



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Bressingham

## Contents

SN2052 .....	3
SN2053 .....	11
SN2054 .....	19
SN2054REVA .....	28
SN2056 .....	38
SN2057 .....	45
SN2079 .....	53
SN3010 .....	61
SN3019SL .....	69
SN3020 .....	78
SN3023SL .....	86
SN3036 .....	94
SN3037 .....	102
SN3038 .....	110
SN4026 .....	118
SN4033 .....	126
SN4037 .....	134
SN5009 .....	143
SN5021 .....	152
SN5022 .....	161
SN5024 .....	168

SN2052

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2052
Site address	East of The Street, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.84 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 18 dph (site promoted for 10-15 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	Field access off The Street. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable. Access onto private drive on northern side. Confirm whether any access rights exist here.  <b>Highways score</b> – Amber. 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. No safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	3km walk to primary school and shop in Bressingham. No continuous footpath  No bus services near site	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus o Village/ community hall o Public house/ café o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		500m walk to church – no footpath  No other core services within 1800m of site (all in Bressingham)	Red
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified SW flow path running across site	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> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland  ALC Grade unknown	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is visually contained so detrimental impacts could reasonably be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Site is small in scale so detrimental impacts could reasonably be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could impact on setting of nearby LBs  <b>HES – Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm suitability of network. Impact on local road network could be reasonably mitigated.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS WITH THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development likely to impact on open setting of LB to south. Seek comment from technical officer if the site is to be considered as a reasonable alternative	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access onto narrow lane. Visibility may not be achievable close to bend. NCC to confirm visibility and impact on network	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/grazing	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to north and east. Fencing separates further paddock to south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Intermittent trees along northern boundary. Wide ditch along northern boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Pumping station adjacent to eastern boundary	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Visually contained site. Most prominent view into site is from road	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 remote from core services. Narrow lanes, lack of continuous footpath or street lighting creates hostile walking environment. Significant SW flood risk identified. Development likely to harm setting of heritage assets. Not suitable for allocation	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is remote from core services. Narrow lanes, lack of continuous footpath or street lighting creates hostile walking environment. Significant SW flood risk identified. Development likely to harm setting of heritage assets. Not suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside; no conflicting Local Plan designation

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE. The site has limited access to services and facilities. Site has significant surface water flood risk issues with flow path running across site. Potential harm to open setting of nearby listed buildings. Concerns over highway impacts.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

## SN2053

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2053
Site address	Adjoining Pond Farm, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.09 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	7 dph (promoted for 10-15 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

**HELAA Score:****Site Score:**

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

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Field access off The Street. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable.  Highways score – Amber. 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. No safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  Part 1: ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Red	3km walk to primary school and shop in Bressingham. No continuous footpath  No bus services near site	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		500m walk to church – no footpath  No other core services within 1800m of site (all in Bressingham)	Red
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified SW flow path running across front of site	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> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland  ALC Grade unknown	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would cause harm to designated heritage asset to north. Query whether harm could be mitigated – views of the technical officer to be sought if the site is considered to be a reasonable alternative.  <b>HES – Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm suitability of network. Impact on local road network could be reasonably mitigated.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development likely to harm open and rural setting of LB to north. Seek comment from technical officer if the site is a reasonable alternative	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access onto narrow lane. Likely to achieve adequate visibility. NCC to confirm	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Ditch and intermittent trees along highway frontage. Hedge along northern boundary. Open to west – part of larger parcel.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along northern boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Pumping station close to southern boundary	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open in views from west and prominent in views along highway	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 remote from core services. Narrow lanes, lack of continuous footpath or street lighting creates hostile walking environment. Significant SW flood risk identified. Development likely to harm setting of heritage assets and landscape. Not suitable for allocation	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Site Visit Observations

Site is remote from core services. Narrow lanes, lack of continuous footpath or street lighting creates hostile walking environment. Significant SW flood risk identified. Development likely to harm setting of heritage assets. Not suitable for allocation.

### Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside; no conflicting Local Plan designations.

### Availability

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

### Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE**. The site has limited access to services and facilities. Site has significant surface water flood risk issues with flow path running across site. Potential harm to open setting of nearby listed buildings. Concerns over highway impacts.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

SN2054

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2054
Site address	Land east of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history on the site – refusal of pp for new dwelling adjacent to the north of the site 2019/0172
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.85ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation for an unspecified no. of residential units
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	88 dwellings (at 25 dwellings/ha)  (NB. The site was promoted for an unspecified number of 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	GNLP HELAA previously scored as Amber due to need for highway improvements and footpath provision  <b>Highways score</b> - Amber. The site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school. Although this would require the removal of all adjacent trees and hedges.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Local healthcare services <input type="checkbox"/> Retail services <input type="checkbox"/> Local employment opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Peak-time public transport	Amber	Local services include: school, public house, village hall  Primary School – approximately 274m  Shop – approximately 670m	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Public House – approximately 500m  Village Hall, Playground – approximately 670m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Fibre technology is already available in this area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination on site or ground stability issues identified	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Not on site  NB: Public comments during earlier stages of the consultation refer to flooding of the site, as well as School Road. To be checked with technical consultee comments as appropriate if the site is to be considered as a Reasonable Alternative.	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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Waveney Tributary Farmland  ALC value – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is prominent within the landscape	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is separated from the settlement by a parcel of undeveloped land (SN4036). The site is located on a key approach into Bressingham in the open landscape. If SN4036 is allocated the site would have an improved relationship with the rest of the settlement, although would extend the pattern of development significantly.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	LB to the north of the site (Pine Tree Cottage). Impact to be checked with technical consultee if the site is to be considered as a reasonable alternative.  <b>HES</b> – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of recreation space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	GNLP HELAA previously scored the site as an amber rating  <b>Highways score</b> – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school. Although this would require the removal of all adjacent trees and hedges.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>LB (Pine Tree Cottage) is adjacent to the northern boundary of the site however there appears to be significant vegetation along this boundary which would reduce the impact of development on the setting of this LB</p> <p>As promoted the site is of a scale that would have a negative impact on the townscape setting as it would be out of keeping with the area. If the site size is reduced development to the north of the site would be preferable, subject to the impact on the LB.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved from School Road; a partial footpath exists on the opposite side of the road so some provision would be required	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Access onto the land was not possible however it appears to be scrub land	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Access onto the site was not possible however, generally, the land rises to the north along School Road	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There are hedges and trees along the site frontage and vegetation on the site – query whether the hedgerow should be classified as an ‘important hedgerow’?	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Access onto the site to check this was not possible	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site are restricted by the existing vegetation along the boundary however, as with other sites promoted along School Road, this forms one of the keys approaches into Bressingham	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is well connected and access should be achievable. However, development of this site would have a substantial landscape impact due to its proposed scale and separation from the existing built form. The loss of the existing boundary treatment would also have an adverse impact on the local landscape as this forms part of the rural setting of the village. Should a smaller scale site be promoted, development should be concentrated to the north and in a linear pattern.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	No conflicting constraints identified	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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?	10 – 15 years	Amber

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	The site promoter has confirmed availability of the site. No additional evidence submitted at this stage.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Some highways works may be required – to be identified by NCC Highways	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

As promoted the scale of development exceeds the village cluster thresholds however the site would be suitable for development if a smaller site boundary was agreed, subject to the comments of technical consultees, particularly the LB officer.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is well connected but in its current form does not relate particularly well to the existing development. The promoted site is of significant size – a smaller boundary may be acceptable – however there would be a landscape impact as the site forms part of the gateway into the centre of the village. The loss of the existing frontage boundary would be regrettable as this forms part of the setting of the local landscape.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP constraints identified.

