



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre
and Burgh St Peter

Contents

SN0014SL	3
SN0414SLREVA.....	10
SN0392	19
SN0518 (2021).....	27
SN0518 (2022).....	35
SN1031	44
SN2005SL	53
SN4003	62
SN4010	70
SN4016	78
SN5011SL	86
SN5035	95
SN5036	106
SN5037	116

SN0014SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0014SL
Site address	Land to the east of Rushley, Station Road, Aldeby
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusal for two dwellings
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.13 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – one or two dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options are constrained due to nature of road NCC HIGHWAYS – RED Substandard highway network and no safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 3.6km Bus service passes site with bus stops in close proximity Local employment at Aldeby Business Park 2.2km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 2.5km Distance to White Lion public house 1.8km	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Confirmation that that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available required	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC: Grade 2	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development of site would reflect linear pattern of development in vicinity	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Amber SSSI IRZ. Land is Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland. Loss of woodland would lead to fragmentation	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained consisting of rural lanes with no footways	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would be infill development in between existing dwellings in linear pattern	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would require loss of trees and hedging on site frontage	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to east and west, agricultural land to south and on opposite side of road. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees on highway boundary and on boundary with field to south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries and also in planting within 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)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are very limited due to trees and hedging	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not suitable due to remote location and visual impact from loss of trees on site	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?	Site is in private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site potentially suitable size for a settlement limit extension, although there is no current settlement limit in this location. Highways and access constraints have been identified. The site is also located within ALC Grade 2, which is very good quality agricultural land.

Site Visit Observations

Site is a gap in a linear pattern of development along the southern side of Station Road. There are currently a number of trees and hedging along the site frontage which would need to be removed if development were to be progressed.

Local Plan Designations

Outside and removed from any development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for inclusion in settlement limit. Whilst the site is situated in between a smaller group of dwellings along Station Road, it is separated from the main village and the surrounding local facilities, an issue exacerbated by the lack of local footways. The site is also heavily constrained by dense tree cover and hedging to all boundaries which would require removing to enable development of the site; this would have a negative landscape impact. Whilst the site doesn't currently appear to be in agricultural rotation, the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) for the site is Grade 2, which is very good quality agricultural land with minor limitations.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN0414SLREVA

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0414SLREVA
Site address	Land north of Beccles Road, Haddiscoe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1990/0617/O for 2 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 28/02/1991. 1989/1368/O for 1 dwelling refused 22/08/1989.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.34
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8
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 likely from Beccles Road, over a footpath. Would require removal of significant frontage hedge.</p> <p>NCC Highways: previous response on a larger site of which this site forms part as follows: A143 frontage would require visibility splays at access in accordance with DMRB, unlikely to be achievable with the available 90m despite there being a 2m footway. The Loke measures at 3.4m on NMB, it wouldn't be feasible for 2 vehicles to pass which would be a particular concern regarding egress from A143, width seems fairly typical over the length of the road. Widening north of the A143 junction doesn't appear feasible. Safe pedestrian access could be formed at A143.</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>Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.3km</p> <p>Bus service runs past site, bus stop to east with relatively frequent service to Gt Yarmouth, Bungay and Beccles.</p> <p>Limited local employment.</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>Opposite the village hall/playing field</p> <p>Distance to The Haddiscoe Tavern public house 330 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		<p>Sewer capacity and local wastewater treatment capacity are potentially constraints.</p> <p>Promoter states that utilities capacity should not be a constraint but no evidence provided.</p>	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that utilities are available due to proximity of adjacent properties.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1, no identified flood risk.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Contained within the landscape and does not encroach into the open countryside. Access onto the A143 would require removal of frontage hedge which would significantly alter the road frontage which is a strong feature in the landscape of the village.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Relatively well contained within settlement, between built-up parts of the village. It is separated from the proposed development on the opposite side of the road by the A143. Frontage linear development would reflect the surrounding area but it would visually consolidate the village particularly as this part of the site has a strong frontage hedgerow which is prominent in the streetscape.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. Proximity to Broads Area. Mature trees on frontage and hedgeline would provide habitat.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on heritage assets. Closest listed building is 180m. Previously: HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	A143 is a Corridor of Movement and Parts of local road network are heavily constrained. Await consult with Highway Authority.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential dwelling to east and west, undeveloped land to north, some caravan storage. Agricultural opposite.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on the historic environment. Some impact on the townscape as this area is undeveloped and is a gap between the two development boundary areas. Removing the mature frontage hedge would have had a detrimental impact on the townscape.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears achievable, would need to check with the Highway Authority as this is a busy road.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Undeveloped land along frontage, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Adjacent land uses, detached properties, are compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat no significant change in levels.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge to frontage with mature trees which make an important contribution to the village, should be retained.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	See above, some habitat but limited within the site.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination or infrastructure.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views both into and out of site apart from passing immediately adjacent on road or footpath. But residential development would be prominent here. Limited impact on wider landscape.	N/A

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)	There are no constraints evident on the site. It is relatively close to the centre of the village but developing this site would mean the loss of this break in development. In addition, the frontage is strong along this north side of the road and the hedge is a prominent feature in the village which is significant.	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – but owner has received enquiries.	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)	No, promoter has indicated the site is deliverable.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown, unlikely.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it will be provided if required.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Highway authority concerns raised over previously promoted site, which was a larger but contained the revised site now promoted, in respect of the ability to form a suitable access at this point. Any access would likely require the substantive removal of frontage hedgerow which is prominent local feature. Potential sewerage and waste water treatment constraints. A143 is an identified corridor of movement and new accesses onto this route would need to be carefully considered in respect of the satisfactory functioning of the local highway network.

Site Visit Observations

There are no constraints evident on the site. Site is relatively close to the centre of the village. Developing the site would mean the loss of a break in existing development. The frontage is strong along this north side of the road and the hedge is a prominent feature in the village which is significant. It is likely that this hedge would be lost if the site were developed.

