



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Burston, Shimpling and Gissing

## Contents

SN0005SL .....	3
SN0208SL .....	11
SN0349 .....	19
SN0386 .....	28
SN0560 .....	37
SN0561 .....	46
SN0562SL .....	54
SN1028SL .....	61

## SN0005SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0005SL
Site address	South east of Diss Road, Burston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Residential - Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.12 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	SL extension  (The site has been promoted for 5 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5 units = 41 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<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	No existing access. NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving safe access  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</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 footway provision linking site to village 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>	Amber	Primary school within 530m walk  Limited employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service (not peak)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		No record on NCC map	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk along highway	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: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental landscape impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Would represent breakout to west of settlement. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Pond at western end of site. Mitigation of any identified impacts to be explored if the site progresses further.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impacts on heritage assets  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No footway provision linking site to village school	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?	No direct impacts	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm	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/agriculture	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)	Established hedgerow with trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant hedgerow and trees along boundaries and within site. New access would result in loss. Pond at western end of site.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site screened by landscaping. Views north from site across open farmland.	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 existing limited services. Lacks continuous footpath but some verges present. Small scale proposal limits townscape impact. Significant impact on landscape character through loss of trees/hedgerow which would harm rural approach to settlement.	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

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter confirming same	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be considered as a settlement limit extension however it would represent a significant breakout to the west of the Burston. Identified desktop constraints include highways, landscape impact and potential ecological issues.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is reasonably well connected to the existing limited services within the village cluster. Lacks continuous footpath but some verges present which may facilitate footways. Small scale proposal limits townscape impact due to the size of development proposed however there would be a significant impact on the landscape character through loss of trees/hedgerow which would harm the rural approach to settlement.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations - open countryside.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** as an extension to the existing settlement limit of Burston. The site is reasonably well connected however highway safety concerns have been identified. A significant adverse impact has also been identified on the landscape character due to the loss of trees and hedgerows on the site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 17 July 2020

## SN0208SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0208SL
Site address	Land at Common Road, Gissing
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2000/0057 – approval for 4 dwellings (SNC) 2010 & 2012 – approval for storage, packing shed and polytunnels
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.26 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension  (The site has been promoted for 6 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 6 dwellings = 23 dph  (25 dph = 6.5 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	54	NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving safe access  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access via southern boundary only, carriageway widening of Common Rd cul-de-sac required to 5.5m at frontage. No safe walking route to school. 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.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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	<p>Primary school greater than 3km away</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Bus service including peak time (bus stop adjacent site)</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <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 within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site outside the proposed fibre installation area	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Contamination issues due to previous use could be mitigated – this would need to be confirmed if the site is to be progressed	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Small area of identified SW flood along adjacent highway	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: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is visually contained. Detrimental landscape impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on any heritage assets  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Access via southern boundary only, carriageway widening of Common Rd cul-de-sac required to 5.5m at frontage. No safe walking route to school. 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.	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?	No direct impacts on heritage assets	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access can be achieved	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Small scale market garden	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/agriculture	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)	Enclosed by hedgerow/trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some significant trees along eastern boundary and possibly within site. Ditch along eastern boundary with highway	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of utilities infrastructure. Potential contamination from previous use should be investigated	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site screened by boundary hedgerows/trees but prominent in views along the 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)	Site remote from primary school but accessible to peak bus service. Limited impacts on townscape and landscape which could be reasonably mitigated.	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

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is not considered suitable for general housing due to lack of access to services including the primary school. The site could be considered under current Development Management policies as a possible Exception Site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is in a remote location, a significant distance from services although a peak time bus service is available. Development would have a limited impact on the townscape and landscape, both of which could be reasonably mitigated.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability within plan period, although the existing tenancy would need to cease. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

### **Achievability**

Promoter advise that existing tenancy would have to be terminated – associated loss of small scale employment.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** settlement limit site due to its poor connectivity and relationship to services, including the primary school. There would be an associated loss of small scale employment on the site.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27 July 2020

