



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Wicklewood

Contents

SN0232REV.....	3
SN0249	11
SN0535	19
SN0577REVB	27
SN1036	35
SN2179	43
SN2179REVA	51
SN4001	59
SN4064	68
SN5018	77

SN0232REV

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0232REV
Site address	Land to the south of Low Street, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development on western part of site
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 12-30 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 30 dwellings at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access onto constrained lane NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Wicklewood Primary School 1.4km, partly with footways Distance to bus service 930 metres Local employment 620 metres away	

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 Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 830 metres Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 960 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and sewerage infrastructure, including the water recycling centre, may need to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available 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
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flow path through western edge of site and across road LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Potential impact on views of landmark windmill. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detached from existing development on southern side of Low Street	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat (buffer suggested)	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed property on northern side of Low Street, also potential impact on setting of listed mill to south-west. Area of Archaeological Importance noted. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Low Street is highly constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision.	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?	Detached from existing development on southern side of Low Road to west but intervening land is within development boundary so may come forward. Also would impact on setting of cottages which can be considered non-designated heritage assets as well as some potential harm to setting of listed building	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is potentially achievable but likely to require removal of at least part of hedgerow on highway boundary. However, Low Road is very constrained likely to raise highway concerns	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural use with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties on northern side of Low Street, agricultural land to south and east	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Wider field rises to the south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging along large part of highway boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited habitat potential other than hedgerow along frontage	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	Open views across site from Low Street	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not recommended for allocation as relatively poor relationship with existing pattern of development, poor access given constrained nature of Low Street and impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Area of Archaeological Importance		
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)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation. It is within close proximity to the existing development boundary however the land immediately adjacent to the site remain undeveloped at this time and development in this location would therefore be detached from the existing linear pattern of development. Significant highways concerns have been identified that adversely impact on the suitability of this site. It has also been noted that development of this site would have a potential impact on both designated and non-designated heritage assets in close proximity of the site.

Site Visit Observations

Undeveloped side of a narrow and constrained lane. Cottages on opposite side of lane could be considered to be non-designated heritage assets, with listed building also close to site on opposite side of lane.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

This site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation. Significant highways concerns have been identified and it is not considered that it would be possible to overcome these issues. Development of this site would also have an impact on the form and character of this part of the settlement and would also have an impact on the setting of both designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11 November 2020

SN0249

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0249
Site address	Land adjacent to former workhouse / hospital, Green Lane, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential development on site (2002/0125)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Residential (The site has been promoted for approximately 7 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	14 dph at 7 dwellings 12 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Constraints on access including nature of road and vegetation NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road width and lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. Access would necessitate local carriageway widening and a 2m site frontage footway, together with the complete removal of the existing frontage hedge.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Distance to Wicklewood Primary School 1.13km, large parts without footway and along rural roads</p> <p>Distance to bus service 730 metres</p> <p>Local employment 1.7km</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 1km</p> <p>Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 720 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage infrastructure, including the water recycling centre, may need to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Potential issue with nearby graveyard which may extend into the site itself	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Does not significantly conflict with identified landscape characteristics of area. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Amber	Detached from main settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site is heavily vegetated and a large number of the trees are subject to TPOs	Red
Historic Environment	Amber	Site forms the setting of a Grade II listed building (The Old Workhouse) HES – Red. Workhouse burial ground.	Red
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local highway network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road width and lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. Access would necessitate local carriageway widening and a 2m site frontage footway, together with the complete removal of the existing frontage hedge.	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?	Would impact on setting of Grade II listed building. The site is also detached from the main settlement although a sensitively designed scheme could relate to cluster of buildings around former hospital. However the site is heavily vegetated at present.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The Green is a very narrow lane with mature trees lining the boundary which restricts the ability to provide an access. Access may be achievable from within the existing site however	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Partly wooded setting of former hospital. Potential issue from nearby graveyard which would need to be investigated further if the site were to be progressed – this may extend into the site	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north, east and south. Agricultural on opposite side of road to the west. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Line of trees along boundary with The Green	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site contains a significant number of trees both on the boundary and within the site which are subject to TPOs	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site are limited due to trees on the boundary and within the site	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to distance from man part of the settlement, impact on setting of listed building and difficulties in developing the site from the number of protected trees	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)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site has a significant number of TPO trees within it which would significantly reduce the developable area of the site. On this basis the site is not considered to be of a suitable size for allocation and is detached from any settlement limits for Wicklewood. It is therefore not considered to be suitable as a settlement limit extension. The site would relate to the existing development at the old hospital/ workhouse, however the site forms the setting of the Listed Building and development would therefore have an impact. Highways concerns relating to achieving access to the site as well as the surrounding road network have also been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Partly wooded site that forms part of setting to former hospital, now converted to residential, which is listed and in a rural location away from the main settlement. Many of the trees are protected which severely limits any development potential on the site.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Limited development of the site may be possible, subject to tree surveys.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an allocation site due to the reduction in developable area caused by the presence of a significant number of trees with TPOs within the site boundaries. The site is also detached from the main settlement and is therefore not considered to be an appropriate site for a settlement limit extension. Development of this site would also have an impact on the setting of the former workhouse to the east. Highways concerns have also been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 November 2020