Local Plan Designations

None

Availability

Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

Achievability

Sewerage and local waste water treatment are potential constraints. Highways authority have raised concerns about whether a suitable access to the site could be achieved. Local concerns about acceptability of hedge removal needed to achieve any access to the site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

The revised site is less than 0.5ha in size is promoted for 8 dwellings. This would mean that it falls below the plan's minimum allocation scale of 12 homes to best ensure the delivery of affordable housing. Therefore the site in isolation the site has been considered as a settlement limit extension.

Whilst relatively unconstrained and with adequate access to services and facilities, following previous highway advice there are concerns about the technical feasibility of achieving an access to the site. Achieving an access would also likely require the removal of a frontage hedge important to the character and appearance of the area. No further details appear to have been submitted to show how this constraint can be overcome. There are also concerns about a further access onto the A143, an identified corridor of movement, in addition to that needed for the adjacent preferred allocation.

Therefore on balance, the site is rejected as being unsuitable for development and is considered UNREASONABLE. If identified issues could be overcome then this decision could be revisited. However, rather than a settlement limit extension, if identified at this stage the site should be allocated in combination with preferred site to ensure maximum delivery of affordable housing and a coherent comprehensive development. However, an allocation of this scale in the Village Cluster plan would only typically be considered where it provided a specific local benefit of has a significant constraint to be overcome.

Preferred Site: No

Reasonable Alternative: No

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

SN0392

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0392
Site address	Land at the junction of the A146 and B1136, Haddiscoe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation – approximately 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified 20dph
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>Potential access constraints due to hedgerows on highway boundaries and proximity to junction of A143 and B1136</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</p> <p>Unlikely to achieve required visibility without removal of large proportion of frontage hedge. Would require 2m f/w at A143/B1136 junction and at full extent of A143 frontage. 1.2km walk along A143, including crossing the road to access school unlikely to be attractive to parents and may result in additional car journeys to school, causing additional concerns re manoeuvring vehicles at the A143.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.3km with footway, although would need to cross A143 Bus route passes site	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Haddiscoe village hall and recreation ground 300 metres Distance to The Haddiscoe Tavern public house 600 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewer capacity and local waste water treatment capacity are constraints	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter is unsure if mains water, sewerage and electricity are available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC: Grade 2/3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Would be detrimental to position of church as landmark within local landscape.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would not relate well to existing pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Proximity to a SSSI	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	In close proximity to Grade I listed St Marys Church and associated grade II listed monument and memorial NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constraints on junction of A146 and B1136 NCC HIGHWAYS - Red	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Place of worship, residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would result in loss of part of open setting of Grade I listed church which cannot be mitigated against	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways have advised that creation of an access is likely to require removal of large part of hedge	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties on opposite side of A143, church to west and agricultural land on opposite side of B1136 to north. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level but elevated from adjacent roads	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows along both road boundaries. Individual trees along western and southern boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site prominent in views along A143 and B1136	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site not acceptable given impact on setting of church and its position in the local landscape. Development of the site would also have poor relationship with other existing development and access would lead to loss of hedgerow	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?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Highways, heritage and landscape have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Agricultural land that forms an important part of the setting of the church. If the site were to be developed, then the church's position in the local landscape would be compromised. Hedgerow along highway boundaries which contribute to character of area and would be lost if site were to be developed.

Local Plan Designations

Site is adjacent to but outside of the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified .

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. The site is located immediately adjacent to the Grade I Listed St Marys Church which has associated Grade II monument and memorial. Development of the site in this location would cause harm to the setting of the church and its position in a relatively open landscape. Development of the site would have a poor relationship with the existing pattern of development in evidence. It is unlikely that the required access visibility splays can be achieved without removal of large sections of the frontage hedgerow.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 4 January 2021

SN0518 (2021)

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0518
Site address	Land at the post office and Beccles Road, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation – numbers not specified
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Possibility of creating suitable access is significantly constrained as Post Office Road is a narrow rural lane and access onto A143.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</p> <p>Access onto A143 would not be supported. Access onto Post Office Road would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway and removal of existing hedge. Would increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable. No continuous footway to catchment school.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.4km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road Distance to bus service 100 metres	
<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 		No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 70 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber		Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	HELAA – small areas within and around the perimeter of the site are at moderate risk of surface water flooding	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would result in erosion of rural character to east of settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement to west	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Within SSSI impact zone	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space NCC HES - Amber	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained with Post Office Road comprising of a narrow lane with no pedestrian facilities. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development to east of existing settlement could have acceptable relationship in townscape terms, but would erode rural character of Post Office Road	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that access could only be from Post Office Road and this would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site front frontage footway and removal of existing hedge.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to west, agricultural land to north, east (beyond belt to trees) and south. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site largely level but falling towards southern boundary	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Belt of trees on eastern boundary, hedgerow along northern boundary with Post Office Road, trees and hedging along boundary with A143. Southern boundary is relatively open	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site from Post Office Road and A143 at field accesses.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not acceptable due to access issues and intrusion into open landscape along Post Office Road	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?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Road widening and footway provision would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Larger site could provide local community village hall, open space and provision of local employment use	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is too large for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings but could be reduced to a more appropriate size. Highway and landscape constraints identified.

