



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Tacolneston and Forncett End

Contents

SN0016REV.....	3
SN0016SLREVB.....	11
SN0084	21
SN0086	30
SN0089	39
SN0094	47
SN0602	56
SN2013	66
SN2031	75
SN4019	84
SN4061SL	92
SN4062SL	100

SN0016REV

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0016REV
Site address	Land to the rear of 122 Norwich Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2014/1959 - 2 new dwellings and detached garage – Withdrawn 2020/0048 - 1 new self-build dwelling - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.95ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Settlement limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1dph (24 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access is available from Norwich Road. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Unlikely satisfactory visibility (2.4m x 90m) could be provided at access. Footway improvement to min 2.0m width required between site and 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 	Green	Primary school – site is located less than 100m from the primary school. Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	

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 		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway – site is adjacent to The Pelican Public House	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water infrastructure should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, electricity available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1. LLFA – no comments	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land Site is surrounded by existing trees and hedgerow which limit wider views.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	This site would introduce development to the rear of properties on Norwich Road which would not reflect the form and character of this part of Tacolneston. This is also within the conservation area. It may be possible to mitigate this through careful design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is in close proximity to Hill Cottage and Saffron Cottage both of which are Grade II listed. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Surrounding road network is suitable. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber Unlikely satisfactory visibility (2.4m x 90m) could be provided at access. Footway improvement to min 2.0m width required between site and school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site forms part of the setting of the listed buildings to the south. Development is considered to result in harm to the setting and their significance.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich road.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Garden land associated with 122 Norwich Road.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and also the Pelican Public House.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is generally flat. It slopes up from the road.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundary treatments comprise a hedge to the front/west and a 1.5m high hedge and close boarded wooden fence of the same height on the northern boundary. The southern boundary is open to the existing garden.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There are existing trees on the site and along the eastern boundary	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are reduced by the existing hedgerow at the front of the site.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would impact on the setting and significance of the listed buildings and conservation area. The traditional verdant setting of the group of dwellings at number 116 and 122 Norwich Road will not be preserved as a result of the reduction in the size of the curtilage at number 122. This formed a reason for refusal of the most recent planning application and is considered to remain relevant.	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)
Article 4 Direction		
Conservation Area		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Widening of the site frontage footway up to the adjacent school would be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but not provided supporting information at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site has been submitted for consideration as an extension to the existing settlement limit but would be of suitable size for an allocation. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement limit. The site is within the Conservation Area and adjacent to Listed Buildings (located to the south of the site). An Article 4 Direction is also in place. Townscape, landscape and highways concerns have all been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Development would impact on the historic environment and is not considered reasonable for development. Potential highways issues.

Local Plan Designations

Site is in the conservation area and has an article 4 direction.

Availability

Promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** site for both allocation and extension to the settlement limit because development would impact on the setting and significance of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area. The traditional verdant setting of the group of dwellings at number 116 and 122 Norwich Road will not be preserved as a result of the reduction in the size of the curtilage at number 122. It is unlikely satisfactory visibility could be provided at access, particularly to on-coming traffic and footway improvement to min 2.0m width would be required between site and school. Any removal of hedging to achieve highway requirements would be detrimental to the heritage assets.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 December 2020