SN0535

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0535
Site address	Land to the south of Church Lane, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.05 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 18 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8dph based on 18 dwellings 51 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Narrow access from Church Lane NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Limited site frontage preclude an opportunity for securing safe access. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of continuous footway to the village school. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Wicklewood Primary School 650 metres Distance to bus service 1km Local employment adjacent to 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 Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 900 metres Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 990 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage infrastructure, including the water recycling centre, may need to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available 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
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is contained within settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Amber	Does not relate to existing linear pattern of frontage development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designated sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained local highway network NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Limited site frontage preclude an opportunity for securing safe access. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of continuous footway to the village school. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential, with commercial premises to east which may raise compatibility issues	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Whilst the site would not be in keeping with the existing frontage development along Church Lane, if adequate access could be secured then the development would be well contained within the form of the village. There is already precedent of such estate development in All Saints Close to the south-west and Hillside Crescent to the north-east	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access drive is currently a private gravelled driveway which would not be suitable for an estate scale development. NCC Highways state that there is no possibility of providing safe access and also considered the local road network to be unsuitable due to restricted width and lack of footway	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north and west and partly to east and south. Commercial premises to east however this shouldn't preclude residential development on the site	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Descends gently from south to north	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on eastern boundary. Hedges, trees and domestic boundaries to west	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees on southern and western boundaries.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is very contained with almost no public views into site – only very glimpsed view from where access is	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 is well contained, however access both in terms of immediate access into site and the suitability of Church Lane inadequate	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)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	Potential improvements including footway provision on Church Lane	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is larger than is considered to be appropriate for allocation however it could be reduced in size to meet the requirements of the VCHAP. The site is contained within wider views and is well connected to the wider settlement. However significant access constraints have been identified and it is difficult to see how these could be overcome.

Site Visit Observations

Site is well contained behind existing development with little impact on wider landscape. However, access is constrained and Church Lane raises highway concerns.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Access constraints will impact on the achieving development on this site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Although the site could be reduced in size to meet the requirements of the VCHAP the site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an allocation as significant access constraints preclude development of the site. Access would need to be obtained via a narrow access driveway between two dwellings.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11 November 2020