Site Visit Observations

Large field along eastern side of village. Bounds A143 to south-west and narrow Post Office Lane to the north, which has a rural character through open countryside which development of this site would harm.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The wider site is significantly too large in the context of this Plan document and no smaller parcels of the site are considered to be suitable for development due to the issues relating to access into the site. Access directly onto the A143 is considered to be unacceptable in highways terms and access onto Post Office Road to the north would require substantial road upgrades and the significant removal of an existing hedgerow. Highway safety concerns include increased slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road/ A143 junction where visibility is restricted. Although parts of the site are within close proximity to some local services and facilities, actual accessibility to these is much more limited due to the constraints of the local highway network.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

SN0518 (2022)

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0518
Site address	Land at Post Office Road and Beccles Road, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5.2
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for between 12 and 50 dwellings, with community/employment uses
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 Highway Authority has advised that an access onto A143 would not be supported. The possibility of creating a suitable access is significantly constrained as Post Office Road is a narrow rural lane which accesses onto A143. Would increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable by the Highway Authority. This still applies with a smaller number of dwellings and the suggestion of employment/ community land.</p> <p>Access onto Post Office Road would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway and removal of existing hedge.</p> <p>No continuous footway to catchment school.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to bus service 100 metres</p> <p>Distance to Glebelands Primary School 1.4km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road. No footpath on Post Office Road.</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>No village or community hall within 1.8km</p> <p>Distance to White Lion public house 70 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		No known constraints	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Small areas around the perimeter of the site and a small area in the south-east are at low risk of surface water flooding, could be mitigated.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The development would result in erosion of rural character to east of settlement and would extend into the wider countryside particularly in views from Post Office Road approaching from the east and from the south on the A143. Previously rated as Amber on the previous site assessment, on reflection the impact is unlikely to be able to be substantially mitigated.	Red
Townscape	Amber	There is an adjacent small linear area of development along the A143 but the site does not relate particularly well to the majority of the small, compact village to the west across the A143. Previously rated as Green on the previous site assessment, on reflection the impact is considered greater than previously assessed.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Limited habitat on site as agricultural field.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>A143 is a Corridor of Movement. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable by the Highway Authority, constrained by Post Office Road comprising of a narrow lane with no pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>Previously rated as Amber on the initial site assessment, on reflection the impact is considered greater than previously assessed on the basis of likely increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development to east of existing settlement could have acceptable relationship in townscape terms but would erode rural character of Post Office Road.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that access could only be from Post Office Road and this would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site front frontage footway and removal of existing hedge.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to west, agricultural land to north, east (beyond belt to trees) and south. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site largely level but falling towards southern boundary.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Belt of trees on eastern boundary, hedgerow along northern boundary with Post Office Road, trees and hedging along boundary with A143. Southern boundary is relatively open.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site from Post Office Road and A143 at field accesses.	N/A

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)	<p>Not acceptable due to access issues and intrusion into open landscape along Post Office Road.</p> <p>Toft Monks is small and access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.</p>	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	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)	No. No details relating to suggestion of community/employment uses and whether these are required or deliverable.	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Road widening and footway provision would be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has indicated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Site could provide local community village hall, open space and provision of local employment use.	N/A

Part 7 – Conclusion

Suitability

Highway Authority advice states that an access onto A143 would not be supported. The possibility of creating a suitable access is significantly constrained as Post Office Road is a narrow rural lane which accesses onto A143. Increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted is a concern. Local road network is also considered to be unsuitable by the Highway Authority.

Concerns that the development would result in erosion of rural character to east of settlement and would extend into the wider countryside particularly in views from Post Office Road approaching from the east and from the south on the A143. Also that, whilst site is adjacent to a small linear area of development along the A143, the site does not relate well to the majority of the small, compact village to the west across the A143.

Whilst there are an acceptable range of services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site, consistent with the assessment criteria, the quality of access to these facilities is diminished by the absence of localised footpath links and the route to the school being along the busy A146.

Site Visit Observations

Access could only be from Post Office Road and this would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site front frontage footway and removal of existing hedge. Development to east of existing settlement could have acceptable relationship in townscape terms but would erode rural character of Post Office Road. Toft Monks is small and access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.

Local Plan Designations

None

Availability

Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

Achievability

Access via A143 not considered suitable by highway authority. Access onto Post Office Road would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway and removal of existing hedge. Unclear that this could be achieved within land ownership. Suggestion that site could provide community/employment uses but no detail provided.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

Despite revisions to promotion that suggests a smaller number of dwellings and employment/community land. Concerns related to the access remain however even at lower number. In particular that Post Office Road is a narrow rural lane which accesses onto A143 and as to whether an increase in slowing, stopping and turning movements at Post Office Road / A143 junction where visibility is restricted would be appropriate.

There are also concerns that the development would erode the rural character to east of settlement and extend into the wider countryside, particularly in views from Post Office Road approaching from the east and from the south on the A143. Also that, whilst site is adjacent to a small linear area of development along the A143, the site does not relate well to the majority of the small, compact village to the west across the A143. There are a limited but acceptable range of local services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site. However, the quality of access is diminished by the absence of footpaths along the whole route and by the nature of the route to primary school which goes along the busy A146. On balance the site is not considered suitable for development and is therefore an **UNREASONABLE** alternative for allocation.