SN0016SLREVB

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0016SLREVB
Site address	Land north of 116 and 122 Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2020/0048/F for 1 dwelling refused 22/10/2020. 2016/0776/F for 1 dwelling refused, appeal dismissed 18/05/2017. 2014/1959/F for 2 dwellings withdrawn 06/11/2014.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.06 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 1 dwelling (1-2dwellings 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>The site has a frontage onto Norwich Road however previous NCC Highways comments for linked site SN0016REV raised concerns about the ability to create a satisfactory visibility splay for access into the site. The amendments to the promoted site have reduced the extent of the road frontage associated with the site – this would likely further impact on the creation of a safe access to the site.</p> <p>Good pedestrian connectivity to the village although previous NCC Highways comments also noted a need to improve the existing footway between the site and the school. PROWs east and south of the site.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Limited frontage, unlikely to achieve satisfactory visibility due to road alignment.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Primary school – site is located less than 100m from the primary school.</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	N/A
<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 	N/A	<p>Village hall c. 925m</p> <p>Recreation ground c. 925m</p> <p>1 public house (The Jolly Farmers) c.1.4km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Utilities capacity to be confirmed but note reference to discussions with AW about connectivity to their infrastructure for this site and adjacent dwellings.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green (Foul Water Capacity)</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	<p>Promoter has previously confirmed that there is mains water and electricity available to the site but this would need to be confirmed. Site is adjacent to existing development so at least some utility infrastructure is likely to be available in proximity of the site.</p> <p>Promoter has advised that agreement has been reached in principle with AW and third parties for waste water drainage connection for this site and the adjacent listed buildings therefore this would result in a limited improvement to the local infrastructure. Redacted correspondence submitted as evidence.</p>	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>There are no known ground stability issues.</p> <p>Site promoter notes presence of asbestos roofed building on site, a septic waste water tank and chicken sheds but it is unclear of the scale of the latter.</p>	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Site located in FZ1. Some surface water flooding noted to the east and west of the site but not extending into the site (0.1% AEP event)</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Flood risk is very minor localised flooding to the site boundary.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green (Flood Risk)</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is surrounded by existing trees and hedgerow which limit wider views into the site. The existing vegetation contributes to the rural and verdant character of the area.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is within the Tacolneston Conservation Area and is adjacent to listed buildings. Development of this site would have the effect of eroding the space between the existing groups of buildings, altering the streetscene to a degree which would be harmful in a sensitive setting. Due to the amended site boundaries it is possible that any new structure would be set further back within the site which could address some of these concerns.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement have been promoted by the site promoter however as a settlement limit extension it would not be possible to secure these benefits as part of the VCHAP process. Existing established vegetation along the site boundaries may provide biodiversity habitat.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber.</p> <p>SSSI risk zone. - Housing and water discharge not identified requiring Natural England consultation. Amber risk zone for GCN and ponds in the area. No priority habitats onsite. PROW Tacolneston FP5 along track which will give access to the site. Ponds within 250m.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Development on this site has previously been refused planning permission due to the adverse impact on the significance of the setting of the adjacent listed buildings. The site submission refers to development of the site taking place in a sensitive manner to address this constraint. Detailed design would be secured at the planning application stage however the earlier concerns of the DM officers, Senior Conservation & Design Officer and the Planning Inspector remain valid and the traditional views of the listed building will be impacted and altered.</p> <p>If the site is considered suitable to progress further as part of the VCHAP process</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Surrounding road network is suitable</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green. Limited frontage, unlikely to achieve satisfactory visibility due to road alignment.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Google Street View – image date: August 2021 and previous planning applications site visit assessments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site forms part of the setting of the listed buildings to the south. Development is considered to result in harm to the setting and their significance through separation of the plot and erosion of the spacing between the row of terraced cottages to the north and 122 and 116 Norwich Road to the south.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be possible from Norwich Road although visibility may be a constraint and result in the loss of some/ all of the existing boundary hedgerow	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential – existing outbuildings on site would need to be removed	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundary treatments comprise a hedge to the front/west and a c. 2m high hedge and close boarded wooden fence of approximately the same height on the northern boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Existing established trees and hedgerows on the site and along the eastern boundary	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No issues identified – utility apparatus present in proximity to the site	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Google Street View – image date: August 2021 and previous planning applications site visit assessments	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 into the site are reduced by the existing hedgerow at the front 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)	Development of the site would impact on both the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building. It would reduce the spacings between the existing groupings of buildings. The site promoter has sought to promote betterment on the site via site design, biodiversity and ecological enhancements etc however earlier concerns about the impact of development on the heritage assets and the overall townscape remain valid.	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)
Conservation Area		
Article 4 Direction		
Conclusion		Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	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)	The site promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable and that planning permission on this site would enable works to listed building to be undertaken. Additional supporting evidence has been submitted (previously submitted in support of planning application).	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. Widening of the site frontage footway up to the adjacent school would be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Ltd improvements resulting from connection of adjacent properties to AW infrastructure for discharge of waste water.	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site has been reduced in area and resubmitted for consideration as an extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is close to the existing settlement limit but does not share a significant boundary with it. The site is within the Conservation Area and adjacent to Listed Buildings (located to the south of the site), an Article 4 Direction is also in place. Townscape, landscape and heritage concerns have all been identified. The proposed access has been amended slightly to reflect the change in promoted boundaries however NCC Highways maintain their concerns about the provision of an adequate access into the site.

Site Visit Observations

The site, including the existing frontage vegetation, forms an important role within the Conservation Area and in the setting of the adjacent listed buildings to the south of the site. The site is currently an attractive and important gap between the existing groupings of historical buildings. The frontage hedgerow also reinforces the rural character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

The site is in the Conservation Area and has an Article 4 Direction.