### **Availability**

The site is considered to be available.

### **Achievability**

The site is considered to be achievable however confirmation should be sought that the site remains viable with a smaller site boundary.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Has a good relationship to services and facilities, but due to its scale and relationship to the existing settlement, the development of the site would have a significant detrimental effect in terms of landscape and the form and character of the area (townscape).

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

## SN2054REVA

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2054REVA
aSite address	Land east of School Road and south of Pine Tree Cottage, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.44
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	35 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>The site has roadside frontage but site access would cross a green verge and require the removal of a mature hedge. Site access would also need to consider the mature oak tree.</p> <p>There is an existing footpath on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Visibility not achievable due limited frontage and presence of significant oak tree. Network a concern due to limited road width.</p>	Red
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Primary School; 140m</p> <p>Bus Service; 280m</p> <p>Shop; 530m</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village hall, playing field; 530m  Public House; 580m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints  <b>Environment Agency</b> - Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown but appears likely to be available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known contamination and ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1  Surface water flowpath along road frontage to west but not within the site.  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.  <b>Environment Agency</b> - 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> )  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland – majority of the site to the south-west  Plateau Farmland – north-east	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland  E2 Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	The landscape and visual impact would depend on whether the site to the north and west are allocated and developed as it would be unacceptable if they were not. If they were then there would be a significant impact on the landscape as development would be read with these other sites as a large extension to the village.  Development of the site would require the removal of a hedge which is continuous on the east side of the road for some distance. There is no hedgerow buffer to the south as the site forms part of a wider field.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The impact would depend on whether the site to the north and west are allocated and developed. If they are this would be the next site sequentially and would relate well to them and the new townscape, if not it would be separate from the existing development and would not be acceptable.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations. Hedgerow to frontage and mature oak tree, otherwise it is an agricultural field with relatively low habitat value.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ - residential and water discharge not a trigger for NE consultation. Not in GI Corridor and on edge of amber risk zone for great crested newts. No PROW.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>LB (Pine Tree Cottage) immediately adjacent to the north and east of the site. The cottage looks towards this site, if both sites (SN4036 and SN2054REVA) were allocated the LB would then be surrounded by development and the impact on its setting would be significant. Previous comments received from the Council's Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer for adjacent promoted site SN4036 noted that the cottage is currently isolated but that its character and setting did not depend on its isolation. It was noted however that the north side of the cottage would be least affected by development although mitigation for SN4036 would still required. Development to the south of Pine Tree Cottage would have a greater impact on the significance of the setting of this listed building.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Red
Open Space	Green	No	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The is site connected to the A1066 and Diss via School Road. School Road narrows towards the southern end.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Visibility not achievable due limited frontage and presence of significant oak tree. Network a concern due to limited road width.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Impact on the LB to the north to be assessed by the heritage officer if the site progresses further.</p> <p>The site is separate from the existing built form of the settlement and would depend on the promoted sites to the north and west being brought forward. This would create an issue with timings if all were allocated – as development would need to be sequential.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site is possible from School Road but would need to break through a hedge. There is an existing footpath opposite the site along the school frontage. The footpath also extends further to the south.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	One dwelling to the north. Fields surrounding.	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)	Fence to the dwelling to the north, then hedge continuing. Hedge to road frontage and open boundary to the south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow along the site frontage which would likely be removed for access and visibility.	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)	None visible.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	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	Currently limited views in from road as there is a bank and a hedge. Would be views above the hedge as travel along School Road in a northerly direction.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>The site is well connected to the centre of the village and its services. There is a footpath connection to services in the village on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>The site is currently separate from the existing built form and would only be connected if the two fields being considered as preferred sites are allocated – sequential development would therefore need to be a consideration. Development of SN2054REVA would have an impact on the local landscape and require removal of a hedge. The impact on the listed building would need to be assessed as would the noted surface water flooding issue along the road if the site progresses.</p>	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No, although partners are in agreement.	Amber
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?	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** SN2054REVA a greenfield site. The site has been promoted at a larger scale than required but could be reduced in size to meet the VCHAP objectives. A number of constraints have been identified including the presence of a listed building adjacent to the site, a roadside hedgerow and an established oak tree. The impact of the identified surface water flowpath may need further consideration. Consideration would also need to be given to the sequential development (phasing) of sites in this location to avoid a disconnect between this site and the existing built form.

**Site Visit Observations** The site relates well to the existing facilities and services within Bressingham. Development of this site would only be considered acceptable in townscape terms if undertaken sequentially with the other sites currently preferred for development along School Road. There would be both a landscape and heritage impact arising from the development of this site – both on its own merits but also in combination with the current preferred allocation site SN2054REVA.

**Local Plan Designations** None

**Availability** The site is considered to be available for development however consideration would need to be given the phasing of development along School Road.

**Achievability** Delivery of SN2054REVA is considered to be achievable however both on- and off-site mitigation measures would need to be confirmed.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** SN2054REVA is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site and is not considered to be an appropriate option for allocation. Development of this site would have a detrimental impact on the significance of the setting of Pine Tree Cottage by virtue of wrapping around the property. In-combination effects with SN4036 would intensify this impact on the heritage asset. Further constraints include the loss of the frontage hedgerow and the potential impact on the oak tree to create a suitable access into the site. The site would have a poor relationship to the existing built form if not developed sequentially with SN4036 which could also impact on the delivery of this site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

## SN2056

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2056
Site address	Land at Fersfield Common, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.72ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for up to 10x dwellings (but subject to site constraints could accommodate a greater number)
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	Site has frontage; no local footpaths  <b>Highways score</b> – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or 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. No safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	The site is poorly connected to any services and is approximately 3.5km from Bressingham	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		(See above)	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Infrastructure availability to the site to be confirmed	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Proposed delivery area	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Approximately half the site is in an area at risk of surface water flooding, including at 1 in 30 year risk	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> )		Waveney Tributary Farmland	



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	ALC – Grade 3  The site is located in an open landscape with limited and sporadic built form in the immediate area only – development in this location would be prominent and have a harmful impact on the local landscape	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Minimal development in the surrounding area therefore the development would have an adverse impact on the townscape	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact upon protected species but the impact could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	LB to the west of the site  <b>HES – Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Surrounding road network is limited  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

**Site visit not undertaken as the site was ruled out at the HELAA stage of the site assessment process**

#### 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	None identified	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site would not represent sustainable development due to its remote location and distance from the local services. It is likely that local improvements would be required to the road network to allow safe vehicular movements. Development in this location would have an adverse impact on the local landscape due to the relatively limited built form in the immediate area. A significant proportion of the site is also shown to be at risk of surface water flooding, and whilst a smaller area of the site could be developed the other constraints identified would outweigh this.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site was considered an unreasonable alternative at the desktop assessment stage therefore a site visit was not undertaken.

### **Local Plan Designations**

There are no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

The land is considered to be available.