Preferred Site: No

Reasonable Alternative: No

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 May 2022

SN1031

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1031
Site address	Land to the south / east of Bulls Green Lane, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation – 8 dwellings, could be extended to 12 or more dwellings for allocation under the village cluster criteria
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Possibility of creating an access is constrained due to planting on boundary and nature of road</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber Access would require road widening to 5.5m, 2m site frontage footway and removal of hedging. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of footway provision. No continuous footway to catchment school. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p> <p>NCC Highways (meeting Jan 2021)- Bulls Green Lane is narrow, single carriageway, no footways, with limited visibility. Substandard highway network generally, including the junction with the A143. Would not be acceptable as an allocation.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.8km Distance to bus service 400 metres	
<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 		No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 400 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to waste water capacity may be required to serve growth in this location	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage AW advise sewers crossing this site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	Small areas of site are at risk of surface water flooding but these are outside the area indicatively shown to be developed	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER New planting to the south-east and south-west; concerns about the eastern boundary and this would require further arboricultural investigations	Green
Townscape	Amber	Site adjoins existing development and would not be out of character	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber SNC HERITAGE OFFICER- No objection in principle, subject to design/layout to avoid crammed on plot parking.	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is highly constrained consisting of narrow lane with no footway</p> <p>NCC HUGHWAYS – Red</p> <p>The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would be relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development. No harm to the historic environment	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that access would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site frontage footway and removal of hedgerow.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and on opposite side of Bulls Green Lane to west. Agricultural land to south and south-east with belt of trees in between. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on highway boundary. Belt of trees with agricultural land to south and south-east. Belt of protected trees on boundary with residential properties to north.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on site boundaries. Some potential for habitat within site given trees and bushes	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are very limited due to vegetation on boundaries	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 this site is dependent on an arboricultural assessment of the trees and vegetation on the highway boundary and within the site that would need to be removed to allow development. If they are not considered to be of significant value if replacement planting can be achieved, and subject to delivery of the required highway improvements, then development of this site could be acceptable in terms of form and character	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?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is much larger than the scale of development currently being sought, however a small part of the site could be allocated for 12 to 25 dwellings. Development of the site would be subject to achieving a satisfactory access; highway constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is a visually well contained site due to tree belts on all boundaries. There is also vegetation within the site. In terms of the pattern of development in the settlement, development of the site could relate well and would not be intrusive into the open countryside beyond the existing extent of development.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** due to identified highway and access constraints. Access to the site would require road widening of Bull Green Lane and the removal of hedgerows. Bulls Green Lane is of narrow, single carriageway width with no footways and limited visibility and it has been concluded that there is no realistic possibility of creating an appropriate access into the site. Additionally, the surrounding highways network is considered to be substandard, including the junction with the A143. Landscape constraints have also been identified; whilst there is relatively new planting to the south-east and south-west, along the eastern boundary is a protected tree belt which would require further arboricultural investigation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

SN2005SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2005SL
Site address	Land off Bulls Green Lane, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.24 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	SL
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Possibility of creating an access is constrained due to planting on boundary and nature of road</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red</p> <p>Access visibility is likely to be restricted by adjacent land. Local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of footway provision. No continuous footway to catchment school. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School 1.8km Distance to bus service 400 metres	
<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 		No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 400 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to waste water capacity may be required to serve growth in this location	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage AW advise sewers crossing this site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	Small areas of site are at risk of surface water flooding but these are outside the area indicatively shown to be developed	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Amber	Site adjoins existing development and would not be out of character	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green Adjacent to SN1031. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber SNC HERITAGE OFFICER- No objection in principle	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is highly constrained consisting of narrow lane with no footway</p> <p>NCC HUGHWAYS – Red</p> <p>Local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of footway provision. No continuous footway to catchment school. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would be relatively well contained within the existing pattern of development. No harm to the historic environment	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that access would require road widening to 5.5 metres, two metre site frontage footway and removal of hedgerow.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and on opposite side of Bulls Green Lane to west. Agricultural land to south and south-east with belt of trees in between. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on highway boundary. Belt of trees with agricultural land to south and south-east. Belt of protected trees on boundary with residential properties to north.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on site boundaries. Some potential for habitat within site given trees and bushes	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are very limited due to vegetation on boundaries	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 this site is dependent on an arboricultural assessment of the trees and vegetation on the highway boundary and within the site that would need to be removed to allow development. If they are not considered to be of significant value if replacement planting can be achieved, and subject to delivery of the required highway improvements, then development of this site could be acceptable in terms of form and character.	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?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for a SL Extension. Development of the site would be subject to achieving a satisfactory access; highway constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is a visually well contained site due to tree belts on all boundaries. There is also vegetation within the site. In terms of the pattern of development in the settlement, development of the site could relate well and would not be intrusive into the open countryside beyond the existing extent of development.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** option for a Settlement Limit extension due to identified highway and access constraints. Access would require road widening of Bull Green Lane and removal of hedgerows. Bulls Green Lane is narrow, single carriageway width with no footways and with limited visibility. It has been concluded that there is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. In addition to this, the surrounding highway network is substandard.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

SN4003

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4003
Site address	Land to the east of Common Road, Aldeby
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.68 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options are constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Substandard highway network, unable to provide safe access. Narrow carriageway, no footway, no safe walking route to 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 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Distance to bus service 600 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall and recreation ground 1.2km Distance to White Lion public house 700 metres	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on highway and along northern boundary	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Site is relatively well contained within pattern of settlement	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and BNG	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained consisting of narrow lanes with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is relatively well contained within existing pattern of settlement, but estate development would still be out of character with the surrounding development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access is from Common Road which is narrow with no footway	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north, south and west. Agricultural land along eastern boundary. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedging along highway boundary. Some trees and hedging on other boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging along boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views across site from access onto highway	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not likely to be suitable due to distance from services, particularly schools, and the narrow rural road network	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated, subject to achieving a satisfactory access. Highways and surface flood risk has been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is located down narrow lanes in a location far from many services, including the nearest primary school. Relatively well contained visually, albeit not in a location that estate development would be in character.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Whilst parts of the site are in close proximity to some local services and facilities, actual accessibility is much more limited due to the constraints of the local highway network. Areas of the site are also affected by surface water flood risk, including on the highway and to the northern boundary. Development would not respect the linear pattern of existing development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN4010