SN0577REVB

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0577REVB
Site address	Land to the south of Wicklewood Primary School
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Up to 10 ha (although a smaller parcel of land has been indicated on the plans at this stage)
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Residential dwellings plus an extension to the school premises for additional car parking, larger sports field and the opportunity to build a hall for indoor sports, school assemblies and collective workshop, a village green and a sports area
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	TBC
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 off Hackford Road would be constrained due to proximity to junctions. The Green is a constrained country lane NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access site via The Green, widen carriageway to 5.5m to Hackford Road. Provide footway over whole site frontage including suitable pedestrian crossing to north side of road and footway to the school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Adjacent to Wicklewood Primary School Distance to bus service 230 metres Local employment 1km	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 550 metres Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 230 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and sewerage infrastructure, including the water recycling centre, may need to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available AW advise sewers crossing the 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
Flood Risk	Amber	Some surface water flood risk on highway and to south of site but should not prohibit development LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Potential intrusion into open elevated landscape. Wider site would involve some loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Main area of existing development is to north of Hackford Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green.SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat (buffer suggested). Potential for protected species/habitat, and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed building to south HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	The Green is a constrained narrow lane NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access site via The Green, widen carriageway to 5.5m to Hackford Road. Provide footway over whole site frontage including suitable pedestrian crossing to north side of road and footway to the school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Adjacent to school	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would be slightly detached from main part of village which is to the north of Hackford Road, but would be adjacent to the school which is also to the south of Hackford Road. There is some further residential development to the south of Hackford Road along Milestone Lane to the west	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways advise that access should be from The Green.	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)	Adjacent to school, with residential on opposite side of Hackford Road to north. Otherwise agricultural. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries with highway are currently open – possible opportunity to reinstate field boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Little habitat. Some hedging on boundary with school.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line on wider field which may affect option 2.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is open with views across site from The Green and Hackford Road. Potential views from Milestone Lane.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Although development would result in significant intrusion into the landscape (depending on the extent of the development taken forward). The site is well related to the school.	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 private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	NCC Highways require footway across whole site frontage and to the school and suitable pedestrian crossing	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The site promoter advises that development would provide an extension to the school premises for additional car parking, a larger sports field and the opportunity for the school to build a hall for indoor sports, school assemblies and collective worship, and for school performances and fund raising, a village green and sports area.	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considerably larger than is considered acceptable in this location. A number of additional benefits have been suggested as part of a residential development on this site however it is not clear whether these suggestions have been based on appropriate evidence and/or discussions with the relevant third parties. The site is well connected to the settlement and highways requirements are considered to be achievable. The site is prominent within the landscape and could form an enhanced gateway to the settlement at a smaller scale, however development of the scale and form proposed is not considered to be appropriate at this time.

Site Visit Observations

The site has open boundaries and is situated within a large open landscape. Adjacent to school. Some precedent for development to south of Hackford Road, but there would be intrusion into the open countryside.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, although it is not clear whether the third parties require the additional facilities set out in the proposal.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

This site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. The proposal incorporates residential development as well as a suite of significant other benefits including additional car parking facilities for the school, open space and educational facilities. No evidence has been provided to confirm that these facilities would be required at this time or in this location. Access to the site would be achievable and the site is well connected, it is however very prominent within the wider landscape. It is considered that an alternative scheme on a smaller parcel of land would be the most appropriate option in this location (SN0577REVA).

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 November 2020

SN1036

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1036
Site address	Land to the rear of Windfalls, Milestone Lane, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Both (The site is of a suitable size for allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10dph at 5 dwellings 12 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Red	<p>Poor access from Milestone Lane, though may be suitable for individual dwelling</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</p> <p>No direct access to the highway and no realistic prospect of securing a suitable access. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted road width and lack of footways. No continuous footway to the village school. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</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 Wicklewood Primary School 720 metres</p> <p>Distance to bus service 1.15km</p> <p>Local employment 1.15km away</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 1.45km</p> <p>Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 1.15km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but not mains sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small area at risk of surface water flooding along the access track	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site detached from village in open landscape. Most of site is high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is detached from main part of village and would constitute backland development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road network is constrained with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No direct access to the highway and no realistic prospect of securing a suitable access. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted road width and lack of footways. No continuous footway to the village school. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is removed from main part of settlement. It is also to the rear of existing dwellings constituting backland development.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be down existing track which may be suitable for one or two additional dwellings but would require removal of part of hedgerow to access 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 to east, agricultural land on all other boundaries. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Descending from east to west	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows with trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges and trees	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is relatively contained due to boundary treatment and dwelling between site and Milestone Lane	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is not suitable to be developed given its poor relationship to the main settlement, backland nature and access via a narrow rural lane.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation but relates poorly to the main areas of the settlement. Development in this location would constitute backland development. Significant access and connectivity constraints have also been identified that would preclude further development in this location. The site is also a significant distance from the closest existing settlement limit.