Availability

Promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an UNREASONABLE site for both allocation and extension to the settlement limit. The fundamental issues remain as highlighted in the previous Regulation 18 Site Assessment SN0016REV, the most recently refused planning application for one dwelling (October 2020) and the dismissed Appeal (May 2017). The reduced site area does not change the previous conclusion. Development would have an unacceptable impact on the setting and significance of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area. The traditional verdant setting of the group of dwellings at number 116 and 122 Norwich Road will not be preserved and development of this site would erode the character of the conservation area. Concerns have also been maintained about the provision of a suitable vehicular access into the site and the provision of acceptable visibility splays.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 10 May 2022

SN0084

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0084
Site address	Horse Meadow, Talconeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	7.1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (178 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 from either Chenerys Lane or The Poplars. NCC Highways – Amber. Access onto Cheney's Lane would require carriageway widening to 5.5m, frontage footway and removal of existing hedges. Wider network limited in width and lacks footway. Visibility limited at Cheney's Lane/ Norwich Road junction. The Poplars/Bentley Road unsuitable to provide access. No continuous footway to catchment school.	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>Primary school – 900m from site if accessed via The Cheneys</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village hall</p> <p>Recreation ground</p> <p>2 public houses and a takeaway</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste- water capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The promoter has confirmed that there is mains water and electricity available to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground contamination or stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 Agricultural land Hedgerows runs along the northern boundary of the site. There are open views across the site. The existing built form to the west is screened by hedgerows and trees Development is considered to have a detrimental impact on the landscape.	Red
Townscape	Amber	Development on this field would extend residential development to the east which would represent a break out. This would be detrimental to the existing development pattern.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Adjacent to priority habitat.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	There are a number of listed buildings located to the west of the site. The impact of the development could be mitigated through careful design. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site will not result in the loss of open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Cheney's Lane is restricted width without passing places and not considered suitable for additional traffic. Access can also be achieved from The Poplars. The local road network in this area is wider.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Access onto Cheney's Lane would require carriageway widening to 5.5m, frontage footway and removal of existing hedges. Wider network limited in width and lacks footway. Visibility limited at Cheney's Lane/ Norwich Road junction. The Poplars/Bentley Road unsuitable to provide access. No continuous footway to catchment school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would represent a breakout of residential use to the east of the settlement. Development would harm the townscape.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Chenery Lane, however this is restricted width with no passing places or footpaths and not considered suitable. Access is also available from The Poplars however it is not clear if this would require third party land.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is flat. It is higher than Chenery Lane.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There are hedgerows surrounding the site.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerows at the 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)	Electricity lines run across the 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 the site. Views into the site are restricted	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would represent a break-out to the east of Tacolneston which would be detrimental to the landscape and townscape. In addition, access from Chenery lane is not considered be suitable, and it is unclear if access can be achieved from the Poplars.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – 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)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, highway improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. Development of the site would break out to the east of the existing settlement and would have a townscape impact. Landscape concerns have also been identified. Highway constraints have also been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Development of the site would impact on the landscape and townscape. Chenery Lane would not be suitable for an intensification of traffic.

Local Plan Designations

Site is in the open countryside and adjacent the defined development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered **UNREASONABLE** for allocation. As promoted the site is excessive scale in scale but it could be reduced in size. Development of the site would represent a significant break out to the east of Tacolneston which would be detrimental to the landscape and townscape. In addition, there is no continuous footway to catchment school and access from Chenery lane is not considered to be suitable as it is unclear if access can be achieved from the Poplars. It would require carriageway widening to 5.5m, a frontage footway and removal of existing hedges which would have a negative impact on the landscape.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN0086