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4010
Site address	Land to the south of Beccles Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Developable area of site is outside the development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history for main part of site but permission for four dwellings where access is located (2019/1109)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options are constrained due to limited highway frontage NCC HIGHWAYS – Red No acceptable access, no feasible safe walking route to school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities Part 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Bus service runs past site	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 500 metres Distance to White Lion public house 250 metres	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained within landscape. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would constitute backland development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Former school to north could be considered a non-designated heritage asset NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained due to rural roads with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Commercial use to west	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would be to the rear of a linear pattern of development, therefore out of character with the townscape	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access route passes through land that has the benefit of planning permission for four dwellings. Whilst one of these dwellings has almost been completed the other three are yet to commence and therefore access remains possible at this stage. If the other three are to be developed shortly then they would prohibit access to the site	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential uses to north and east. Commercial site to west consisting of a coach depot which may raise some amenity issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees on western boundary, southern boundary appears relatively open	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees on 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 evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views into site are limited as it is largely to the rear of existing development. This will be even more the case when the dwellings along the Beccles Road frontage are constructed.	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of site would constitute backland development out of character with linear pattern of development, as well as being remote from services in particular the nearest primary school	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?	Site is in private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Backland site behind linear pattern of development, including recently permitted development. Site is remote from most services, including the nearest primary school.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Development of this site would result in backland development, out of character with the existing linear settlement pattern and requiring a convoluted access arrangement which could result in amenity issues for existing residents. Highways concerns about the suitability of the local road network and the lack of footpath provision have also been raised.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN4016

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4016
Site address	Land to the east of Mill Road, Burgh St Peter
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.99 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocation – minimum 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access options are constrained due to nature of roads NCC HIGHWAYS – Green Network - narrow roads. No feasible safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Distance to Toft Monks Primary School over 5km Distance to bus service 250 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 500 metres Distance to White Lion public house 600 metres	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified floor risk on highway and eastern boundary	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would result in erosion of rural character to south of settlement. Potential loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Creation of estate development would be out of character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY- Green SSSI IRZ. Close to Priority Habitat - Deciduous woodland. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Possible non- designated heritage asset adjacent to site NCC HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained as narrow lanes with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS - Red	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Allocation of site is likely to require a small estate development that would be out of character with linear character of development to north.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Vehicular access should be achievable from Mill Road. Pedestrian access is poor.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and south. Agricultural land to east and west on opposite side of Mill Road. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on most boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries, plus in vegetation within 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)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Some views into site from Mill 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 site is likely to adversely affect rural character by intruding development south into the open landscape and introducing estate development. Also remote from many services, including primary school.	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?	Site is in private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Highways and landscape constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is to the south of a linear pattern of development. It is currently open countryside to that contributes to the rural character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The site is located off Mill Road which is both narrow and restricted. The site is also at the limits of accessibility to services in terms of an acceptable distance, and this is exacerbated by the lack of footways. Development of the site would need to respect the linear pattern of existing development in evidence in order to avoid an urbanising effect in this location. This would restrict development of the site to frontage development only.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 5 January 2021

SN5011SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5011SL
Site address	Land west of The Bungalow, Lily Lane, Aldeby
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2018/2036/CU for equestrian use, approved 20/11/2018.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.23
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1-2 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing field gate access, would need to be improved would require removal of frontage hedge. NCC Highways – Amber. Access would require carriageway widening at frontage and hedge removal. Network highly constrained with no footway to local facilities / school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Distance to Glebelands Primary School over 5km Distance to bus service 580 metres, No.86 to Norwich infrequent service. Distance to Aldby Business Park circa. 300m.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Distance to Burgh St Peter village hall 1.1km Distance to White Lion public house 680 metres	Amber
Utilities Capacity		No known utilities constraints. Environment Agency: Green	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are all available. No gas and foul drainage is not present in this part of the village, most properties have their own individual treatment facilities.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues. NCC Minerals & Waste: site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1 Small area of surface water flood risk on north-east boundary and along the road.</p> <p>LLFA: Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>The site is within proximity of 1 known record on internal flooding on Duncow Road. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	<p>C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 (Grade 1 to north)</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>The site is part of the rural landscape where the lane opens out and is visually separate to the closet dwelling. It would have a significant impact.</p> <p>Broads Authority: Small site. On upland 'peninsula' with river valleys to north and south but BA boundary 700m to south, and 1400m to north so visibility unlikely.</p>	Red
Townscape	Amber	This site is part of the countryside and is not well related to the rest of the village. A wooded area separates it from the settlement boundary.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No protected sites in close proximity. Limited potential – currently a paddock.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ- Natural England need to be consulted for residential development of 50 units or more, or any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas, or where discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream. Amber zone for great crested newts (ponds within 250m), not in GI corridor and no priority habitat onsite.</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets evident in close proximity.</p> <p>HES: Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is constrained consisting of narrow lanes with no footways.</p> <p>NCC Highways: Red. Access would require carriageway widening at frontage and hedge removal. Network highly constrained with no footway to local facilities / school.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/paddock and dwelling each side, although not immediately adjacent.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	None.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is an existing gate to the paddock, but visibility splays would be required which would result in loss of a rural hedge and would change the nature of this rural road. Lily Lane is a very narrow single-track road with no formal passing places.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural/paddock	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	North and south – agricultural. Trees, dwelling to east and dispersed dwelling to west.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Strong native hedge to north along road, mature trees to east, open to south and west.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedge and trees provide habitat, off site pond to south-east and large pond to south-west.	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)	Electricity and telephone.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views in and out from north, road side. Wider views to south.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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)	The site is separate from the main part of the village, both visually and physically due to the wooded area adjacent. Also because of the narrow rural road. Development here would have a negative impact on the landscape. The site does not have access to a limited range of local services and facilities, but access is much more limited due to the constraints of the local highway network.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Highways advice identified that the local network is highly constrained and direct access would require carriageway widening at frontage with hedge removal. Highways advice also raised concerns about lack of footway access to local facilities and school.

Local Flood Authority advice identifies that the site is within proximity of 1 known record on internal flooding on Duncow Road but no overall concern raised on flooding. Ecology advice indicates that discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream. Amber zone for great crested newts (ponds within 250m).