### **Achievability**

The land is considered to be achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE due to its unsustainable location. The site has limited access to services and facilities. Site is subject to surface water flood risk issues. Development of the site would have an adverse effect on local landscape due to limited built form in the immediate area. Concerns over suitability of local highway network.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 12 June 2020

## SN2057

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2057
Site address	North of A1066, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.2 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25dph = 30 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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access to A1066, also serving adjacent barns. NCC to confirm acceptability of enlarged access onto main road and impact on network  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	900m walk to primary school  Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall, public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known ground stability issues but site is within hazardous installations consultation zone	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Small area of identified SW flood risk in south-west corner.	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> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland  ALC Grade unknown	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development would cause harm to designated heritage assets to east and south (church). Query whether harm could be mitigated  <b>HES – Amber score</b>	Amber/red?
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber/red?
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development likely to cause harm to setting of LB and curtilage-listed barns on eastern boundary and to St Johns Church to south. Seek comment from technical officer if the site is to be considered as a Reasonable Alternative	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access from main road. NCC to assess intensification of use of access onto A1066	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat site but elevated from road	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow (including trees) to south, west and east. Northern boundary open to larger parcel of land	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along southern and eastern boundaries.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Site is within hazardous installations consultation zone. Consult HSE if the site is to be considered as a Reasonable Alternative.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visually contained from views along main road. Open in views to and from site to north	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Relatively well connected to existing services. Development likely to be constrained by heritage issues, highways and river valley designation so unlikely to achieve sufficient level of development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley	Site frontage only. Policy DM4.5 relevant	
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same. No further evidence requested at this time.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm re. highways requirements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

It is constrained by heritage issues, highways issues and the River Valley designation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Relatively well connected to existing services. Development likely to be constrained by heritage issues, highways and river valley designation so unlikely to achieve sufficient level of development. Not suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside. Partially within designated river valley.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is relatively well connected to existing services. However, development will be constrained by the need to protect the setting of nearby listed buildings, potential highways issues and the landscape concerns due to its position in a designated River Valley. Site is unlikely to achieve a level of development that would make it suitable for allocation.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

## SN2079

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2079
Site address	Land at Fersfield Road/ Folly Lane, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land - unallocated
Planning History	2006/1396 – outline pp refused for 9x dwellings (limited information submitted to support the proposal but considered to be a sustainable location for development)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.94ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation <i>(but promoted for 9 dwellings only and would therefore be considered as a SL extension if an increased number of dwellings is not suitable on the site)</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 9 dwellings but could potentially accommodate a greater number subject to onsite constraints
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Green	<p>Site frontage to Fersfield Road, a single track road which widens along the frontage of the site; site is in close proximity to crossroads; existing footpath on opposite side of Fersfield Road ; footpath on opposite side of Fersfield Rd</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> – Amber. Subject to highway conditions in planning application to widen carriageway and provide a footway to the school.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Access to services including primary school, public house, village hall</p> <p>Primary School – approximately 300m</p> <p>Public House – approximately 1000m</p> <p>Shop – approximately 495m</p>	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village Hall, Playground – approximately 495m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Available – no known issues. The site promoter advises all available with the exception of a gas supply to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site has no identified contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small area of surface water flooding to west of site  NB. Earlier public consultation comments refer to surface water run off passing over the site from the land to the north	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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC – Grade 3  The site is next to and opposite existing development which would mitigate its impact on the landscape setting	Green
Townscape	Green	Continuation of the existing built form – appears to be a ‘rounding off’ of the settlement	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably be mitigated. The site is bound on two sides by highway.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	War memorial opposite the site  <b>HES</b> – Amber score	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Impact of crossroads on highway safety to be assessed by highways  <b>Highways score</b> – Green. Subject to highway conditions in planning application to widen carriageway and provide a footway to the school.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No significant impact on the historic environment (although note war memorial opposite the site)	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be achievable onto Fersfield Road however would need highways comments regarding proximity to the crossroads; Fersfield Road widens closest to the crossroads and there is an existing pedestrian footpath on the opposite side of the road	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site rises to the north fairly significantly –when approaching the site in a southerly direction along Folly Lane the existing houses along Fersfield Road are not significantly visible	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open boundaries around the site on all sides	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential ditch along the southern boundary (road frontage) however this was overgrown at the time of the site visit	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable

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	The site is very open and prominent in the surrounding landscape. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on the gateway entrance to Bressingham from Folly Lane, Fersfield Road and School Road	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 occupies a prominent position within the local landscape and development in this location could have an adverse impact on the surrounding area. The site is well connected and is in a sustainable location.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	No conflicting LP designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

Subject to the comments of the technical consultees, in particular highways and the landscape officer, the site is considered suitable for development, potentially of a scale greater than it has been promoted for. Local concerns have previously been raised about the potential for surface water run off towards the existing dwellings to the south of Fersfield Road.

### Site Visit Observations

The site is prominent within the local landscape due to the topography of the land and development of the site would have an adverse impact on the local landscape. There are no significant existing boundary features. Dwellings opposite the site are a combination of one- and two-storey properties and due to the falling land levels these are less obtrusive in the landscape. Development of this site would create a hard edge to settlement when viewed from School Road, Fersfield Road and Folly Lane – existing views from School Road and Fersfield Road are of tree belts in the distance.

### Local Plan Designations

No conflicts identified with the Local Plan designations.

### Availability

The site is considered to be available.

### Achievability

This site is considered to be achievable.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to **UNREASONABLE** due to the adverse landscape impact development of this site would have on the local setting. The site is relatively well connected to existing services. However, development will be constrained by the need to protect the setting of nearby listed buildings, potential highways issues and the landscape concerns due to its position in a designated River Valley. Site is unlikely to achieve a level of development that would make it suitable for allocation.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

## SN3010

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3010
Site address	Wyevale Garden Centre
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions relating to previous use as garden centre and associated uses
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.6 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site (for residential)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 80 dwellings= 31 dph  (25 dph = 65 dwellings)
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Potential access constraints to creating enlarged access and additional movements on A1066. NCC to confirm.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Primary School</li><li>○ Secondary school</li><li>○ Local healthcare services</li><li>○ Retail services</li><li>○ Local employment opportunities</li><li>○ Peak-time public transport</li></ul>	Amber	1.2 km walk to primary school – no footpath  Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough. Bus stops close 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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Previous use may result in contamination issues	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Risk of SW flooding in SW section of site	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Rural River Valley and Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have detrimental impact on heritage assets	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated	Amber/red?
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Horticulture/employment. Issues of compatibility could be reasonably mitigated	Amber



#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on LB to west should be assessed	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Highway frontage may allow new access. NCC to confirm feasibility of new access and increased movements on A1066	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Existing employment use (garden centre). Loss of employment contrary to local plan policy	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Horticulture/employment. Issues of compatibility could be addressed through design.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Eastern and southern boundaries open to adjoining sites. Intermittent hedgerow and trees to north and west.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along northern boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Previous use may result in contamination. Overhead lines near eastern side of site.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from main road and from open land to south and east.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Loss of employment. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not considered suitable for allocation due to loss of employment and issues of townscape and landscape in the designated river valley, highways and connectivity. Heritage issues would also constrain development.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Loss of employment. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside and designated river valley.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE**. The site is poorly related to core services within the settlement and this is reinforced by the separation resulting from the main road. The site would result in a loss of employment. Development of the whole site would be outside the scale proposed by the VCHAP but smaller scale development would result in piecemeal development in an unsustainable location.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