Site Visit Observations

The site is detached from the main settlement and is accessed via a private track. The site is to the rear of existing dwellings when viewed from the main road. Enclosed by hedging and trees.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Access constraints suggest that the site would not be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site has been considered **UNREASONABLE** as both an allocation site and as an extension to the existing settlement limit for Wicklewood. The site relates poorly to the main settlement and significant access and connectivity constraints associated with its remote location have been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11 November 2020

SN2179

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2179 (a smaller parcel of land has also been promoted as SN2179REVA)
Site address	Land east of High Street, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.25 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 81 dwellings at 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Long site frontage onto High Street where access can be achieved NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Site is on the edge of the village where traffic speeds are likely to be higher than local speed limit. Unlikely to achieve required visibility. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted road width and lack of footways to village centre / catchment school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Wicklewood Primary School 1.23km Distance to bus service 800 metres Local employment 500 metres away	

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 Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 700 metres Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 800 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and sewerage infrastructure, including the water recycling centre, is likely to need upgrading	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available 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
Flood Risk	Red	North of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3, surface water risk along western and eastern boundaries LLFA – Amber. Mitigation required for heavy constraints. The site is affected by moderate/ significant flooding (flowpath). The south of the site is not affected by flooding.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Intrusion into open landscape to north. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Potential to continue existing linear form and character north	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Listed buildings to south of site HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential has capacity issues on local highway network NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Site is on the edge of the village where traffic speeds are likely to be higher than local speed limit. Unlikely to achieve required visibility. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted road width and lack of footways to village centre / catchment school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development could relate to existing townscape through development in keeping with the form and character of linear development to the south extending to the same extent along High Street as development on western side of road. Extension of development deeper into the site would not be in keeping with the existing form of development.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the west of the site should be achievable from High Street	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential on opposite side of High Street to west and to south along with a garage. Agricultural land to east. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site descends slightly from north to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees on northern boundary, some hedging on eastern boundary, trees to south. Western highway boundary is 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, plus associated with watercourse to north of 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 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	Clear views into the site from the 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)	Not recommended for allocation due to intrusion into landscape and flood risk issues	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)
Flood Zone 2 & 3		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting 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)	Potential highway improvements along High Street such as provision of footway. Flood mitigation measures.	Red
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is excessive in size to be considered as an allocation site (a smaller site has been also been promoted, SN2179REVA) and has considerable constraints. Development of the site would be heavily constrained by the identified flood risk to the north of the site and there would be significant landscape impacts too.

Site Visit Observations

Open site that contributes to setting of village.

Local Plan Designations

Flood zone 2 & 3.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site would be constrained by the identified areas of flood risks and there may be viability issues associated with connected mitigation measures required.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an allocation site. The site is excessive in size and would not meet the objectives of the VCHAP although the identified flood risks would restrict the developable area of the site. Nonetheless, development of the scale proposed would have an intrusive impact on the local landscape and townscape that could not be easily mitigated. Significant areas of the site also lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11 November 2020

SN2179REVA

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2179REVA (this forms a parcel within site SN2179)
Site address	Land east of High Street, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Long site frontage onto High Street where access can be achieved NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Site is on the edge of the village where traffic speeds are likely to be higher than local speed limit. Unlikely to achieve required visibility. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted road width and lack of footways to village centre / catchment school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Wicklewood Primary School 1.23km Distance to bus service 800 metres Local employment 500 metres away	