The site is part of the rural landscape where the lane opens out and is visually separate to the closet dwelling and is not well related to the rest of the village. Its development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

Site Visit Observations

The site is separate from the main part of the village, both visually and physically due to the wooded area adjacent. Also because of the narrow rural road. Development here would have a negative impact on the landscape and creation of an access would require the removal of a rural hedge to achieve visibility splays. There suitability of the site is limited due to the constraints of the local highway network.

Local Plan Designations

None

Availability

Privately owned and available immediately.

Achievability

At the least would require road widening to create a suitable access. Unclear whether this could be achieved within land ownership and unlikely to be achievable without unacceptable impacts on local landscape.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

This is a small site of sufficient scale to only be considered as a settlement limit extension. The site however not a natural extension of the settlement boundary as it forms part of the rural landscape where Lily lane opens out and is visually separate to the closet dwelling by virtue of adjacent wooded area. The site is on the periphery of and therefore not well related to the rest of the village. As such its development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

There are also concerns about the ability to form a suitable access to the site without removal of a rural hedgerow that is characteristic of the area. The wider road network is not considered suitable to accommodate further development and access to the local services is significantly diminished by narrow rural form of that network. The site is not considered to be a suitable settlement limit extension and is therefore rejected and categorised as **UNREASONABLE**.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

SN5035

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5035
Site address	Land north of Mardle Road, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	6.1
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	52 dwellings With village green to the south and playing pitches to the north
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>An access onto A143 is unlikely to be supported. The possibility of creating a suitable access onto Pound Lane or Burnthouse Lane is significantly constrained as these are very narrow rural lanes. An adequate access onto Mardle Road would mean the loss of a green area of mature hedge and trees. An access would require road widening and a site frontage footway.</p> <p>No footway on these three roads linking to A143 and catchment school.</p> <p>In addition, such a large increase in vehicles would increase slowing, stopping and turning movements at both the Mardle Road and Pound Lane/A143 junctions onto the Corridor of Movement.</p> <p>NCC Highways: Amber. No direct access to A143, would require access via Pound Lane including right turn lane and pedestrian crossing refuge at A143, Pound Lane would require widening and footway for its entire frontage, likely to result in tree / hedge removals.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to bus service 170 metres</p> <p>Distance to Glebelands Primary School 1.3km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road. No footpath on Pound Lane.</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 230 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity		No known capacity constraints Environment Agency: Green	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates these are available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Agricultural land with no buildings, unlikely to be contaminated. No issues evident. Minerals & Waste: Safeguarding area (sand and gravel). Site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 with some small areas at risk of surface water flooding around the perimeters, along the central east-west field boundary and to the south around the pond. Mitigation possible.</p> <p>LLFA: Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>On-site flood risk is mostly concentrated to the site boundary, with some areas of localised ponding.</p> <p>The site is in proximity of one known record of anecdotal/external flooding on St Benedicts Close. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	<p>C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development on this scale would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape in this location. This site naturally divides into distinct areas; the northern open field along Pound Lane and the southern area fronting Burnthouse Lane/Mardle Road. Of these the northern field would extend the built-up area into the wider countryside with a severe impact on public views approaching the village from the north. The area fronting Burnthouse Lane is more contained with a lesser impact.	Red
Townscape	Amber	Residential development on this scale would be completely out of character with the small village and sporadic outlying dwellings and farms. Only a much smaller area could be designed to reflect the existing pattern of development – either linear or as a small cul-de-sac – and would need to be close to the existing village pond where development is concentrated.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. Large site with a variety of habitats. Various mature trees and woodland also hedges and a pond. Would require further investigation.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with NE. Residential dwellings not identified as requiring NE consultation. Amber zone for great crested newts. Not on GI corridor and no PROW onsite.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Listed church to west, listed hall to east. No direct impact on heritage assets but parts of the proposal would have a significant impact on the wider setting of the listed church.</p> <p>Archaeology would require further investigation due to finds on west side of Burnthouse Lane.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss – proposed public open space would mean a net increase.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The surrounding highways network is considered to be substandard, including the junction with the A143.</p> <p>NCC Highways – No direct access to A143, would require access via Pound Lane including right turn lane and pedestrian crossing refuge at A143, Pound Lane would require widening and footway for its entire frontage, likely to result in tree / hedge removals.</p> <p>Due to no specific scoring provided by NCC Highways site is scored Amber but there are significant local concerns.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential, large agricultural storage building to north. Woodland and a pond.	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No immediate impact on heritage assets although some parts would be in views from the listed church and would impact on its wider setting.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears difficult to achieve and would need to focus on a smaller site area which requires the Highway Authority to assess suitability. The roads are very rural in nature, to the north and west they are single track with few passing places and the junctions are difficult to navigate. Turning onto the A143 can be difficult because of road speeds.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential. Large agricultural storage building to north – use would need consideration if residential proposed adjacent. Woodland and a pond.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Various, largely field boundaries with hedges and trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Woodland and a pond present.	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)	Secondary Distribution Cable over 230/400V and up to 11KV crossing the site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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	Southern part of site is more contained with woodland backdrop, views out limited although can see the church from various vantage points. Views in and out of northern area are wider as the landscape is more open and flatter.	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)	Residential development of the whole area, or on the scale proposed would be out of character with the village and have an impact on the landscape. Concerns about the suitability of the surrounding roads and the impact on the A143. Access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private – two owners.	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)	Supporting details relating to services. No details relating to the deliverability of proposed open space etc.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, road widening and footpath.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Village green/open space and playing pitches.	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The Highway Authority have not specifically scored the site in respect of the suitability of the surrounding highway network to accommodate further development. However, a number of issues are raised including the need for road widening, a right turn lane and pedestrian refuge at the A146.