SN0349

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0349
Site address	Land west of Gissing Road, Burston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.54 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site  (The site has been promoted for 20 units)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 20 units = 14 dph  38 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	No existing access. NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving safe access  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, 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.	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	Primary school within 230m walk  Limited employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service (not peak)	

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>		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues – the site promoter advises desktop investigations have not raised any issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk on eastern side and along highway  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few constraints.	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 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Site visually contained. Detrimental landscape impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p><b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> – Significant concerns regarding the loss of the frontage hedgerow associated with this site. The importance of this hedgerow would need to be assessed.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>Detrimental impacts could be mitigated through reduction in site area</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Amber. If the site was reduced in size to be compatible with linear development to the east of the site it would remove the heritage harm in terms of access and townscape.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Detrimental impacts of development could be mitigated</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. GI corridor. SSSI IRZ. Orange/Green DLL risk zone for great crested newts. Hedgerows may be 'Important' under Hedgerow Regulations 1997.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Any detrimental impacts on Grade II LB (Manor House Farmhouse) to the south could be mitigated through a reduction in site area and landscaping.</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Amber. Manor House (Grade II) to the south of the site currently has no development to the rear allowing views from the front to the open countryside behind. The front view of this property has the most significance however development would result in a degree of harm even if mitigated by keeping some open space to the rear of the building.</p> <p><b>NCC HES</b> – Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>NCC to confirm impact on local network</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, 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.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting: the site promoter should investigate the road width, provision of footway etc to assess whether the site is acceptable however there may be delivery issues associated with this site).</i></p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Residential/agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential harm to the setting of Manor House Farmhouse to the south. Technical officer already commented that site area should be reduced to preserve setting	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	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)	Residential/agriculture	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)	Established hedgerow with trees	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant hedgerow and trees along boundaries. Ditch along western boundary with highway.	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 screened by landscaping but open farmland 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)	Development of eastern side only would preserve setting of heritage assets and reflect form and character of existing settlement but this would require a reduction in the site area. The site is well connected to the limited local services but footpath improvements would be required. Loss of hedgerow to improve access could be mitigated.	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 (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 confirming 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 access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	The promoter has confirmed the delivery of affordable housing but no evidence has been provided	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Suggested areas of POS within the site.	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The eastern section of the site only is considered to be suitable for a reduced number of dwellings, subject to achieving satisfactory access. The site relates well to existing services and existing development in the settlement. Constraints relating to designated heritage assets have been noted.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Development of eastern side only would preserve setting of heritage assets and reflect form and character of existing settlement. Well connected to limited local services. Loss of hedgerow to improve access could be mitigated. Well connected to existing limited services but footpath improvement required.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** site for allocation, subject to a reduction in both the scale of the site and the numbers on the site.

The site is well located in relation to the village and technical responses indicate that highway access issues can be overcome. The overall extent of development is likely to be limited to the eastern part of the site to minimise impact on a listed building to the south. Development to the east would also be more reflective of the form and character of the existing settlement.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 17 July 2020