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 Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 700 metres Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 800 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and sewerage infrastructure, including the water recycling centre, is likely to need upgrading	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available 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
Flood Risk	Red	North of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3, surface water risk along western and eastern boundaries LLFA – Amber. Mitigation required for heavy constraints. The site is affected by moderate/ significant flooding (flowpath). The south of the site is not affected by flooding.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	No significant landscape impact identified. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Green	Potential to continue existing linear form and character north	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat (buffer suggested).	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Listed buildings to south of site HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential has capacity issues on local highway network NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Site is on the edge of the village where traffic speeds are likely to be higher than local speed limit. Unlikely to achieve required visibility. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable due to restricted road width and lack of footways to village centre / catchment school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would relate to the existing townscape through development in keeping with the form and character of linear development to the south along High Street.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the west of the site should be achievable from High Street	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential on opposite side of High Street to west and to south along with a garage. Agricultural land to east. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site descends slightly from north to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees on northern boundary, western highway boundary is 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, plus associated with watercourse to north of 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 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	Clear views into the site from the 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)	The site could continue the linear form of development in evidence along High Street and would not have a significant impact on the townscape.	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Zone 2 & 3		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of an appropriate size for allocation however the significant areas of flood risk that have been identified to the north of the site would limit the developable area of the site and reduce the numbers that could be achieved on this site. A linear development would follow the form and character of the existing pattern of development and there would not be a significant townscape or landscape impact resulting from the development of this site. Although the site is adjacent to current settlement limit highways concerns have been identified, including the poor connectivity of the site to the local services.

Site Visit Observations

Open site that contributes to setting of village but linear development would continue the existing form of development.

Local Plan Designations

Flood zone 2 & 3.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site would be constrained by the identified areas of flood risks and there may be viability issues associated with connected mitigation measures required.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an allocation site. The site has a significant area of identified flood risk that would impact upon the developable area of the site. Landscape and townscape impacts could be mitigated however the on-site areas of flood risk and the identified highways concerns, including poor connectivity of the site, are constraints that it is not considered possible to reasonably address.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11 November 2020

SN4001

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4001
Site address	Land west of Milestone Lane, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 15 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	20 dwellings at 25dph 18dph at 15 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access off constrained lane</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to widening at Milestone La to a minimum of 5.5m and provision of 2.0m wide continuous footway at south side of Hackford Rd and to school.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting: previous discussions about this site indicated that Milestone Lane would need widening back to the junction with Hackford Road. This site would make more sense if SN4045 is allocated and a Settlement Limit drawn around the housing in the triangle between Hackford Road and Milestone Lane. Assumed that the site has not been situated closer to Hackford Road due to the setting of the church.)</i></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 	Green	<p>Distance to Wicklewood Primary School 300 metres</p> <p>Distance to bus service 730 metres</p> <p>Local employment 820 metres away</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 1km</p> <p>Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 730 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Clarification needed that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all 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	<p>No identified flood risk</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Prominent location in setting of village from west. No loss of high grade agricultural land</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER –A problematic site due to the landscape character issues that would arise, particularly the impact of development on views towards the Church</p> <p>**NOTE** Appeal decision 2019/2522 on land to the south of Highview was dismissed in Feb 2021 due to the effect of development on the character and appearance of the locality – 2 no. self-build dwellings.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detached from main part of village with little existing development on western side of Milestone Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No protected sites in close proximity</p> <p>NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Grade I listed church and Grade II listed war memorial to north of site</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Red. This area is important to the rural setting of the church as it is in relatively close proximity and you can appreciate the church from Wicklewood Road in a relatively well preserved rural setting not affected by development.</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Red
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Milestone Lane is constrained with no footway</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to widening at Milestone La to a minimum of 5.5m and provision of 2.0m wide continuous footway at south side of Hackford Rd and to school.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting: previous discussions about this site indicated that Milestone Lane would need widening back to the junction with Hackford Road. This site would make more sense if SN4045 is allocated and a Settlement Limit drawn around the housing in the triangle between Hackford Road and Milestone Lane. Assumed that the site has not been situated closer to Hackford Road due to the setting of the church.)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development will impact on some views of church therefore affecting its setting, both from the south and potentially in views across the valley to the west. Depending upon the scale of development, it could introduce estate development on a side of Milestone Lane where there are currently only sporadic individual dwellings	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is likely to be achievable and footway can be provided in land under same ownership along Milestone Lane back to footways on Hackford Road	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 dwelling to south and also residential on opposite side of Milestone Lane to east. Agricultural land to west and north. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land descends from east to west	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open boundary on to highway, hedge on southern boundary, north and western boundaries are undefined as part of larger field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited given open agricultural land, hedge on southern boundary is only permanent vegetation	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	Very open views across site from Milestone Lane and also across valley from west. Site is prominent due to its position on the side of the valley	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)	The site would be prominent within the landscape due to its valley setting. There could be some townscape compatibility issues depending on the scale/ form of development on the site. Heritage impacts due to the proximity to the Church.	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)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated. Consideration would need to be given to the scale and form of development on this site as there is no evidence of estate development in this part of the village. The site is prominent within the landscape due to the topography of the land. Highways matters could be reasonably addressed however consideration needs to be given to the impact of development on the nearby listed heritage assets, including the Church.