## SN3019SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3019SL
Site address	Land west of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.49 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	SL extension <i>(but could the site be extended by 0.1ha to allow for it to be considered as an allocation?)</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 5-10 dwellings (Site could accommodate 12 dwellings at 25 dwellings/ha)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Green	On site check required re. footpath provision; road frontage  <b>Highways score</b> – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Access to school, public house, village hall  Primary School – approximately 125m  Bus Service – approximately 945m  Shop – approximately 530m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall and play area – approximately 530m  Public House – approximately 650m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints – the site promoter has confirmed availability of most services (excluding gas) to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Fibre technology is already available in this area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding – this forms the site frontage	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALV – Grade 3  The site extends the settlement in a linear pattern further into the open countryside, outside of the existing built form	Green
Townscape	Green	Continuation of existing built form along School Road - a linear pattern that is in keeping with the settlement; does not appear to extend the settlement to a detrimental degree  <b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer –</b> Amber. This would continue the development on this side of the road with linear development which is very characteristic of Bressingham.  There is no existing hedgerow, but being peripheral and an entry to the village, re-establishment of hedgerow and setting building back from road with access drive may be beneficial to the more rural character of the settlement. Plot boundary line does appear to be drawn to allow scope for this. Don't want it to be too urban. Setting building back would also benefit setting of LB opposite	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No anticipated impact however any impact could be mitigated	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	<p>LB opposite site and to south (Pine Tree Cottage and The Spinney)</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Amber. The Setting of Pine Tree Cottage would be affected but agree that suitable development would not result in significant harm if well designed/good materials. The house faces away from the road and has quite an immediate setting. Setting should be mentioned in allocation to ensure better design and materials.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber score</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Views of Highways required – GNLP HELAA noted an amber score in this category</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to north; open fields to south and west	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	LB opposite the site but do not consider that it would have a significant impact on its setting – check with LB Officer  Development of this site could be read as an extension of the recent development at Pascoe Place with a suitable site layout	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Yes – access directly from School Road and an existing footpath already extends along the site frontage	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is undulating and rises to the north and west- consideration would need to be given to the building heights to address this (e.g., the western-most dwelling at Pascoe Place is single storey)	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No significant boundaries around the site to the west – no natural site delineation. An access track to a water pump installation forms the southern boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	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)	There is a water pump to the south west of the site (adjacent to the site)	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	The site currently forms part of the gateway into the village on the approach from School Road and has a pleasant open aspect however it is immediately adjacent to the existing boundary of the village	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is well connected and relates well to the settlement. Development of this site would not have a significant impact on the nearby listed buildings although due to the topography of the land it would be prominent within the landscape. With an appropriate design and layout, the development of this site would continue the existing built form along School Road without significantly encroaching further into the surrounding landscape.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	No conflicting LP designations identified	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – not requested or submitted	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?	As promoted the site size would fall below the required size for affordable housing delivery. The site promoter would need to confirm that a larger number is viable and would deliver the required affordable housing contribution on this site.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

If the site is extended by 0.1ha or is shown to accommodate 12 dwellings then it would be suitable for a site allocation however the site is not considered appropriate as a settlement limit extension as it would encroach further southwards along School Road.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is well related and connected to the centre of the settlement and there is an existing footpath provision. Access is achievable from School Road. The site would be read in the context of the existing development at Pascoe Place which would reduce its visual intrusion into the landscape. The topography of the site, however, means that it may be appropriate to include single or 1.5 storey dwellings to the west of the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting Local Plan designations identified.

### **Availability**

The site is considered to be available.

### **Achievability**

The promoter has not confirmed whether affordable housing could be delivered on the site as it has been promoted for a smaller number of dwellings at this time. For this reason, the site has scored a red rating in this category.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site was initially promoted as a settlement limit extension, however as it is of a scale that is only just below the nominal 0.5ha allocation threshold it has been identified suitable as an allocation. The site is well related and connected to the centre of the settlement where there is an existing footpath provision. Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding, however this forms the site frontage.

**Preferred Site:** Yes (as an allocation)

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

## SN3020

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3020
Site address	Land west of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.69ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 10 dwellings <i>(therefore below required number for allocation but the site could potentially be extended to 12 dwellings)</i>
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Green	<p>Check local footpath provision on site visit; road frontage access</p> <p><b>Highways score</b> – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school. Would need to be allocated with SN3019</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><b>Part 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Local services include: school, public house, village hall</p> <p>Primary School – approximately 274m</p> <p>Bus Service – approximately 950m</p> <p>Shop – approximately 670m</p>	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Public House – approximately 490m  Village Hall, Playground – approximately 670m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No anticipated issues	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Provision already available within the area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding – this forms the site frontage	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> )		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC – Grade 3  The site appears to be a prominent addition in the landscape	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site would be prominent in the local landscape and separated from the main area of the settlement by an undeveloped parcel of land (SN3019). If SN3019 is not allocated development of this site would have an adverse impact on the townscape due to the continued linear development of the settlement.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may have an adverse impact but this could be subject to mitigation measures.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II LB (The Spinney) adj to southern boundary of the site. Views of the heritage officer to be sought  <b>HES</b> – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of recreational space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Advice of highways required re. impact on local road network, including A1066 to south.  <b>Highways score</b> – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school. would need to be allocated with SN3019.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to south; agricultural land to north and west	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Limited impact on the LB and this could be mitigated by design/ layout.  The site is detached from the settlement with a parcel of land (promoted as SN3019SL) between this site and the existing development at Pascoe Place	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from the site frontage onto School Road; the existing footpath stops before the site boundary begins but could potentially be extended within the site boundary	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The land rises to the north (towards the main settlement)	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site boundaries are minimal and the site forms part of a larger agricultural field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	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)	There is a water pump adjacent to the north west corner of the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views across the site and this forms part of the approach into the main centre of the village	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	There is good connectivity to the site and it is well located in terms of access to the available services in the village however the site is separated from the existing built by a small parcel of land and this could result in an uncomfortable relationship if this site comes forward in terms of its impact on the local landscape, particularly due to it forming one of the gateways into the village.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	No conflicting LP designations identified	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No additional evidence requested/ submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	If highways request works – otherwise none anticipated	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	The number of dwellings on the site has been promoted below the affordable housing threshold. The promoter would need to confirm viability if the number of dwellings is increased.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is considered to be suitable for development, subject to the comments of the technical consultees.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is well connected but would not relate well to the existing built form due to its separation from this by another parcel of land (SN3019). The site lies on one of the key approaches into the village and would therefore have an impact on the overall setting of Bressingham, particularly due to the open landscape and the topography of the land.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting Local Plan designations identified.

### **Availability**

The site is considered to be available.

### **Achievability**

The site has been promoted for 10 dwellings and has therefore scored a red rating as it falls below the affordable housing threshold for delivery.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** due to its poor relationship with- (separation from-) the existing settlement. The site is separated from and therefore has poor relationship with the existing settlement. Consequently, development of this site is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the local landscape setting and character and appearance of the area. This impact would be particularly significant if the adjacent site is not considered to be a reasonable option.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

## SN3023SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3023SL
Site address	South of Darrow Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.33 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified  (25 dph = 19 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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Access onto Darrow Lane requiring improvement  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	2km walk to primary school. No continuous footpath  Limited retail services within 1800m  Limited bus service to Diss	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW 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> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland  ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would have no detrimental impact on any designated heritage assets  <b>HES - Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Any potential impact on local network could be reasonably mitigated  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Visibility likely to be achievable with loss of hedgerow. NCC to confirm impact on capacity of narrow lane	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant. Last use for outside storage.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow including trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along boundaries and within site	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is visually contained by established landscaping and neighbouring residential curtilages	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Small site separated from development boundary and isolated from services by poor walking environment. Issues relating to highways, residential amenity and trees likely to constrain development. Not likely to achieve required numbers so not suitable for allocation	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted. Proposing bungalow development	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Site Visit Observations

Small site, separated from development boundary and isolated from services by poor walking environment. Issues relating to highways, residential amenity and trees likely to constrain development. Not likely to achieve required numbers so not suitable for allocation.

### Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside.

### Availability

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

### Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

**Unreasonable** –The site is isolated from, and poorly related/connected to the existing settlement. There are further Identified constraints including highway and amenity issues and landscape (tree) constraints.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

## SN3036

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3036
Site address	South of Low Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions relating to previous use as plant nursery and aquatics centre
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.89 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Allocated site (for residential-led mixed use)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	21 dph (approximately 40 dwellings)
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Potential access constraints to creating enlarged access and additional movements on A1066. NCC to confirm.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	1.3 km walk to primary school – no footpath  Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough. Bus stops 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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Previous use may result in contamination issues	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW 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	Rural River Valley and Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have detrimental impact on heritage assets  HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated	Amber/red?
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Horticulture/employment. Issues of compatibility could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Well distanced from any heritage assets so no direct impacts identified	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access in separate ownership. Highway frontage may allow new access. CC to confirm feasibility of new access and increased movements on A1066	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant. Previously in horticultural use	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Horticulture/employment. Issues of compatibility could be addressed through design.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Western and southern boundaries open to adjoining sites. Hedgerow and trees to north and east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along eastern boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Previous use may result in contamination. Overhead lines cut across western side of site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from main road and from open land to south	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is considered unsuitable. The site is poorly related to the main settlement and is constrained by highways issues.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation of a reduced area at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside and designated river valley.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is detached from the main settlement and separated from it by the A1066. This results in a poor relationship with resultant detrimental impacts on the landscape and character and appearance of the area and diminished access to services and facilities. The site is potentially constrained by highways issues.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 19 June 2020

## SN3037

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3037
Site address	North of Low Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Small scale development associated with horticulture 1979 – LV overhead lines
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	6.47 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	23 dph  (approximately 148 dwellings)
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Potential access constraints to creating enlarged access and additional movements on A1066. NCC to confirm.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	800m walk to primary school – no footpath  Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough. Bus stops close 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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Previous use may result in contamination issues	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Areas of identified SW flood risk in centre of site and along southern boundary.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Rural River Valley and Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC Grade TBC	



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of LB but impact could be reasonably mitigated  HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site opposite entrance to Bressingham Hall and other LBs in vicinity. Impact on setting to be assessed	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Multiple site accesses from A1066. NCC to confirm feasibility of new access and increased movements on main road	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Horticulture. Much of site does not appear in use	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/agriculture - compatible	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat but elevated from main road	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and planted hedge to north, west and east	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some significant trees at entrance/boundaries. Constructed pond at northern end which may now have ecological value	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)	Previous use may result in contamination. Overhead lines.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views from main road. Visually contained in views to/from other directions	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Poorly related to important core services. Development likely to be constrained by highways and townscape issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is considered unsuitable. The site is poorly connected and does not relate well to the main settlement. It is also constrained by highways and townscape issues.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Poorly related to important core services. Development likely to be constrained by highways and townscape issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside and designated river valley .

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is not well connected to the main settlement, nor does the site relate well physically to the main settlement. This results in detrimental impacts on the landscape and character and appearance of the area and diminished access to services. The site is likely to be constrained by highways issues.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 19 June 2020

## SN3038

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3038
Site address	South of High Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.33 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 21 dph (Up to 49 dwellings)
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Potential access constraints to creating enlarged access and additional movements on A1066. NCC to confirm.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	1.4 km walk to primary school – no footpath  Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough. Bus stops close 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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Previous use may result in contamination issues	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Small area of identified SW flood risk in south west corner	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Rural River Valley and Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland  ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB but could be reasonably mitigated  <b>HES – Amber score</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Horticulture/residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB to north if the site is to be progressed as a Reasonable Alternative	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access in separate ownership. Highway frontage may allow new access. NCC to confirm feasibility of new access and increased movements on A1066	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant. Previously in horticultural use	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Horticulture/residential - compatible	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and trees to west and north. Open boundaries to east and south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along western boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Previous use may result in contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from main road and from open land to south and east	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is unsuitable. The site is poorly connected and is constrained by highways issues. The separation of the site from the main settlement is reinforced by the A1066 which acts as a barrier between the two.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside and designated river valley.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

Access issues may impact on achievability (see clarifications).

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is detached from the main settlement and separated from it by the A1066. This results in a poor relationship with resultant detrimental impacts on the landscape and character and appearance of the area and diminished access to services and facilities. The site is potentially constrained by highways issues.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 19 June 2020

## SN4026

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4026
Site address	Land east of Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8ha
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	18dph 12-15 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	Single track road; no pedestrian footpath; site has road frontage  Highways score – Green	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Primary school – c. 2km  Access to village shop - approximately 1690 metres from the 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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall and playing field – approximately 1690 metres from the site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Unknown - assumed key utilities are available as the sites is adjacent to existing dwellings however this has not been confirmed as part of the site promotion	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within a planned delivery area	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No identified contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk  <b>LLFA score</b> – Green (standard planning information required)	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> )		Waveney Tributary Farmland	



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC – Grade 3 Frontage development would continue the linear form of development on the opposite side of Darrow Lane, although it would further extend the settlement.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Separated from the main settlement; development in this part of the village is linear in form and sporadic	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated  <b>NCC Ecology score</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on the historic environment  <b>HES</b> – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Impact to be checked with Highways	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?	No impact on historic environment but the site is located some distance from the centre of the settlement and whilst there is some linear development along Common Rd, development in this location would have an adverse impact on the wider setting	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Vehicular access into the site would be achievable – although would require the removal of the hedgerow. 30mph speed limit would likely need to be extended and the road is between 1.5-2 car widths. There is no existing pedestrian footpath and limited footpath provision into the main village	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural – no issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally a level site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow along the site frontage but no significant trees – hedgerow would require removal for access	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Not seen on site visit – ditches may have been overgrown	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable

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	Development on the site would be prominent due to the open nature of the site and the surrounding landscape. Development in this location would result in a 'hard edge' in what is otherwise a rural setting	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of this site is not considered acceptable due to the impact of the development on both the townscape and the landscape setting.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	No conflicting LP designations identified	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Unknown	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?	A timescale has not been provided but it has been indicated that it would be soon after allocation.	Amber

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Based on the desktop exercise the site is generally considered to be acceptable for development, subject to the technical consultee comments. Issues noted include poor linkages to the main settlement and the future connection to Broadband.

### **Site Visit Observations**

For the reasons set out above the site visit observations concluded that the site is not considered to be appropriate for development. In summary, the site is considered to be poorly connected, and development of this site would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations identified.