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0086
Site address	Land north of Common Road, Forncett End
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.05ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph would equate to 26 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	Common Road is narrow and includes passing places. Land allocated to the north is within the same ownership and may provide a suitable access. Applicant should confirm. NCC Highways – Amber. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich 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>Primary school – 1.5km from the site – the first 300m does not have a footpath</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village hall</p> <p>Recreation ground</p> <p>2 public houses and a takeaway</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste water infrastructure should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed water and electricity are available at the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Site is in flood zone 1.</p> <p>LLFA – Few if any constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. No areas of surface water risk identified on this site as shown in the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land</p> <p>Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact upon the landscape. Appropriate landscaping may mitigate this.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact on the townscape. Appropriate landscaping may mitigate this.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not impact on the historic environment. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Common Road is narrow and includes passing places. Consideration should be given to access via the allocated site to the north. NCC Highways – Red. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road / Norwich Road junction.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural	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 represent a break out to the south of the village which would not reflect the built form as currently developed.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Common Road. There are no footpaths and the road is narrow with no formal passing places	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural, land to the north is part of allocation TAC1.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows to both the north and south of the site	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is highly visible within the landscape and development would have a detrimental impact	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both across the site and into the site	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape by virtue of its location detached from the existing built form, however note existing allocation TAC01 (2017/0225) immediately to the north. Access via Common Road may be problematic.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The site relates reasonably well to the settlement and is in close proximity to previous allocation TAC01 (2017/0225). As a standalone site it would represent a breakout into the countryside and would appear detached in the landscape. Highways and landscape concerns have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is detached from the settlement and would represent an extension into the open countryside. Common Road is narrow.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised that the site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for allocation by virtue of its separation from the existing built form. Development would be an encroachment into the countryside and would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape. Access could be achievable at Common Rd but given the narrow width of the road it would require carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway. This would require the removal of frontage hedge/trees which would further impact on the landscape. It is not feasible to provide a footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich Road junction. Possibility of surface water flooding as there is a small area of ponding in the southeast but it is unlikely to prevent development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN0089

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0089
Site address	Land south of Common Road, Forngett End
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.93ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph would equate to 98 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 is available from Common Road which is narrow. NCC Highways – Amber. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/ Norwich Road junction.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Primary school – 1.5km from the site – the first 300m does not have a footpath Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	

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 		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water infrastructure should be confirmed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed water and electricity are available at the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land Development of the site would represent a significant breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact on the landscape.	Red
Townscape	Green	Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact on the townscape	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not impact on the historic environment. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	The surrounding road network is narrow. Common Road includes informal passing places. NCC Highways – Red. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road / Norwich Road junction.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/allotments	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 represent a break-out to the south of the village which would not reflect the built form.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Common Road. There are no footpaths and the road is narrow with no formal passing places	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat, site slopes to the south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows to both the north and south of the site	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is highly visible within the landscape and development would have a detrimental impact	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both across the site and into the site	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape by virtue of its location detached from the existing built form. Common Road may not be suitable for increased traffic.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter has confirmed deliverability	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Off-site highways improvements may be required to Common Road	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed viability but not submitted supporting evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. The site is reasonably well located but would represent a breakout into the countryside to both the south and west of the existing built form. Highways, landscape and townscape concerns have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

The site is detached from the settlement and would represent an extension into the open countryside. Development of the site would be detrimental to the landscape and it is not considered could not easily be mitigated. Common Road is narrow.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised that the site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Development of the site is **UNREASONABLE** as it would be a significant breakout to the south of the existing village. The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size however development on this site would be detrimental to the landscape and townscape. Furthermore, access is likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. It is not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich Road junction.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 26 November 2020

SN0094

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0094
Site address	Land north of Norwich Road, Fornsett End
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph would equate to 27 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access to the site is via Common road which is restricted width and does not have public footpaths. NCC Highways - Amber. Site located at Fornsett End. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich 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>Primary school – 1.5km from the site – the first 300m does not have a footpath</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village hall</p> <p>Recreation ground</p> <p>2 public houses and a takeaway</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter has confirmed water and electricity are available at the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Surface water flood zone along the eastern boundary of the site.</p> <p>LLFA – Few if any constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. There is a small area of ponding in the southeast of the site for the 0.1% event as shown on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. No watercourse apparent.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Settled Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land</p> <p>Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside which would have a detrimental impact upon the landscape. Appropriate landscaping may mitigate this.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Development of the site would breakout into an undeveloped area of countryside but appropriate landscaping may mitigate this.</p> <p>Development is immediately south of previous allocation TAC01 (2017/0225).</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Development would not impact on the historic environment.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Common Road is narrow and includes passing places. Consideration should be given to access via the allocated site to the north.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Red. Site located at Forncett End. Access achievable at Common Rd subject to providing acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway, likely to require removal of frontage hedge/trees. Not feasible to provide footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road / Norwich Road junction.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural	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 represent a break-out to the south of the village which would not reflect the built form but it is adjacent to 2017/0225	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Common Road. There are no footpaths and the road is narrow with no formal passing places. Opportunity to access via site to the north?	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows to both the north and south of the site	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is visible within the landscape and development but will be adjacent to a new development	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both across the site and into the site	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape by virtue of its location detached from the existing built form(although note existing pp to the north). Access via Common Road may be problematic.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	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)	Promoter has confirmed the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Off-site highways improvements may be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed the site is viable but has not provided evidence at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of suitable size for allocation. The site is adjacent to a previous allocation which has the benefit of planning permission but would be a breakout further south into the countryside. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and townscape concerns could potentially be mitigated. Landscape and highway concerns have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is detached from the settlement and would represent an extension into the open countryside. Development of the site would be detrimental to the landscape Common Road is constrained.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised that the site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is unreasonable for allocation as development would be an encroachment into the countryside and have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape. Access could be achievable at Common Rd but given the narrow width of the road it would require carriageway widening to 5.5m min and a 2.0m footway. This would require the removal of frontage hedge/trees which would further impact on the landscape. It is not feasible to provide a footway to catchment school due to constraint in vicinity of Common Road/Norwich Road junction. There is the possibility of surface water flooding as there is a small area of ponding in the southeast but it is unlikely to prevent development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN0602

