 dwellings and one further west for 3 dwellings. These are currently field accesses and would need up-grading. The lane is very narrow, single carriageway, with no footpath or lighting.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access would require hedge removal, carriageway widening / footway at frontage. Poor local network with no footway to catchment school.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to school and shop in Surlingham 2.5km along mainly rural roads often with very poor provision for pedestrians</p> <p>Distance to No.85 frequent bus service 550 metres with no footways</p>	N/A
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	<p>1.2k to Water's Edge public house. The Ferry House and Coldham Hall public houses in Surlingham are both over 3km away.</p> <p>Village Hall and recreation area is adjacent</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		Promoter advises; Water supply is available on the north boundary from Bramerton Lodge to the neighbouring single dwelling. An incoming electric supply from the south is above ground. At the site's southern boundary, the electric supply is underground along the east boundary and the Electric substation.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	None known or identified.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 Some low to medium surface water risk within the site to the east and west along the adjacent access driveway.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints, on-site flood risk is localised ponding. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Tributary Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification: Grade 2-3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Whilst the site is not visible in the wider landscape as it is well contained, it is an important site within this rural enclave focused around the village hall. When travelling west the narrow Lane takes you along the treed conservation area frontage with only intermittent houses to the south. Passing the driveways to Lodge Cottages, to the south and Bramerton Lodge to the north the lane is undeveloped. Developing the site would not relate well to the character of this area.</p> <p><b>Broads Authority:</b> Approx. 250m from BA boundary. On higher ground. Probably not visible from the river/moorings/parking due to topography and tree cover, although some Broads visitors could pass the site on their way to these attractions.</p>	Red
Townscape	Red	There is a small group of dwellings around the junction with Surlingham Road however these are sporadic. A more intense development would not be in character and, if it were, would be more appropriate along the larger Surlingham Road than this narrow Lane.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations. There is potential for habitats which would require further investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. Just off GI corridor. No priority habitat identified onsite. Residential development of 50 units or more. Rural Residential, or any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas, or where water discharge is greater than 5m<sup>3</sup>/day requires NE consultation. Ponds nearby and site in amber risk zone for great crested newts.</p> <p><b>Norfolk Wildlife Trust:</b> Note that this site may be supporting species-rich grassland and this is possibly Priority Habitat. If site is to be taken forward this requires further investigation. Recommend ecological surveys for this site.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Adjacent to the conservation area, shares eastern boundary. It would have an impact on the setting of the conservation area to the east.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	<p>No loss of public open space. Bramerton Tennis Court to north-east, not affected.</p>	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Easthill lane is a single carriageway with no passing places and the connecting road network is very constrained. Additional traffic would have a negative impact on the functioning of the highway.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Access would require hedge removal, carriageway widening / footway at frontage. Poor local network with no footway to catchment school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and recreation, some residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of this site would impact on the conservation area as it would alter the setting on the approach from the west.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?		N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Small agricultural/paddocks. No buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to south, village hall to east and residential, Bramerton Lodge, properties. Compatible uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Between the paddocks there is approx. 1m level change.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees, less dense to south and north.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Yes, woodland area and mature trees, pond to east.	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 on site, unlikely given paddock use.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into and out of the site are limited by site boundaries and trees. Also by the narrow width of the road, which is the public viewpoint.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not recommended to allocate as it is remote from services such as the village school and the road network is limited with no paths to get to others. It does not reflect the way this small group has grown incrementally. If the site was to be considered then the views of the highway authority would be needed as to whether suitable access can be achieved as well as an assessment of the level of harm to the setting of the conservation area.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Policy Area		
Adjacent to the conservation area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Some conflict with the conservation area designation	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Access improvements including likely road widening, possible footpath.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site accessed via field gates and would need up-grading. East Hill Lane is very narrow, single carriageway, with no footpath or lighting. remote from services such as the village school and the road network are limited with no paths to get to others. It does not reflect the way this small group has grown incrementally. If the site was to be considered, then the views of the highway authority would be needed as to whether suitable access can be achieved as well as an assessment of the level of harm to the setting of the conservation area.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary and conservation area.

### **Availability**

Promoter states that the site is available.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development, due to its constrained access; Easthill lane is a single carriageway with no passing places and the connecting road network is very constrained. This is exacerbated by the remoteness of the site from services that are not accessible by a footway. Additional traffic would have a negative impact on the functioning of the highway. Development in this location would also have some impact on the adjoining Conservation Area and on the Broads area. Whilst there is a small group of dwellings located around the Surlingham Road junction, these are sporadic, and a more intense development would not be in character.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 28/04/2022