### **Availability**

The land is considered to be available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is considered to be achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is detached and poorly connected to the main settlement. This diminishes access to services and facilities. The site is prominent within the landscape and its development would result in a hard edge in what is an otherwise rural setting. This results in detrimental impacts on the landscape. Highway concerns have been identified.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

## SN4033

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4033
Site address	Rear of 34 Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.54 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (ee) Allocated site (ff) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified  (25 dph = 14 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access is very narrow and in separate ownership. NCC to assess potential access via no. 34  <b>Highways score</b> – Green.	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	1.3 km walk to primary school. No continuous footpath  Limited retail services within 1800m  Limited bus service to Diss	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW flood risk  <b>LLFA score</b> – Green (standard planning information required)	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> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland  ALC Grade TBC	



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated  <b>NCC Ecology score</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Development would have no detrimental impact on any designated heritage assets  <b>HES</b> – Amber score	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Any potential impact on local network could be reasonably mitigated  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts identified	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Improvement of existing narrow access does not appear feasible. NCC to assess proposal to take access through plot of 34	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential garden	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/ AW pumping station/grazing	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Residential curtilages to west and south. Hedgerow and trees to north and east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Large number of trees within site including oak. Would significantly reduce developable area	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 but AW pumping station to east. AW owns existing narrow access	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is visually contained with limited views in and out.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Reasonably well connected to services. No continuous footpath – this is feature of this settlement. Issues relating to highways, residential amenity and trees likely to constrain development. Not likely to achieve required numbers so not suitable for allocation	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted. Proposing bungalow development	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is unsuitable; constrained by issues relating to highways, residential amenity and landscaping.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Reasonably well connected to services. No continuous footpath – this is feature of this settlement. Issues relating to highways, residential amenity and trees likely to constrain development. Not likely to achieve required numbers; not suitable for allocation.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Within open countryside; no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No additional constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE** – Whilst the site is reasonably well located to services in distance terms there is no continuous footpath, which diminishes accessibility. The site is constrained by issues relating to highways, residential amenity and landscaping (trees).

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

SN4037

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4037
Site address	Land to the south of Fersfield Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.29ha
Promoted Site Use, including (gg) Allocated site (hh) SL extension	Allocated site for up to 20 dwellings with POS, landscaping and infrastructure
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12-20 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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Site frontage adjoins Fersfield Road a single track road; drainage ditch along site frontage; no existing footpath provision  <b>Highway score</b> – Green	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Access to services including primary school, public house, village hall  Primary School – approximately 300m  Bus stop – approximately 265m  Village Shop – approximately 495m	

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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village Hall, Playground – approximately 495m  Public House – approximately 1000m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The site promoter has advised ‘unknown’ however the site is adjacent to existing development and it is anticipated that infrastructure would be available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Provision already available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No identified contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small area of surface water flooding identified in south west corner of the site  <b>LLFA score</b> – Green (standard planning 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



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC - Grade 3  Development of the site appears to have limited impact on the landscape when viewed from the east or west. The landscape impact from the north and south may be an issue.	Amber
Townscape	Green	PROW adjacent to the western boundary of the site; infill plot between existing residential properties; adjacent development is linear in form however it also extends along onto School Road; Poplar Farm has a number of agricultural buildings on the site.  <b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> - Bressingham is predominantly linear development, and this would result in some clustering. However, at some point linear development becomes detrimental and inefficient, and perhaps the time has come for clustering. farm complex is to west so rear plot line already created. This site will have less impact on existing residents in terms of views/relationship to open countryside – although views are quite expansive compared to SN3019. Restablishing a hedgerow to the lane would be good.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<b>NCC Ecology score</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>LB Poplar Farm adjacent to the western boundary of the site</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Amber. The LB is in a relatively big plot and existing thick landscaping will separate it from the development. Landscaping and appropriate materials/building design can mitigate harm, particularly along the frontage.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber score</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>HA to advise on local road network</p> <p><b>LOCAL CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, educational and agricultural land use	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	LB to the north-west of the site is currently well screened behind trees.  The site sits between existing residential properties although it is at the edge of the settlement. It can also be seen on the approach north along School Road.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The site has a road frontage but the road width is narrow (single car) and there is no existing pedestrian access along the site boundary (although the existing pathway could potentially be extended within the site boundary)	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Scrub land	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, agricultural and education (school playing field)	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site appears to be level although there was dense vegetation across the site so unable to confirm this on the site visit	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	At the time of the site visit the site was bounded by an overgrown PROW and tall trees to the west and vegetation to the east	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is densely covered with vegetation – a mix of large shrubs and small trees. There is an existing tree along the site frontage which would likely need to be removed to allow for safe access and/or visibility. Whilst the tree may not be significant it would be a loss in the landscape. The vegetation covered the ditches but there appeared to be ditches along the northern 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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is between two residential properties and due to the surrounding trees the visual impact of development when viewed from Fersfield Road would be minimised. Due to the local topography, development of the site would be visible on the approach north along School Road but this would be viewed within the context of the existing development at Pascoe Place. Loss of the existing vegetation across the site would be necessary in order to develop this site.	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is well connected to the main areas of the settlement and there is potential to join the existing footpath provision. Whilst development would be visible in the landscape from different approaches this would be read in the context of the existing built form and would not be detrimental to the local landscape. Existing vegetation currently provides screening between the site at the adjacent LB.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	No conflicting LP designations	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private – multiple site owners	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Enquiries received but the site is not being actively marketed	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Subject to the comments of the technical consultees, the site is considered to be suitable for development. In particular the comments of the highways department and the heritage officer will be key to determining the overall suitability of this site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is well related to the main centre of Bressingham and existing footpath provision could potentially be extended to allow for safe pedestrian access. A small development in this location could relate well to the existing built form and from School Road would be viewed in the context of existing development at Pascoe Place. The loss of the tree along the site frontage would likely be necessary for safe vehicular access and this would be regrettable in terms of the local landscape.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations identified.

### **Availability**

The site is considered to be available.

### **Achievability**

The site is considered to be achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site relates well to the existing settlement and would not have a detrimental impact on the landscape or townscape. It is anticipated that other constraints identified could be subject to suitable mitigation measures.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

SN5009

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5009
Site address	Land between 105 and 117 Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside settlement boundary
Planning History	2020/0453/PIP for 2 self-build homes, refused 03/04/2020.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	4.1
Promoted Site Use, including (ii) Allocated site (jj) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 12-18 dwellings  (102 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	<p>Frontage to road. No existing pedestrian footpaths or street lighting.</p> <p>Bressingham Footpath 7 and 9 both cross the site north-south and east-west which would reduce the developable area.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Not feasible to provide safe access remote from local facilities, no footpath to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Red
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><b>Part 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary school; 1,900m</p> <p>Access to village shop - approximately 1, 460m from the site</p> <p>Limited bus service to Diss</p>	N/A



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village hall and playing field – approximately 1,400m from the site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known infrastructure constraints  <b>Environment Agency:</b> (Foul Water Capacity) Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown but likely to be available due to proximity to existing development	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No evidence of contamination of ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1  High risk of surface water flooding along road frontage and within site close to road because of pond adjacent to south. Also small area to north within the site and an area just outside the entire western boundary where there is a pond.  <b>LLFA:</b> Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Flood risk is minor, localised ponding to the site boundary. The site is within proximity of anecdotal external flooding records held by the LLFA.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> (Flood Risk) Green	Green

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 Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is large but well contained, more so along the frontage. It would mean the loss of a valuable piece of open green space within this part of the settlement which would be to the detriment of its setting.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is separated from the main settlement and is located in a gap between existing dwellings. There is a more concentrated group opposite however development is generally linear and is sporadic, particularly on this side of Common Road.  The size of the proposed site would be out of scale and character with this looser and more rural part of Bressingham. A reduced site area would be possible but would still result in a significant townscape impact.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Habitat present in hedges and trees. Also several ponds and drains around the site which are likely to provide a valuable network for wildlife to move between which would be reduced if the site was developed.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ - housing and water discharge not listed as triggers requiring Natural England consultation. Pond adjacent to boundary - site in amber great crested newt risk zone. Not in GI corridor.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No close heritage assets.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Common Road is restricted.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Not feasible to provide safe access remote from local facilities, no footpath to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on historic environment but the site is located some distance from the centre of the settlement and whilst there is some linear development along Common Rd, development in this location and of this size would be out of character with the wider setting. A reduced scale of development would be possible on this site but would have also a detrimental townscape impact.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Vehicular access into the site would be achievable –the hedgerow is not continuous. The road is narrow, between 1.5-2 car widths. There is no existing pedestrian footpath and limited footpath provision into the main village.  Two footpaths crossing the site.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Pasture land, undeveloped.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential on frontage and agricultural to west. Livestock buildings to northern boundary, would need to check compatibility.	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)	Broken and immature hedge to frontage, with trees to north which are prominent in the street scene. Significant hedge and tree boundaries on all other sides.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Boundary hedges/trees.  No significant trees/hedges within the site.	N/A