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0602
Site address	Land off The Fields, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated, adjacent land allocated previously
Planning History	Adjacent land subject to Outline planning approval – 2017/0225 Residential Development for 21 dwellings and open space. Extant - expires 30/11/21.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.55ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dph (14 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access available from The Fields. This would need to be shared with the adjacent allocation. NCC should confirm number of houses which can access from single access.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. No identifiable means of access to the site.</p> <p>Highways Meeting: to be accessed via the current permission, which would be acceptable.</p>	Red
<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>Primary school – 1.3km from the site</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Waste-water capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity supply to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. LFFA – Green. Few or no constraints	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land</p> <p>The site is relatively contained with existing hedgerows. It is well related to existing development and development is not considered to result in an adverse landscape impact.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - appropriate in the context of approved scheme; would read against the settlement.</p>	Green
Townscape	Green	<p>The site forms part of a wider agricultural field however the remainder of the field has previously been allocated. The proposal would not extend the built form beyond existing residential development.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design Officer – no objections.</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>The proposal is not considered to have an adverse impact on the historic environment</p> <p>HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design Officer – no objections.</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>No issues identified with the local road network.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. No identifiable means of access to the site.</p> <p>Highways Meeting: to be accessed via the current permission, which would be acceptable.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would not extend the built form beyond the existing development to the south or the west	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would need to be from The Fields. Highways should confirm the number of dwellings which can be accessed from this single point.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is part of a wider field which includes the existing allocation TAC1. There are no boundaries between the two. There are hedgerows surrounding the site.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site is relatively contained. Development would have limited impact on the landscape.	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	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. Site is visible from Common 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)	Visually contained. Development is adjacent to existing residential, a suitable design solution would be feasible to prevent harm to residential amenity. Site is considered a suitable option for development.	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided additional evidence at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Development would not extend the built form beyond the existing allocation. Access would need to be from The Fields. Visually contained. Development is adjacent to existing residential, a suitable design solution would be feasible to prevent harm to residential amenity. Site is considered a suitable option for development. Subject to a combined application included TAC1 the site is considered to be a suitable option for residential development.

Site Visit Observations

Site is adjacent to existing residential development and would represent a suitable option for a further extension to the development boundary. Highways should confirm the number of dwellings which would be able to access the site from The Fields.

Local Plan Designations

Site is adjacent to the existing allocation. No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised that the site is available within the plan period. No additional constraints identified.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** site for allocation. It is adjacent to the settlement limits and an extant residential permission. It is well related to existing residential development and would have a limited impact of the landscape as it is contained by a western and southern boundary line. It could come forward as a comprehensive scheme with the existing allocation. Access should be from The Fields to the north, via the extant permission.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN2013