Whilst there are an acceptable range of services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site, consistent with the assessment criteria, the quality of access to these facilities is diminished by the absence of localised footpath links and the route to the school being along the busy A146.

Significant concerns about the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area both in respect of the relationship of the site to the existing built form of Toft Monks and more widely on the landscape due to the distance between the site and the built-up area of the village.

From a biodiversity perspective, Ecology advice has indicated that any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with NE. Noted that site was within an Amber zone for great crested newts.

Site Visit Observations

Residential development of the whole area, or on the scale proposed would be out of character with the village and have an impact on the landscape. Concerns about the suitability of the surrounding roads and the impact on the A143. There is limited access to services by foot and the majority of journeys would be by car.

Local Plan Designations

None

Availability

Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

Achievability

A number of Highway alterations are identified as being necessary across the local network to address concerns about its suitability. It is unclear that these could be viably achieved or without unacceptable levels of harm to the character of the area or more widely within available landownerships.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

Concerns about the suitability of the local network to accommodate the development proposed. There are concerns about the potential to create a suitable access onto smaller adjacent road, or in certain on Mardle without loss of tree and hedgerow important to the character of the area. Residential development on the scale proposed in this location would have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area in terms of landscape and its relationship to the existing village. SN5037, which is closer to the village, has been promoted as a smaller element of this site and has been assessed separately. There are a limited but acceptable range of local services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site. However, the quality of access is diminished by the absence of footpaths along the whole route and by the nature of the route to primary school which goes along the busy A146. On balance the site is not considered suitable for development and is therefore an UNREASONABLE alternative for allocation.

Preferred Site: No

Reasonable Alternative: No

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

SN5036

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5036
Site address	Land west of Burnthouse Lane, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.18
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Not specified 29 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 possibility of creating a suitable access onto Burnthouse Lane is significantly constrained as this is a narrow rural lane. An access would require road widening and possibly a site frontage footway.</p> <p>No footway on the three roads linking to A143 and catchment school.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green. Network not of suitable standard, no footway to school / local facilities.</p> <p>Whilst NCC highways have not raised a direct concern over direct access being formed to the site potential for localised road widening means that the Council has rated this Amber.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to bus service 350 metres Distance to Glebelands Primary School 1.4km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road. No footpath on Burnthouse Lane/Pound Lane/Mardle Road.	N/A
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 280 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity		No known utilities constraints Environment Agency: Green	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates these are available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Agricultural land with no buildings, unlikely to be contaminated. No issues evident.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1 with a very small area along the northern boundary at medium risk of surface water flooding. This could be mitigated.</p> <p>LLFA: Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>On-site flood risk is very minor on the northern site boundary.</p> <p>The site is on proximity of one known record of anecdotal/external flooding on St Benedicts Close. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	<p>C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site fronts Burnthouse Lane between some limited development however it is very rural in character and does encroach into the wider landscape towards the church.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Residential development of the whole site would be out of character with the small village and sporadic outlying dwellings and farms. A smaller frontage area could reflect the existing linear pattern of development in the village.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. There is limited habitat with some nearby mature trees, woodland and a pond. Would require further investigation.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ - Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with Natural England. Amber zone for great crested newts - ponds within 250m radius. not on GI corridor and no priority habitat onsite (MAGIC). PROW Toft Monks FP10 passes through site.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Some impact on setting of heritage assets as it would be in views of the listed church. Well used footpath link to the church crosses the site. Site of Archaeological Interest to the west – would also require investigation.</p> <p>HES – Amber. Partially within area of earthworks. Will require investigation to determine if would be affected of if either ‘preservation by record’ or a change to the development layout enabling ‘preservation in situ’ would be most appropriate.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The surrounding highways network is considered to be substandard, including the junction with the A143.</p> <p>FP10 crosses the site diagonally.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Network not of suitable standard, no footway to school / local facilities.</p>	Red

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

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No immediate impact on heritage assets although it would be in views from and to the listed church which would need to be assessed.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Has a road frontage and access may be possible if visibility is achievable. However, the surrounding roads are narrow with few passing places and poor visibility.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries not delineated, open to west and east. Some trees to north and south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some trees. Land is cropped as part of the wider field.	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)	Secondary Distribution Cable over 230/400V and up to 11KV to south of the site.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is not contained as it is part of a larger field. Site is open in views across the landscape, it would be in views from and to the listed church.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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)	<p>Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village but linear development would reflect the village. Would need to assess the visual impact on the setting of the church, the suitability of the surrounding roads and the impact on the A143.</p> <p>Access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.</p> <p>A footpath crosses the site diagonally which would reduce the developable area significantly.</p>	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
None		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	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)	Supporting details relating to services.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, road widening and footpath.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

NCC highways have set out their view that the local network not of suitable standard and raised concerns about the lack of a continuous footway to school / local facilities. Officer concerns about ability to create a suitable direct access given nature of local highway.

Site is in a location that is very rural in character development would encroach into the wider landscape towards the church. Residential development of the whole site would be out of character with the small village and sporadic outlying dwellings and farms.

Ecology advice has identified that any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with Natural England. Site is in an Amber zone for great crested newts - ponds within 250m radius. PROW Toft Monks FP10 passes through site.

Historic Environment Service advice identifies that site is partially within area of earthworks. This will require investigation to determine if site is affected, and if so whether either 'preservation by record' or a change to the development layout enabling 'preservation in situ' would be most appropriate.

Site Visit Observations

Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village but linear development would more closely reflect the village. Would need to assess the visual impact on the setting of the church given the open, unbounded nature of the field. Narrow rural roads would need to consider suitability and also the impact on the A143. A footpath crosses the site diagonally which would reduce the developable area significantly.