## SN0386

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0386
Site address	Land east of Rectory Road, Burston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Deemed approval – high & low voltage lines
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.44 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified 25 dph = 61 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing field access. NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving safe access  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Visibility poor west from Rectory Road, no footway for safe journey to school. Would also require Rectory Road to be widened to 5.5m &amp; speed limit extended. (Highways meeting 15/12/20: There is a lack of footway provision to the school and Rectory Road would require widening. To make this site acceptable the access road – not restricted to the site frontage – would need to be improved. Visibility at the Rectory Road crossroads remains a key concern)</b>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 within 330m walk</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Limited bus service (not peak)</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <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, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises no services are currently available to the site, however the site is adjacent to existing development and therefore services are likely to be available. High & low voltage lines along northern boundary and crossing southern end of	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Identified SW flood risk in SE corner of site and along highway	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 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site visually contained. Detrimental landscape impacts of development could potentially be mitigated.  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> – Potential landscape issues as the site is on a rural approach. This would need to be assessed further.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated through reduction in site area. The site is adjacent to existing estate development although it extends beyond the existing boundaries.  <b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Green. No significant issues. Audley Close already extends development back from Rectory Road so in townscape terms a deeper layout would have less of a townscape impact than in other parts of the village which are characterised by linear street fronting development.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Ponds outside site to south and east. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> - Green. GI corridor. SSSI IRZ. Orange DLL risk zone for great crested newts. Hedgerows may be 'Important' under Hedgerow Regulations 1997.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Both designated and non-designated heritage assets are in proximity to the site however any detrimental impacts on heritage assets could likely be mitigated</p> <p><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Green. No significant issues</p> <p><b>NCC HES</b> – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>NCC to confirm impact on local network</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Visibility poor west from Rectory Road, no footway for safe journey to school. Would also require Rectory Road to be widened to 5.5m &amp; speed limit extended.</p> <p><b>(Highways meeting 15/12/20: There is a lack of footway provision to the school and Rectory Road would require widening. To make this site acceptable the access road – not restricted to the site frontage – would need to be improved. Visibility at the Rectory Road crossroads remains a key concern)</b></p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Residential/agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Non-designated heritage asset to the west and Listed Building to the south. Impacts likely to be mitigated through design and layout.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow lane with limited verge. NCC to confirm accessibility issues.	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)	Residential/agriculture	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)	Established hedgerow with trees. PROW meets SE corner of site	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly some significant trees within boundaries and this should be checked further should the site progress. Ponds just outside site to both the east and south. Ditch along the western boundary with the highway.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead lines along northern and western boundaries and crossing site at southern end. Pumping stations close to SW and NE corners of site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site screened by boundary hedgerows/trees but prominent in views along the road. Views from the PROW also a consideration.	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)	No continuous footpath to school but possible scope to provide a TROD, otherwise the site is reasonably well connected to local services. Development of the whole site would be excessive in respect of the existing form and settlement but a reduced area in line with eastern boundary of Audley Close and southern hedge line would respond well to existing pattern of development, subject to achieving safe access.	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 (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 confirming same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC Highways have advised that significant highways improvements would likely be required for the delivery of this site.	Red
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same but no evidence submitted at this time.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Subject to a reduction in both the scale of the site and the numbers proposed the site is suitable for development. A single storey form of development would be the most appropriate form of development to reflect the adjoining dwellings. Highways constraints would need to be assessed.

### **Site Visit Observations**

No continuous footpath to school but scope to provide a TROD, otherwise the site is reasonably well connected to local services. Development of whole site excessive in respect of existing form and settlement but reduced area in line with eastern boundary of Audley Close and southern hedge line would respond well to existing pattern of development, subject to achieving safe access. Development should also respond to the existing storey developments to the north of the site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting Local Plan designations.

### **Availability**

The site promoter has advised availability within the plan period.

### **Achievability**

Off site highway improvement works may affect the viability / delivery of this site. This would need be assessed further.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be a suitable, subject to a reduction in both the scale of the site and the numbers to reflect the form and character of the existing adjacent development. Development of this site should follow the boundaries of Audley Close and the southern hedgeline. However, heritage constraints have been identified and a potential requirement for off-site highway improvement works may affect the viability of this site.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 17 July 2020

## SN0560

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0560  (The site has been promoted alongside SN0561)
Site address	Diss Road, Burston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.49 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Both  (The site has been promoted for 5x eco-friendly dwellings however the site is of a scale that could be considered for allocation. The site has therefore been assessed as both an allocation and a settlement limit extension).
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 5 dwellings = 3.3 dph  (25 dph= 37 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	Access through adjoining land.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No footway provision linking site to village school	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	Primary school within 500m walk (including unimproved PRow)  Limited employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service (including peak)	