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2013
Site address	Land at Black Barn, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2003/2387 Black Barn – Change of use from photographic studio to residential dwelling - Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for up to 5 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 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	<p>Access to the site is from Tabernacle Lane. The lane in this area is narrow and highways improvements would be required. Furthermore, the footpath on Tabernacle Lane does not extend as far as this site.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Unlikely to be able to provide acceptable access/visibility with limited frontage and due to adjacent hedge/narrow carriageway. Would require improvement scheme to provide 5.5m carriageway and 2.0m footway between site access and Long Stratton Road. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Primary school – 1.8 km from the site – part of this route does not include a footpath</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</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 		Facilities available within Tacolneston including: Village hall recreation ground, 2 public houses and a takeaway. There is no footway provision to these services	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that mains water, sewerage and electricity are available at the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	1 in 1000 year surface water flooding within the site. 1 in 100 year surface water flooding along the road.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land Development of the site would impact upon the landscape.	Amber
Townscape	Red	Development of this site would result in harm to the townscape in this location which could not reasonably be mitigated.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Granville Farmhouse is located to the south of the site which is grade II listed. Black Barn is considered to be curtilage listed. Development of the site would impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets and it is not considered that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh this harm. HES - Amber	Red
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Tabernacle Lane at the entrance of this site is narrow. Improvements would be required.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Unlikely to be able to provide acceptable access/visibility with limited frontage and due to adjacent hedge/narrow carriageway. Would require improvement scheme to provide 5.5m carriageway and 2.0m footway between site access and Long Stratton Road. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site would represent a break-out of development which does not reflect the existing townscape. The site would also impact the setting of Granville Farmhouse (LB).	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is from Tabernacle Lane. The land is not considered suitable for increased vehicular movements due to its restricted width and no footpaths	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and Residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Significant trees on all site boundaries screen the site from the wider view	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant trees on all site boundaries screen the site from the wider view	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into or out of the site due to existing screening	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 not considered suitable for development due to location, access, and impact on the historic environment/townscape	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	5 – 10 years	Amber

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)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Would require improvement scheme to provide 5.5m carriageway and 2.0m footway between site access and Long Stratton Road.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided any supporting evidence.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings so would be more appropriately considered as a settlement limit extension. The site would represent a break-out of development which does not reflect the existing townscape. The site would in close proximity to Granville Farmhouse (a listed building). Highways constraints and landscape concerns have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is screened from the wider landscape. It's detached in form.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

The promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as both an extension to the settlement limit and an allocation. The site is detached from the existing built form and would represent a breakout, which does not reflect the existing townscape. The access and local road network along Tabernacle Lane is also not considered to be suitable for increased traffic by virtue of its restricted width and lack of footpaths and passing places. Unlikely to be able to provide acceptable access visibility with limited frontage and due to adjacent hedge/narrow carriageway. Development of the site would negatively impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets and it is not considered that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh this harm.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 December 2020

SN2031

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2031
Site address	Land east of Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/1346 – One self-build dwelling - Withdrawn
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.25ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (31 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access is available from Norwich Road. NCC Highways - Amber Subject to widening the frontage footway to 2m. Like to require removal of frontage hedge. Highways Meeting - Issues with substantial tree and hedge removal and together with SN1057 these form a significant green break between two parts of the village. Forward visibility issues to the south along bend.	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>Primary school – 350m from the site</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village hall</p> <p>Recreation ground</p> <p>2 public houses and a takeaway</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	The promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1. A surface water flow path runs along the south of the site. The 1 in 1000 year event extends into the centre of the site significantly reducing 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	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land. PROW Tacolneston FP9 runs to the south of the site and across the south-eastern corner, connecting to a wider footpath network.</p> <p>There is an existing hedgerow along the front of the site.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - lots of roadside vegetation, including some significant oaks and ash trees; the hedgerow along the roadside has been neglected in recent years; the vegetation provides a green lung between the two groups of development, reinforcing the rural character.</p>	Red
Townscape	Green	Site is well related to other residential development	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Any impacts of development can be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>A listed building is located to the south of the site. This is set within a reasonable sized plot. Subject to an appropriate design, it is considered that the impact could be mitigated.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Access is from the B1113. There is an existing footpath along the site frontage.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green. Subject to widening the frontage footway to 2m. Like to require removal of frontage hedge.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Issues with substantial tree and hedge removal and together with SN1057 these form a significant green break between two parts of the village. Forward visibility issues to the south along bend.</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is relatively contained. Listed buildings are located to the south of the site however the impact of the development could be reduced through suitable design solutions.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be from Norwich Road however would require the removal of trees and hedgerow	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is generally flat but it slopes towards the southwestern corner.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is bounded by hedgerows Public footpath is located to the south of the site	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	There are oak trees at the front of the site which support the verdant rural characteristic of this part of Talconeston	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)	A sewerage pumping station is located in the south-eastern corner of the site. This would reduce the developable area of the site. Electricity power lines cross the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are restricted by the existing boundary treatments	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would require the loss of significant trees along the western boundary of the site to provide access and suitable visibility splays, this would impact on the 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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Improvements to achieve access visibility.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but not provided additional supporting evidence at this time	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site exceeds the objectives of the VCHAP however identified flood risk to the south of the site would reduce the developable area. The site is adjacent to existing built form and relatively well contained. Development of the site would require the loss of significant trees along the western boundary of the site to provide access and suitable visibility splays and this would significantly impact on the landscape.