Local Plan Designations

None

Availability

Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

Achievability

Road widening is likely to be necessary across the local network to address concerns about its suitability and it is unclear that these could be viably achieved and without unacceptable levels of harm to the character of the area or more widely within available landownerships.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

Significant concerns about the suitability of the local network to accommodate the development proposed and there are concerns about the potential to create a suitable access given the nature of the local roads. The field is unbounded and has views across to the local church which raises both heritage and landscape impact concerns. Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village. A smaller linear development to the village could help to address this but this may not be of a scale suitable for allocation as is unlikely to address other concerns. The footpath that crosses the site is likely to reduce the developable area and may result in an awkward layout if the site were developed.

There are a limited but acceptable range of local services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site. However, the quality of access is diminished by the absence of footpaths along the whole route and by the nature of the route to primary school which goes along the busy A146. On balance the site is not considered suitable for development and is therefore an UNREASONABLE alternative for allocation.

Preferred Site: No

Reasonable Alternative: No

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/04/2022

SN5037

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5037
Site address	Land at Mardle Road and Burnthouse Lane, Toft Monks
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1987/2103/O for 4 dwellings refused 09/09/1987. 1981/1365/O for 3 dwellings refused 13/05/1981. 1977/3241/O for 26 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 27/02/79. 1974/0971/D for 26 dwellings approved but not built.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.7
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 30 dwellings and a village green/open space
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The possibility of creating a suitable access onto Burnthouse Lane is significantly constrained as this is a narrow rural lane. An adequate access onto Mardle Road would mean the loss of a green area of mature hedge and trees. Either access would require road widening and a site frontage footway.</p> <p>No footway on roads linking to A143 and catchment school.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Highway have scored the site "Green" for access, indicating that they believe that access by all means is possible. However, they have also set out that the surrounding network is not of suitable standard, no footway to school / local facilities.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to bus service 150 metres Distance to Glebelands Primary School 1.4km with footway along A143 but intimidating route given nature of road. No footpath on Burnthouse Lane/Mardle Road.	N/A
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	No village or community hall within 1.8km Distance to White Lion public house 80 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known utilities constraints. Environment Agency: Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates these are available but this would need to be confirmed.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Agricultural land with no buildings, unlikely to be contaminated. No issues evident.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 with some small areas at risk of surface water flooding around the perimeters, along the central east-west field boundary and to the south around the pond. Mitigation possible.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>On-site flood risk is mostly concentrated to the site boundary and a pond feature near the south site boundary.</p> <p>The site is on proximity of one known record of anecdotal/external flooding on St Benedicts Close. We advise this is considered in the site assessment.</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	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	<p>C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The area fronting Burnthouse Lane is relatively well contained with woodland to the south and east. It is very rural in character, but it does not encroach into the wider landscape.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Residential development on this scale would be out of character with the small village and sporadic outlying dwellings and farms. A smaller area could be designed to reflect the existing pattern of development – either linear or as a small cul-de-sac – and would need to be close to the existing village pond where development is concentrated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. There is a variety of habitats; mature trees and woodland also hedges and a pond. Would require further investigation.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ- Residential development of 50 units or more/Any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas/Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream will require Natural England consultation. Amber risk zone for great crested newts - ponds within 250m and no priority habitat onsite. Not in GI corridor.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No visual impact on heritage assets. Would be seen to a limited extent in views from the listed church. Archaeology would require further investigation due to finds on west side of the road.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss – proposed public open space would mean a net increase.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The surrounding highways network is considered to be substandard, including the junction with the A143.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Network not of suitable standard, no footway to school / local facilities.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential. Woodland and a pond.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No immediate impact on heritage assets although the frontage along Burnthouse Lane would be in views from the listed church.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Has two road frontages, Mardle Lane would likely result in the loss of hedging and trees, Burnthouse Lane may be possible if visibility is achievable. Roads are narrow with few passing places.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential. Woodland and a pond.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Various, largely field boundaries with hedges and trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Woodland and a pond present.	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)	Secondary Distribution Cable over 230/400V and up to 11KV crossing the site.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is relatively contained with woodland backdrop, views out limited although can see the church.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2019)	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)	Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village but the site could be reduced to a smaller part closest to the village. Concerns about the suitability of the surrounding roads and the impact on the A143. Access to local services by foot is limited due to nature of network with impacts in terms of the number of journeys made by car.	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The Highway Authority have raised specific concerns about the suitability of the surrounding highway network to accommodate further development. Whilst there are an acceptable range of services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site, consistent with the assessment criteria, the quality of access to these facilities is diminished by the absence of localised footpath links and the route to the school being along the busy A146.

In respect of biodiversity technical consultees have noted that any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream will require Natural England consultation. Also the site is in an amber risk zone for great crested newts.

Site Visit Observations

There are concerns about whether a suitable access could be created to the site without significant detrimental impacts on local character as a result of the removal of trees and other vegetation.

In respect of the form and character of the settlement any development would need to be of a more limited in scale than is proposed and located in close proximity to the existing built-up area of the village. It is questionable whether a development of sufficient scale to be allocatable could be accommodated on this site within its form and character constraints.

Local Plan Designations

None.

Availability

Site is in private ownership and is available immediately.

Achievability

Road widening is likely to be necessary across the local network to address concerns about its suitability and it is unclear that these could be achieved locally without unacceptable levels of harm to the character of the area or more widely within available landownerships.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

Significant concerns about the suitability of the local network to accommodate the development proposed. Residential development on the scale proposed would be out of scale with the village. A smaller development to the village could address this but this may not be of a scale suitable for allocation. There are concerns about the potential to create a suitable access that without significant loss of trees and hedgerows important to the character of the area. There are a limited but acceptable range of local services and facilities within an appropriate distance of the site. However, the quality of access is diminished by the absence of footpaths along the whole route and by the nature of the route to primary school which goes along the busy A146. On balance the site is not considered suitable for development and is therefore an UNREASONABLE alternative for allocation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 28 April 2022