

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0431REV
Site address	Land south of Hethel Road, Wreningham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.8 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25 dwellings = 9 dph (25 dph = 70 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	Field access from Hethel Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. NCC Highways – Green. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road width or junction visibility. No safe walking route to school. NCC Highways Meeting - Hethel Road is narrow with no footways and limited verges, blind bend and poor visibility at the Church Road junction.	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities	Amber	700m walk to primary school	
<i>Part 1:</i> o Primary School o Secondary school o Local healthcare services o Retail services o Local employment opportunities o Peak-time public transport		Limited employment opportunities and bus service (including peak) within 1800m	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground and public house within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises electricity, water, foul drainage to site. No UKPN constraints. AW advise sewers crossing the site	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	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk outside site along Hethel Road. LLFA - One flood event recorded. Few or no constraints, standard information required.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Settled Plateau Farmland	X	
		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
		D1: Wymondham settled plateau farmland ALC: grade 3		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	At scale promoted, detrimental impacts may not be reasonably mitigated through design. SDC Landscape Officer. Landscape concerns about the loss of roadside hedgerow and trees. Development of the site would be contrary to the existing settlement pattern.		Red
Townscape	Amber	At scale promoted, detrimental impacts may not be reasonably mitigated through design. SNC Heritage Officer for smaller site - No significant townscape or heritage objections.		Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network may be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecologist – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/ habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.		Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	No detrimental impact on designated or non-designated HAs. SNC Heritage Officer for smaller site - No significant townscape or heritage objections. HES – Amber.		Green

Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red.</p> <p>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road width or junction visibility. No safe walking route to school.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - Hethel Road is narrow with no footways and limited verges, blind bend and poor visibility at the Church Road junction.</p>	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?	No direct impacts	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if improved access is achievable while retaining significant trees.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
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)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with some trees on western and highway boundaries. Residential boundaries to south.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow with some trees to western and highway boundaries. Drains within site and butting 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 and 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 and open in views along Hethel Road.	
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)	Close to school and local services. Lack of footpath provision with wider verge at points which is characteristic of settlement but reduces connectivity. As promoted, would represent excessive development in relation to scale of settlement and would not reflect dispersed pattern of development on north side of Hethel Road. Would result in significant expansion of settlement to the north. Landscape and townscape impacts could be limited by development of southern section only for 10-15 dwellings, subject to satisfactory access, but impact on residential amenity may be concern.	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 (<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>	Yes to access the site.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not suitable for allocation as promoted due to poor connectivity, landscape and townscape impact.

Site Visit Observations Close to school and local services. Lack of footpath provision with wider verge at points which is characteristic of settlement but reduces connectivity. As promoted, would represent excessive development in relation to scale of settlement and would not reflect dispersed pattern of development on north side of Hethel Road. Would result in significant expansion of settlement to the north. Landscape and townscape impacts could be limited by development of southern section only for 10-15 dwellings, subject to satisfactory access, but impact on residential amenity may be of concern.

Local Plan Designations Open countryside

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-5 years

OVERALL CONCLUSION: It has poor connectivity to the school along narrow, unlit roads with no footpaths. This also results in significant highway safety concerns because of the blind bend and poor visibility at the Church Road junction. The size of the site is out of scale with the village, 2.8ha (70 dwellings), although it could be reduced in size. It is also out of character as Hethel Road only has sporadic development to the north. This site is prominent to the south and would be a significant intrusion within the landscape requiring the removal of a strong frontage hedge line for access.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0598REV
Site address	Land east of New Road, Ashwellthorpe
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.26 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 31 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
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	Field access from New Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. NCC Highways – Amber. Network poor with no footways, unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility at Silfield Road junction.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	More than 3000m walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 3000m and bus service (including peak) within 1800m	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground and public house within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Amber
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	<p>Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues.</p> <p>SNC Environmental Protection – Green.</p> <p>Land Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No potentially contaminated sites shown within 500m of the site in question on the Landmark database or PCLR database. - Historic OS maps show a void (about 7m by 11m) was once present about 35m to the south which has been filled with unknown material. This is considered to represent a low risk to the site in question. - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application. <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No issues observed. 	Green

Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified across site and within western section. LLFA – Amber. Surface water; significant mitigation required for severe constraints.	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: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may not be reasonably mitigated through design.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Large pond western side of highway. Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated. NCC Ecologist – Green. SSSI IRZ (Lower Wood Ashwellthorpe SSSI to the north). Potential for protected species/ habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	AAI to north west. Impacts could reasonably be mitigated HES – Amber.	Amber

Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated. NCC Highways – Red. Network poor with no footways, unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility at Silfield Road junction.	Amber
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?	AAI immediately to north west of site. HES to comment.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access. NCC to confirm if access achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/ residential - compatible	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to most boundaries including highway. Open to south	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within boundary hedgerows Ponds outside western and eastern boundaries so survey required.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles and O/H lines along highway boundary and crossing site. 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 New Road and open to views from south.	
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)	Isolated from school with no continuous footpath provision and access to limited local services only. Does not adjoin settlement limit and development would have significant townscape impacts.	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 (<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>	No		
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: Not confirmed		

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>	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>	Yes. Access improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Not confirmed	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Not suitable for allocation due to isolation from school, lack of connectivity to most services and impacts on townscape and ecology.

Site Visit Observations Isolated from school with no continuous footpath provision and access to limited local services only. Does not adjoin settlement limit and development would have significant townscape impacts.

Local Plan Designations Open countryside

Availability Statement from promoter

Achievability Statement from promoter

OVERALL CONCLUSION: It is remote from the school and other services with poor connectivity along narrow, unlit roads with no footpaths. It is a large site which is out of character with the village particularly as development here is sporadic. The site is physically and visually separate from the existing village and it would be a significant intrusion in the wider landscape as it breaks into the open countryside to the south-east. Surface water flooding may occur.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 12 January 2021