Site Visit Observations

There is an existing footpath along the front of the site however, to achieve a suitable access a number of trees at the front of the site would need to be removed. This would impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised that the site is available.

Achievability

The promoter has advised that the site is achievable however constraints to the size of the site by virtue of the areas of surface water flood risk, the presence of the sewerage pumping station and the overhead electricity power lines have been identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for allocation. Whilst it is well located adjacent to the development boundary access it would have a negative impact on the landscape. It would require the loss of significant trees and hedgerow which create the rural character of this part of Tacolneston and form a significant green break between two parts of the village. There are forward visibility issues to the south along the bend and a surface water flow path runs along the south of the site. These constraints significantly reduce the developable site area.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN4019

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4019
Site address	Land to the south of Hall Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (25 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access to the site is from Hall Road. This is of restricted width. NCC Highways – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	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 	Green	Primary school – 140m from the site but there are no public footpaths Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	

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 		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Site is in flood zone 1. There is an area of surface water flood risk at the north of the site adjacent to Hall Road. Due to the size of the site it may be possible to mitigate this. LLFA – Surface water flooding but would not prevent development. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.	Amber

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land There are currently open views across the site from Hall Road. Development would impact upon the wider landscape	Red
Townscape	Amber	Development would represent a breakout to the north east and backland development.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could reasonably be mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and also 103 Norwich Road which is Grade II listed. Development of the site would impact views of the CA from Norwich Road. This may be mitigated through an appropriate design solution. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Hall Road is of restricted width. The trees at the front of the site are subject to a TPO woodland order and it is not considered possible to mitigate the road width. NCC Highways – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural land	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	103 Norwich Road located to the north east of the site. Visible from the site.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be via Hall Lane. This is narrow single car width with no passing places. The access is not considered suitable.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties are located to the east of the site. Land to the west is in agricultural use	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	The northern boundary is tree lined and includes a woodland TPO. There is a hedgerow to the south. There is no western boundary as this forms part of a wider agricultural field.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Access to the site would impact on trees to the north of the site.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Electricity power lines cross the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are screened by the existing trees. There are open views across the site.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would impact on the landscape representing a breakout of development to the north west of the village. It is not considered that this can be mitigated through design. Furthermore, the access is not considered to be suitable.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and is adjacent to the development boundary. An area of TPO woodland is located adjacent to the north east of the site. Access to the site is not considered to be appropriate via Hall Road. Development of the site would result in a backland form of development and would impact on the landscape representing a break-out to the north west of the village.

Site Visit Observations

Hall Road is not a suitable option for access. The road is of restricted width and access would result in the loss of trees. These support the verdant rural character of the site. Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation due to the detrimental impacts on the landscape and townscape. Development of the site would be a significant extension into the countryside which would not reflect the existing form of the settlement on this side of Norwich Road. It would negatively impact on the adjacent Conservation Area and Woodland TPO. Access is also not considered to be suitable as Hall Road is substandard, there is no safe walking route and visibility splays would require the removal of important countryside trees/hedging.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 25 November 2020

SN4061SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4061SL
Site address	The Pelican, 136 Norwich Road, Talconeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/2645 - Erection of 2 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	SL Extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dph (5 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access is available from Norwich road. NCC Highways – Amber. Subject to 90m x 2.4m x 90m visibility splays and provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, with improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Primary school – 170m from the site Public transport provision with a service to Norwich Nearest GP service and retail offer is in Long Stratton	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village hall Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that water and electricity are available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	1 in 1000 year surface water flood risk located across the centre of the site. LLFA – Surface water flooding but would not prevent development. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment		Grade 3 agricultural land Site is surrounded by existing trees and hedgerow which limit wider views.	
Townscape	Amber	This site would introduce development to the rear of properties on Norwich Road which would not reflect the form and character of this part of Tacolneston. This is also within the conservation area. It may be possible to mitigate this through careful design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	The site is located within the conservation area and within the setting of The Pelican PH which is Grade II listed. New dwellings in this location will contribute towards eroding the open space behind the properties on Norwich Road and will cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Surrounding road network is suitable. NCC Highways – Amber. Subject to 90m x 2.4m x 90m visibility splays and provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, with improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and public house	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site is located within the conservation area and also forms part of the setting of The Pelican public house which is grade II listed. Development would have a significant impact on both the townscape and historic environment.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich Road.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Pub garden	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Public house and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Existing trees are located along and adjacent to the side and rear boundaries.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Existing trees are located along and adjacent to the side and rear 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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are available from Norwich 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)	Development of the site would erode the open space to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house. This is considered to result in harm historic environment.	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)
Conservation Area		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	The pub has been marketed for 30 months previously for sale as a pub/restaurant but has ceased trading. The site has been closed for nearly 3.5 years	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)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided additional supporting evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be considered as an extension to the settlement limit. It would erode the open space to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house. It would also have a negative impact on the historic environment. Development of the site would result in the loss of the Public House as a community facility, however it is noted that there is another public house within the village and that this pub is currently closed.