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.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views into the site from the roadside are limited apart from at frontage where the hedge is not continuous. Public views both in and out of the site from the footpaths crossing the site therefore there would be a landscape and visual impact arising from this development.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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 too large for area but could be reduced in area. However, development of this site is not considered acceptable (even at a reduced scale) due to the impact of the development on both the townscape and the wider landscape setting. Isolated from services by poor walking environment. Issues relating to highways, also concerns about surface water flooding and possible habitat fragmentation.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
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)	Highway improvements (to be confirmed if the site progresses)	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is excessive in size and would not meet the objectives of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in scale to meet the identified criteria and reduce the visual impact of development in this location. The site is separated from the main areas of the settlement and is poorly connected to the existing services and facilities. The existing highway network and lack of connectivity is considered to be a constraint of this site. Two footpaths have been identified as crossing the site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is separate from the main areas of settlement and is poorly connected to the main areas of development in Bressingham. Development of the site at the scale proposed would not be appropriate in this location and would have a significant townscape and landscape impact. A smaller scale development would also have a significant impact due to the rural context. The road network is narrow. Footpaths cross the site and there would be a visual impact arising from development of the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

None

### **Availability**

The site is considered to be available

### **Achievability**

The site is considered to be achievable but would require both on-site and off-site highways mitigation measures to make it acceptable which could impact on the viability of the site.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. The site has been considered both at the larger scale it was originally promoted for and a smaller scale development that would meet the objectives of the VCHAP. However, the site is not considered appropriate in either form due to the landscape and townscape impact that would result and it's poor connectivity to the existing facilities and services within Bressingham. The site would be reliant on a narrow road network that does not benefit from pedestrian footpaths.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

## SN5021

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5021
Site address	Land north of High Road and east of Folly Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1
Promoted Site Use, including (kk) Allocated site (ll) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 20 dwellings  (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	Amber	<p>The site is accessed via Folly Lane which is a national speed limit road. Folly Lane is single track with no passing places nearby. The site is in close proximity to High Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access subject to demonstrating satisfactory visibility. Network subject to demonstrating land adjacent to Folly Lane available for highway improvement including widening &amp; footway and demonstrating acceptable visibility at Folly La / High Road junction.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Primary School – 400m</p> <p>Shop – 595m</p> <p>Bus stop – c. 50m</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village Hall, Playground – 595m  Public House – 1,100m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Adjacent to existing development therefore utilities infrastructure likely to be available however this would need to be confirmed.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site is within an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Undeveloped agricultural land with no known contamination or ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1.  Surface water flooding along Folly Lane. No issues on site.  <b>LLFA:</b> Green. At risk of surface water flooding. Flood risk is very minor, localised flooding to the site boundary. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> 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>  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	E2 Great Moulton Plateau Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	The site is next to existing development but it encroaches into the undeveloped landscape to the north. It would have a significant detrimental impact.	Red
Townscape	Red	It does not respect the linear form of development of the village and is out of character. It would have an adverse impact on the village.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Limited habitat as agricultural field with limited hedge boundaries.  <b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Green. SSSI IRZ - housing and water discharge not listed as triggers requiring Natural England consultation. Pond adjacent to boundary - site in green great crested newt risk zone. Ponds within 250m of boundary - site arable field. Not in Green Infrastructure corridor.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets.  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Restricted width of Folly Lane with no passing places but close to junction. No foot path but close to village facilities.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access subject to demonstrating satisfactory visibility. Network subject to demonstrating land adjacent to Folly Lane is available for highway improvements including widening &amp; footway and demonstrating acceptable visibility at Folly La / High Road junction.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture and residential.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on any heritage assets but a significant impact on the townscape as it is completely out of character with the existing form of linear development along High Road. Land also gently rises to the north meaning development would be more visible.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No existing access but has road frontage and no hedge would be lost.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture – monoculture.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture on all sides except to the south where there is a row of bungalows fronting High Road.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Slope south to north.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to fields with mainly fenced rear boundaries to dwellings on south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited as it is an arable field with few if any natural features.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Wide views from all sides as it is currently open. Would be some private views from dwellings to south.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Do not consider development in this location would be in keeping with the surrounding pattern of development and it would have a severe impact in the landscape.  Concerns regarding the adequacy of Folly Road.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
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)	Likely highway improvements including road widening, footpath.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated that 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 is considered to be suitable for residential development. The site is adjacent to the existing development along High Road but would result in a breakout to the north of the existing dwellings. The site is well related to existing services and facilities. The site is in close proximity to High Road but access would be required off Folly Road which is constrained.

**Site Visit Observations** Development on this site would be prominent in the landscape due to the open views to the north and west of the site. Development of this site would also represent a significant departure from the linear development currently in evidence along High Road and would impact on the gateway to the village when approaching from both Folly Road to the north and Fersfield Road to the west. Folly Road is narrow and access may be problematic. Dwellings closest to the promoted site are single storey in height.

**Local Plan Designations** None

**Availability** The site is available for development

**Achievability** The site is considered to be achievable but would require highways mitigation measures which may impact on the viability of the site.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. Development on this site would be very prominent within an open landscape, and this would be exacerbated by the land rising to the north along Folly Lane. Development of the site would also have a detrimental impact on the existing townscape, being in conflict with the existing linear pattern of development along High Road. Although the site is close to the High Road/ Fersfield Road junction the site would be accessed via Folly Lane which as a single width carriageway poses a significant constraint to the development of this site. The site is therefore not considered to be suitable for allocation.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022



## SN5022

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5022
Site address	Land east of Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Several applications for retention of a caravan, polytunnels and netting, most recently 2007/1620.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.03
Promoted Site Use, including (mm) Allocated site (nn) SL extension	Allocated site – 1 occupational dwelling for small holding owner (Due to its size this site could only be considered as a settlement limit extension)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1
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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Green	Current access to the small holding is along a lane to the north of 46 Common Road.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. See SN4033 - no independent access.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	1,400m walk to primary school. No continuous footpath  Limited retail services within 1,900m  Limited bus service to Diss	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"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Sports/rec facilities within 1,900m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Not known; would need to be confirmed.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises that mains water is already connected to site. Connection to the electrical grid, mains foul sewer appear achievable as these services are located close by however this would need to be confirmed.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW flood risk  <b>LLFA:</b> Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green	Green

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 Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B4: Waveney tributary farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Land is flat, currently in cultivation with tree belt to west. Only one dwelling proposed which would be screened within existing small holding, therefore limited impact.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Would not be in keeping with the linear pattern of development along Common Road. Site would be separated from the existing settlement limit by intervening land (rejected site SN4033) and is not a logical extension to an existing settlement limit.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations Land is farmed as a small holding, there will be some habitat but unlikely to have a significant affect.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ - housing and water discharge not listed as triggers requiring Natural England consultation. Ponds within 250m of boundary and site in amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in Green Infrastructure corridor.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets affected</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>One dwelling would have a minimal impact on local network.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. See SN4033 - no independent access.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

**\*\*Site not considered suitable as a settlement limit extension based on desktop assessment therefore site visit not undertaken \*\***

#### 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		Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)  Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:	Site not being put forward as open market housing, it is with the intention of providing a dwelling for the owner to manage the small holding.	N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown – unlikely given small size of site	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No – site area does not trigger requirement	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 as an allocation but as a small site for one self-build dwelling. As such the site is not considered suitable for allocation. Whilst the site lies within proximity of an existing settlement limit it is separated by an intervening parcel of land which has been assessed as being unsuitable for allocation within the VCHAP – as a result the site is disconnected from the existing settlement limit. Access to the site appears to be constrained.