Site Visit Observations

Prominent site on side of valley that would be visible in long views across valley from west. Also on side of Milestone Lane where there is currently only a few sporadic individual plots. Would impact on the setting of church.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for allocation due to the significant impact that development would have in this location on the landscape character, as well as the setting of the Grade I listed church. The topography of the site within the open landscape would result in development being visible in long views back towards the settlement and it would not be possible to provide reasonable mitigation to address this. Highways constraints could be addressed.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 November 2020

SN4064

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4064
Site address	Wicklewood Nurseries, High Street, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary (other than access) – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 15 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Constrained access to High Street NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Acceptable visibility at access does not appear to be achievable. Continuous 2.0m footway required at west side of High street from ex facility north of access and south to Wymondham Road. <i>(NCC HIGHWAYS - visibility on the access to The Street is an issue, and a footpath back to Wymondham Road would be preferable, however there would be a potential trade off re the traffic generation from the existing nursery if that use is going to cease.)</i>	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 	Green	<p>Distance to Wicklewood Primary School 730 metres</p> <p>Distance to bus service 300 metres</p> <p>Local employment 840 metres away</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 200 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 300 metres</p>	Green
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	Amber	Potential for contamination from existing use	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Areas of surface water flood risk on site and on public highway near site</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site contained in landscape by other development. No loss of high grade agricultural land SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER – Acceptable in landscape terms	Green
Townscape	Amber	Development is largely frontage development in this part of the settlement SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. No townscape concerns.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage sites in close proximity SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. No impact on the historic environment.	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>High Street has some constraints, including lack of footway</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Acceptable visibility at access does not appear to be achievable. Continuous 2.0m footway required at west side of High street from ex facility north of access and south to Wymondham Road.</p> <p><i>(NCC HIGHWAYS - visibility on the access to The Street is an issue, and a footpath back to Wymondham Road would be preferable, however there would be a potential trade off re the traffic generation from the existing nursery if that use is going to cease.)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Whilst the site would not be in keeping with the existing frontage development along High Street, if adequate access could be secured then the development would be well contained within the form of the village. There is already precedent of such estate development within the triangle of streets created by High Street, Church Lane and Hackford Road in All Saints Close to the west and Hillside Crescent to the north	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Private access drive serving the nurseries and a small number of dwellings. NCC Highways comments needed as to whether there is adequate space to upgrade to an adoptable highway. May also need footway provision on High Street.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Existing nurseries. Issue of potential loss of employment along with demolition of existing structures	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north, east and south. Further horticultural use to west. Clarification would need to be provided on how remainder of site would be accessed to consider whether this would be compatible.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Domestic boundaries to east and south. West is currently part of same site.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited potential for habitat	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Some limited potential issues from existing use but shouldn't preclude residential development on site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is very well contained with no public views across site	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 is well contained and an allocation could be accommodated without having an adverse impact on the character of the area or wider landscape. However existing use of the site in terms of retaining employment would need to be explored along with the suitability of the access both in terms of immediate access into site and the suitability of High Street	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)	Unknwon	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)	Potential requirement for footway along High Street	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is suitable for allocation of 12 dwellings. The site is well contained within the settlement and would not have a harmful impact on the wider townscape. Development of the site would result in the utilisation of a brownfield site but would result in the loss of existing employment land. Access to the site is expected to be achievable. No other significant constraints have been identified at this stage.