Site Visit Observations

Development of the site would impact on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets.

Local Plan Designations

Site is located within the conservation area and adjacent to listed buildings.

Availability

Site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** as an extension to the settlement limit as it would not reflect the existing form and character of the immediate area and would result in harm to the historic environment. New dwellings in this location will contribute towards eroding the open space behind the properties on Norwich Road and will cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and impact on the Grade II listed Pelican PH. It would require improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school and visibility splays which would also have a negative impact on the historic environment. There is surface water flooding although it is unlikely to prevent development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 December 2020

SN4062SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4062SL
Site address	The Pelican 136 Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2018/2645 - 2 dwellings - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.45
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	SL Extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Pub is brownfield – Pub garden is greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access is available from Norwich road. NCC Highways - Amber. Subject to 90m x 2.4m x 90m visibility splays and provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, with improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school. Highways meeting: On a slope surrounding existing terrace properties. Concerns over visibility. Would not want to encourage an allocation but could accept a SL extension.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Primary school – 170m from the site</p> <p>Public transport provision with a service to Norwich</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village hall</p> <p>Recreation ground</p> <p>2 public houses and a takeaway – This proposal includes the conversion of one of the pubs.</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that water and electricity are available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known ground stability or contamination issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>1 in 1000 year surface water flood risk located across the centre of the site.</p> <p>LLFA – Surface water flooding but would not prevent development. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Grade agricultural land</p> <p>Site is surrounded by existing trees and hedgerow which limit wider views.</p> <p>SND Landscape Officer - recent refused Appeal decision on the site; landscape concerns about this site.</p>	Red
Townscape	Amber	<p>This site would introduce development to the rear of properties on Norwich Road which would not reflect the form and character of this part of Tacolneston. This is also within the conservation area. It may be possible to mitigate this through careful design.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>The site is located within the conservation area and includes The Pelican PH which is Grade II listed. New dwellings in this location will contribute towards eroding the open space behind the properties on Norwich Road and will cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Heritage concerns.</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Surrounding road network is suitable.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber. Subject to 90m x 2.4m x 90m visibility splays and provision of 2.0m footway for full extent of frontage, with improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school.</p> <p>Highways meeting: On a slope surrounding existing terrace properties. Concerns over visibility. Would not want to encourage an allocation but could accept a SL extension.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site includes The Pelican public house and is located within the conservation area. Impact on both townscape and heritage assets.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich Road.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Pub garden	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Public house and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Existing trees are located along and adjacent to the side and rear boundaries.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Existing trees are located along and adjacent to the side and rear 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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are available from Norwich 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)	Development of the site would erode the open space to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house. This is considered to result in harm historic environment.	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)
Conservation Area		
Listed Building		
Conclusion	Some potential conflicts with LP designations	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	The pub has been marketed for 30 months previously for sale as a pub/restaurant but has ceased trading. The site has been closed for nearly 3.5 years	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)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highway/footpath improvements.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided additional evidence at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be considered as an extension to the existing settlement limit. Development of the site would impact on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets. Development of the site would erode the open space to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house.

Site Visit Observations

Development of the site would impact on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets.

Local Plan Designations

Conservation area and listed buildings.

Availability

Site is available.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** as a settlement limit extension. Development of the site would be to the rear of numbers 126 to 134 Norwich Road and The Pelican public house which would not reflect the existing form and character. This will result in harm to the historic environment because it is located within the Conservation Area and would impact on The Pelican PH which is Grade II listed. It would require improvement to existing footway to 2.0m between site and school and visibility splays which would also have a negative impact on the historic environment.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 December 2020