### **Site Visit Observations**

A site visit was not undertaken for this site as it was considered to be an unreasonable extension to the settlement limit based on a desktop assessment of the site in Part 3 of the assessment.

### **Local Plan Designations**

None

### **Availability**

The site is considered to be available for development.

### **Achievability**

Overall it is considered unlikely that the site could be achieved due to the access constraints that have been identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is too small to allocate and is not adjacent to an existing settlement limit to be reasonably be considered as an extension to the existing settlement limit. In addition an intervening parcel of land that was also promoted has been rejected and the site would therefore be an isolated single dwelling located in the open countryside. Access to the site also appears to be a constraint to its development.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

SN5024

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5024
Site address	Land west of Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2006/1721/F for 9 dwellings refused 01/08/2006. 2002/1721/F for 36 dwellings refused 29/12/2003.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.79 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (oo) Allocated site (pp) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	20 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>The site has a road frontage but this has a mature hedge along it as well as two TPOs. The site promoter is proposing two accesses, but these will have a significant impact on the hedge. No continuous footpath connecting the site to the existing services and facilities within the village.</p> <p>Footpath 7 along rear boundary and Footpath 8 across the road to east.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Not feasible to provide safe access remote from local facilities, no footpath to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	1,550m walk to primary school. No continuous footpath and no lighting.  Village shop 1,200m  Limited bus service to Diss	N/A
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Sports/rec facilities 1,200m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Foul water capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises these are available nearby however this would need to be confirmed	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Promoter states there is no evidence to suggest contamination issues, there have been no historical works undertaken on the site that would have resulted in any known ground stability issues. The site has not been previously developed.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood zone 1</p> <p>Surface Water Flood risk to north area of the site.</p> <p><b>LLFA:</b> Green. At risk of surface water flooding. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>The on-site flood risk is a minor flow path in the 0.1% AEP event cutting the site northwest-east in the north of the site. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows east off the site contributing to a larger flow path east of the site. The site marks the beginning of this minor flow path, we advise this must be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk and has the potential to be developed.</p> <p>Development of the site has the potential to reduce flood risk off-site.</p> <p>Any water leading from off-site to on-site should be considered as part of any drainage strategy for the site.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Flood Risk)</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Tributary farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	B4: Waveney tributary farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would be contained so wider impact minimal but would have some detrimental impact on landscape given the need for a new access. Would need to be able to achieve access with no impact on the protected trees.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would continue the adjacent developed area, however the site is large and the depth is out of character so should be restricted to frontage to reflect the existing linear pattern. It would have some impact on townscape which it may not be possible to mitigate.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Two trees on frontage have TPOs and it is unlikely that a satisfactory access can be achieved to this site without detriment to these trees . Also, a hedge along the frontage and north boundary and ponds within immediate area. Would need to retain the trees with no impact and ensure no impact on species. Further information would be required should this site progress further.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. SSSI IRZ - housing and water discharge not listed as triggers requiring Natural England consultation. Ponds within 250m of boundary and site in amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not on Green Infrastructure corridor.</p> <p>Adjacent to Bressingham FP7 and opposite Bressingham FP8 (potential to link the two footpaths).</p> <p><b>Norfolk Wildlife Trust:</b> Note that this site may be supporting species-rich grassland and this is possibly Priority Habitat. If site is to be taken forward this requires further investigation. Recommend ecological surveys for this site.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Adjacent to Grade II listed building (Jubilee Farmhouse) but good separation – unlikely to have significant impact – but this should be confirmed with Heritage and Conservation Officer should this site progress further.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>Common Lane is a minor rural road with no footpaths or lighting. There is no safe route to the primary school, shop or playing fields. The junction where it meets Bressingham Road/High Road currently appears unfavourable for pedestrians.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Not feasible to provide safe access remote from local facilities, no footpath to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Residential to east and south, farmhouse to west.</p> <p>No compatibility concerns.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Listed building – Jubilee Farmhouse to west and impact would need to be assessed.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Currently no access onto road frontage, access to farmhouse to south could possibly be used would need to clarify with Highway Authority. No continuous footpaths.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grassed paddock/small field.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Part of farm holding with listed farmhouse to west, residential to south and east. No significant concerns regarding compatibility.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedgerows, particularly to roadside boundary. TPO trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Impact on hedgerow could be significant, would need consideration. Also are two TPO trees on frontage.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination, would need clarification on what land has been used for in the past.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views in and out of site are currently limited because of mature hedge along the road frontage however note the existence of footpaths in proximity to the site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>Adjacent to development boundary and opposite existing development. School is less than 2k but is difficult to walk to due to the lack of a continuous footpath. Access to other services is also limited for the same reason.</p> <p>Development of the site would significantly change the road frontage, particularly if the hedgerow needed to be removed for access, and it would therefore have a negative impact on the street scene.</p> <p>If development were acceptable in this location the appropriate form would be linear development along the frontage, minimising the loss of the existing hedgerow and avoiding an impact on the TPO trees.</p>	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score</b> <b>(R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Being promoted and enquiries have been received.	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score</b> <b>(R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	The promoter has stated the site is viable including the provision of all known infrastructure.	Amber
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possibly depending on number of dwellings. Need to investigate acceptable access provision.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would comply with Policy.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is of a suitable scale for allocation and is adjacent to the existing settlement limit however a number of constraints have been identified. Two TPO trees are located along the site frontage and there is an existing established hedgerow also along the frontage. There is currently no vehicular access into the site. Limited (not continuous) footpaths connecting to the central areas of the settlement. A listed building (Jubilee Farmhouse) is adjacent to the site. Significant highways concerns have been identified, including the lack of footways.

### Site Visit Observations

The site is well contained in the landscape by the existing established vegetation along the road frontage. There is currently no obvious access into the site and it is likely the hedgerow would be significantly altered to create a suitable access and visibility. This would be detrimental to both the landscape and the streetscene. Poor connectivity back into the centre of the village with Common Road seen to be narrow in places. Linear form of development in evidence around the site with the promoted site potentially conflicting with this pattern of development. Reasonable separation between the listed building and the site.

### Local Plan Designations

None

### Availability

The site is available for development.

### Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable however highway mitigation works would need to be confirmed and may impact on the viability of the site.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Although the site is adjacent to the existing settlement limit it is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation due to both the substandard highway network (including poor pedestrian connectivity to the facilities and services in the village) and the detrimental landscape and townscape impact that would result. Furthermore, the established hedgerow along the site frontage would be impacted significantly by development of the site and this would alter the character of the area to an adverse degree. In depth development of the site would be out of character with the existing linear pattern of development in evidence around the site and would also result in a harmful townscape impact.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022