

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

| | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference | SN0009SL |
| Site address | Land at Top Row, Wreningham |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.18 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension | SL extension |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 1 dwelling (25 dph = 4.5 dwellings) |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield | Greenfield |

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

| | |
|---|----|
| ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment) | |
| Is the site located in, or does the site include: | |
| SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar | No |
| National Nature Reserve | No |
| Ancient Woodland | No |
| Flood Risk Zone 3b | No |
| Scheduled Ancient Monument | No |
| Locally Designated Green Space | No |

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

| SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Access to the site | Amber | Existing access from Top Row. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. NNC Highways - Red. 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. Limited frontage onto Top Row precludes creation of access. Top Row is limited in width, has no footway and substandard visibility into Norwich Road. No continuous footway to catchment school. | Red |

| | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | Green | <p>1.25km walk to primary school</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities and bus service (including peak) within 1800m</p> | |
| | | Village hall (with groups), recreation ground and public house within 1800m | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | <p>Wastewater capacity to be confirmed</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p> | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter advises electricity, water, foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints. | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site is within the area served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station | Green |

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues. NCC Minerals - site under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy. | Amber |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Southern section in flood zones 2 & 3. SW flow path across large southern section. | Amber |
| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | | Rural River Valley | |
| | | Tributary Farmland | |
| | | Tributary Farmland with Parkland | |
| | | Settled Plateau Farmland | X |
| | | Plateau Farmland | |
| | | Valley Urban Fringe | |
| | | Fringe Farmland | |
| SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | | D1: Wymondham settled plateau farmland ALC: N/A | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Amber | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. | Amber |
| Townscape | Amber | Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Amber | Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecology – Amber. SSSI IRZ Site identified as priority habitat. Potential for protected species/ habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain | Amber |

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------|---|-------|
| Historic Environment | Amber | May impact on setting of designated HAs to north. HES – Amber. | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | Development would not result in the loss of any open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated. NNC Highways - Red. 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. Limited frontage onto Top Row precludes creation of access. Top Row is limited in width, has no footway and substandard visibility into Norwich Road. No continuous footway to catchment school. | Red |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Agriculture/residential | Green |

Part 4 Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | May impact on setting of LBs on north side of Top Row through this could be mitigate through good design | |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Existing gated field access. Improvements limited by TPO on boundary with highway. NCC/tree officer to comment. | |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Grazing | |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agriculture/residential – compatible uses | |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Ground level falls towards watercourse along southern boundary | |

| | | |
|--|---|-------|
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedgerow including some significant trees and TPO on northern boundary. | |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Trees/hedgerow to boundaries and TPO on northern boundary. Watercourse along southern boundary. | |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No constraints. No evidence of contamination. | |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Site prominent in views from Top Row and from farmland to south due to changes in ground level. | |
| 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) | Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wider verge at points - characteristic of settlement – but also separated by B1113. This impacts on access to other local services too. Single dwelling would fit within existing pattern of development but restricted by TPO on highway boundary and identified SW flood risk in southern part of site. | 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 (<i>UNIFORM</i>) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Conclusion | Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | | | |
|--|----------------|---|-------------------------|
| | Comments | | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | private | | |
| Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Unknown | | |
| When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i> | Immediately | X | Green |
| | Within 5 years | | |
| | 5 – 10 years | | |
| | 10 – 15 years | | |
| | 15-20 years | | |
| | Comments: | | |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Supporting statement from promoter | Amber |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i> | Access already improved under 2018/2301. Limited frontage onto Top Row precludes creation of access. | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | No. Advises promoted for market housing only. | Red |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | No | |

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not suitable for SL extension due to isolation from main settlement and resulting lack of connectivity, flood risk, heritage and tree issues.

Site Visit Observations Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wider verge at points - characteristic of settlement – but also separated by B1113. This impacts on access to other local services too. Single dwelling would fit within existing pattern of development but restricted by TPO on highway boundary and identified SW flood risk in southern part of site.

Local Plan Designations Open countryside

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-3 years

OVERALL CONCLUSION: UNREASONABLE. The site is not close to any settlement boundary and is very remote from services. It has very poor connectivity to the school along narrow, unlit roads with no footpaths and across the B1113. This also results in highway safety concerns because Top Row is limited in width and has substandard visibility into Norwich Road. It would be a significant intrusion within the landscape to the south and it is constrained by a TPO and flood risk to the south.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021