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>		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer, gas and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		No record on BBfN map	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Area of identified SW flood risk in central and eastern parts of site which would restrict the developable area of the site, as well as potential access and egress into the site. This should be assessed further if the site is to be progressed.	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 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Part of a larger parcel of land. Detrimental landscape impacts of development could be mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Physically separated from the settlement. Detrimental impacts on existing form and character could not easily be mitigated, with either scale of development on the site.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ancient woodlands to the east of the site.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	No detrimental impacts on designated heritage assets  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No footway provision linking site to village school	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No detrimental impacts identified on either designated or non-designated heritage assets. The site is separated from the main form of the settlement.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Would rely on access through adjoining land (same ownership). If the site is developed in isolation this would result in along access road/ driveway.	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	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 boundary open to farmland. Other boundaries enclosed by hedgerow and PRow adjacent to eastern boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow including some trees to enclosed boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	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 open in views from the west and is prominent in views along the 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)	The site relies on adjoining land for access (same ownership). The site is relatively close to existing services. There is a reasonable walking route to school but this would require improvements. The site is physically separated from the existing settlement so resulting townscape impacts could not be reasonably mitigated.	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 (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 confirming same. A capacity study has been submitted to support the promotion of this site.	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 however access improvements are likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	The site has been promoted for 5 dwellings and therefore affordable housing would not be required. If progressed as an allocation the promoter would be required to confirm the viability of the required affordable housing provision on the site.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site has been promoted for a low density form of development that would not make effective use of the land. It has therefore been assessed as both a potential settlement limit extension (as promoted) and as an allocation. Access constraints as well as townscape constraints have been identified.

### Site Visit Observations

The site relies on adjoining land for access (same ownership) and would potentially result in a long driveway/ access road. The site relatively close to existing services walking routes would require upgrades. The site is physically separated from the existing settlement so the resulting townscape impacts could not be reasonably mitigated.

### Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

### Availability

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

### Achievability

Relies on adjoining land for access, although this land is within the same ownership and has also been promoted (SN0561).

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** extension to the existing settlement limit due to its physical separation from the main settlement, access issues and the detrimental townscape impact its development would have. The site has also been considered as an allocation due to its size however it is also considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for allocation due to its poor access arrangements and the detrimental impact development would have on the existing townscape.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 29 July 2020

## SN0561

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0561  (The site has been promoted alongside SN0560)
Site address	Diss Road, Burston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Pre-1974. Two applications for single dwelling refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.88 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 30 'starter home' dwellings = 34 dph  (25 dph= 22 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	Green	Existing field access from adjacent land. NCC to confirm if safe access can be achieved  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No footway provision linking site to village school.	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	Primary school within 500m walk  Limited employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service (including peak)	

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>		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer, gas and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		No record on BBfN map	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Small areas of identified SW flood risk along the northern boundary and in the highway to the south	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 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Part of larger parcel of land; landscape impacts of development could be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Physically separated from the main settlement. Adverse impacts could not be easily mitigated.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No harmful impacts on either designated or non-designated heritage assets  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No footway provision linking site to village school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	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?	NCC to confirm if safe access can be achieved	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	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 boundary open to farmland. Southern boundary open to road. Remaining boundaries enclosed by hedgerow and separating residential development to east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow including some trees to enclosed boundaries	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site open in views from west and prominent in views along the 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)	The site is relatively close to existing services. There is no continuous footpath but there is a reasonable walking route to the primary school. The site is separated from the existing settlement and the promoted development would not reflect either the density or character of nearby dwellings, resulting in townscape impacts which could not be reasonably mitigated.	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 (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 confirming 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 access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoting site for 30 affordable starter homes. No supporting 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 of a suitable scale for allocation but is promoted for a density that would not be characteristic of the development in closest proximity to the site. Possible harmful townscape and /or landscape impacts identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is relatively close to existing services however there is no continuous footpath (but there is a reasonable walking route to the primary school). The site is separated from the existing settlement and the promoted development would not reflect either the density or character of nearby developments, resulting in townscape impacts which could not be reasonably mitigated.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting Local Plan designations.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. Development is proposed at a scale that would have a harmful impact on the existing townscape. Existing development to the west of the settlement is characterised by a loose development grain. A development of reduced scale would not sufficiently address this concern.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27 July 2020