Site Visit Observations

Site is well contained but an existing nurseries site raising potential loss of employment issues and how the remainder of the site will be accessed. Also existing access from High Street is constrained.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** site for allocation subject to clarification being obtained regarding the future use of the remainder of the nurseries site and the possible loss of employment land. Access to the site is constrained which is likely to limit development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 12 November 2020

SN5018

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5018
Site address	Land rear Birchwood, High Oak Road, Wicklewood
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Various householder applications for adjacent High Oaks. Conversion of outbuildings to 5 holiday units.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.55
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 4 dwellings (13 dwellings at 25 dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Existing access from High Oak Road to Birchwood, would need to have adequate visibility. NCC Highways – Amber. Not clear acceptable access can be achieved without 3rd party land. Network constrained with no footway to school and local facilities.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	Distance to Wicklewood Primary School 1.8km, without footway and along rural roads (except for 150m on Hackford Rd). Morley Primary School 2.3km. Distance to bus service 1.85km Limited local employment within 1km	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 Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 2.15km Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 1.9km. The Buck, Morley 1.3km.	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed Environment Agency: Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates, Private treatment - mains electricity but this would need to be confirmed	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	Amber	Contaminated land as former industrial site – would need investigation if the site progresses further.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1. No identified surface water flood risk. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: Green (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	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	E3 – Hingham Plateau Farmland Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is well contained within the curtilage of the existing property and does not encroach into the wider landscape.	Green
Townscape	Amber	The site is distant from the main concentrations of both Wicklewood and Morley and is an outlying area around a previous utility/commercial use. Although it is land associated with an existing property it does not relate well to the villages and is remote from services.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Garden area with some native trees around – some potential limited for habitats which could be mitigated. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but housing and water discharge do not require NE consultation. No priority habitats, No PROW. Not on GI corridor. Amber risk zone for great crested newts. Ponds within 250m.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No designated heritage assets. HES – Amber. Site of brick kiln.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Restricted local network of rural roads with no footpaths.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Not clear acceptable access can be achieved without 3rd party land. Network constrained with no footway to school and local facilities.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Large residential properties, agriculture. Compatible.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	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 a concreted access which serves the house and the holiday units behind. The hedge at the front and trees to the side are conifers and could be removed for visibility if required.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Garden/ amenity land associated with the existing house.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, holiday and agriculture. Care would be needed with regard to the relationship between holiday 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)	Some conifer, some deciduous hedges, well delineated.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some mature trees around perimeter.	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)	Previous works area means a contamination investigation would be required.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Very limited as the site is contained.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	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 does not encroach into the landscape and is well contained however it is remote from the school and other services and the surrounding roads are very constrained with no footpaths. This is not a sustainable location and the majority of trips will therefore be 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?	Promoter states that the site is owned by a developer.	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	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Has indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site has been promoted for 4 dwellings but is circa 0.55 hectares in size. The site is therefore of suitable size for allocation however whilst increasing the number of dwellings on the site may result in a more efficient use of land (as required by the NPPF) increased density on this site would not be compatible with the existing pattern of development in this location, including the recent developments at The Oaks and Wicklewood Rise which are low density developments on a former brownfield site. There is no existing settlement limit in proximity of the site and there are no plans to designate a settlement limit in this location. Highways constraints have been identified by the Highways Authority, including poor connectivity to the existing facilities and services. Development of the site would not have a significant landscape impact as it is contained by existing development. A contamination survey would be required due to the past use of the site.

Site Visit Observations

The site is remote from services and facilities. Recent residential development to the west of the site. High Oak Road is of narrow width and existing trees would likely need removal to create an appropriate visibility splay. Clear views towards the site due to the open landscape however site would be within existing cluster of residential buildings therefore limited visual impact.

Local Plan Designations

None.

Availability

The site is considered to be available.

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

SN5018 is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site, both for allocation and as a settlement limit extension. There are currently no plans to designate a settlement limit in this location and an allocation-scale development in this location would be incompatible with the existing built form. The site is contained within the landscape but is poorly connected to the existing services and facilities, both by the existing local road network and pedestrian footways.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 4 May 2022