## SN0562SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0562SL
Site address	Diss Road, Burston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.41 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	SL Extension  (The site has been promoted for a single dwelling and would be considered as a Settlement Limit Extension. It may be possible for the site to accommodate an increased number, subject to any constraints identified)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1 dwelling = 1.3 dph  (25 dph= 19 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Agricultural – barns and outbuildings

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access into farmyard. Access constraints could be overcome through development  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No footway provision linking site to village school.	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	Primary school within 500m walk but with no footpaths connecting to the site  Limited employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service (including peak)	

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>		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer, gas and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		No record on BBfN map	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Potential contamination due to previous use	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Area of identified SW flood risk along eastern boundary	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B4: Waveney tributary farmland  ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Brownfield site. Detrimental landscape impacts of development could be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Physically separated from settlement however an additional single dwelling would relate to the existing farm and associated outbuildings.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Unlikely due to the existing land use.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	No detrimental impacts on designated heritage assets  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. No footway provision linking site to village school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agriculture/residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts identified	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing wide access into farmyard.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural storage buildings and yard. Would require demolition	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	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Eastern boundary open to farmland. Western boundary adjacent to existing development.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Ditch 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)	Contamination investigation required due to previous use. No utilities constraints identified.	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 open in views from the east and south and is prominent in views along the road too.	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 close to existing services. There is no continuous footpath however there is a reasonable walking route to the school. The proposed small scale development of the site would limit any townscape and landscape impacts.	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

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter confirming 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 if access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be considered as an extension to the existing settlement limit however it is separated from the existing settlement and any proposals for the redevelopment of this site would be better assessed against existing Development Management policies.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is close to existing services. There are no continuous footpaths however there is a reasonable walking route to school. Small scale development of this site would have limited townscape and landscape impacts.

### **Local Plan Designations**

There are no conflicting LP designations.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for a settlement limit extension. The site is separated from the existing settlement and has been promoted for a single dwelling only. It is considered that this site would be better assessed against the current Development Management policies.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27 July 2020

## SN1028SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1028SL
Site address	Land east of Mill Road, Crown Farm Barn, Burston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Deemed approval – high & low voltage lines
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	SL extension  (The site has been promoted for 5 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 5 dwellings = 17 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing field access. NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving safe access  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Unsuitable road network, no safe walking route to school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <b>Part 1:</b> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary school within 240m walk but with no footways  Limited employment opportunities within 1800m  Limited bus service (not peak)	

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>		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer and electricity available to site. High & low voltage lines along western boundary.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Small area of identified SW flood risk adjacent to the SW corner 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: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site visually contained. Landscape impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Would impact on loose grain of existing development. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have an adverse impact on heritage assets (including church) however these could be mitigated. The site is also adjacent to the Conservation Area.  <b>NCC HES</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Unsuitable road network, no safe walking route to school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Residential/agriculture	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Adjacent to the Conservation Area. Several LBs in close proximity , including church. Comments required from the technical officer if this site is to progress further.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access onto narrow lane. NCC to confirm.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Paddock and plantation	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/agriculture	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)	Trees/hedgerow to all boundaries. PRow along SE boundary. Residential and public house to south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Extensive tree coverage within site and extending north beyond 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)	O/H lines along western boundary	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site screened by boundary hedgerows/trees but prominent in views along the 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 close to existing services. No continuous footpath but reasonable walking route to school. Small scale development of the site would have a limited impact on the wider townscape but impacts on the identified heritage assets and trees are likely to be significant.	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 (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 confirming 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 access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be considered as a settlement limit extension but heritage and landscape issues have been identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site close to existing services. No continuous footpath but reasonable walking route to school. The small scale of the site would result in limited impacts on townscape but impacts on heritage assets and trees are likely to be significant.

### **Local Plan Designations**

No conflicting Local Plan designations.

### **Availability**

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

### **Achievability**

No constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE extension to the existing settlement limit due to the identified harm that would result to both the identified heritage assets, as well as the landscape (resulting from the loss of trees on the site).

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 17 July 2020