



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Dickleburgh and Rushall

Contents

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| SN0063 | 3 |
| SN0199 | 11 |
| SN0217 | 20 |
| SN0230 | 29 |
| SN0256 | 37 |
| SN0257 | 45 |
| SN0258 | 54 |
| SN0259 | 63 |
| SN0350 | 71 |
| SN0361SL | 79 |
| SN0389 | 88 |
| SN0389 | 96 |
| SN0516 | 104 |
| SN2083 | 113 |
| SN2084SL | 121 |
| SN2145 | 129 |
| SN3017 | 137 |
| SN4043SL | 145 |
| SN4056SL | 153 |
| SN4057 | 161 |
| SN4070SL | 169 |
| SN6003SL | 177 |

SN0063

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|---|
| Site Reference | SN0063 |
| Site address | Land to the south of Harvey Lane / Langmere Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 1.25 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension | Allocated site for residential development – 15 to 30 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Proposed 15 – 30 dwellings. (25 dph = 31dph) |
| 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 | Constrained lane may restrict access options NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. | Amber |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 200 metres Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 530 metres Distance to shop / post office 550 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 150 metres Distance to public house 480 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Green | Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site | Green |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available. No gas supply. | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Site within area of identified surface water flood 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>) | | B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland ALC: Grade 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Intrusive into open landscape given detached nature of site. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Detached from existing development on southern side of road | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Green | No designated heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber | Green |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Constrained lane with no footways | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Residential and agricultural NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. | Red |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|--|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Poor relationship with existing pattern of development due to gap with other development on southern side of Harvey Lane | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Potential issues with acceptability of any more development on Harvey Lane | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural to south, west and east. Residential development on opposite side of road to north. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is relatively level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedge along highway boundary and on western boundary | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Potential habitat in hedges | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on site | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Some views from public highway | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable as wouldn't relate directly to existing development on the southern side of Harvey Lane. Likely highway issues as well. | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in private ownership | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Off-site highway improvements are likely to be required but may not be deliverable | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | 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, subject to achieving a satisfactory access.

Site Visit Observations

The site is relatively close to existing services however, the site is disconnected to other development on the southern side of Harvey Lane, which is a constrained lane with no footways.

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 **UNREASONABLE** option for development due to identified highway constraints. In particular, the site is to be accessed via Harvey Lane which is considered to be a constrained access where highways would not want to see further development off. A solution to these constraints is not considered to be possible. In addition to this there are also no footways along Harvey lane. Town and landscape impacts could be mitigated, and no other constraints have been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0199

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|---|
| Site Reference | SN0199 |
| Site address | Land north of Rectory Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | Withdrawn application for 10 dwellings (ref: 2013/1166) |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 2.69 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension | Allocated site – approximately 80 homes with POS (reduction in size is considered suitable for SL Extension) |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified (25 dph = 63 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>Constraints on achieving access from hedge along boundary and congested part of road</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility along with carriageway widening to 5.5m and footway widening to 2.0m. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> | Amber |
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | <p>Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 200 metres via footpath between Rectory Road and Harvey Lane</p> <p>Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 230 metres</p> <p>Distance to shop / post office 165 metres</p> | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 200 metres via footpath between Rectory Road and Harvey Lane Distance to public house 300 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but query regarding sewerage | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Some identified surface water flood risk in north-east of site LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Mapping indicates that there are no areas of surface water risk as shown in the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. The detailed River Network map indicates that there is a watercourse connecting the site to a wider network. | 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>) | | B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland ALC: Grade 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Part of site contained within settlement, but part prominent across Dickleburgh Moor. Limited/nil loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |
| Townscape | Amber | Development to rear of site would not relate well to linear pattern of development along Rectory Road SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. GI corridor. Mostly green DLL Risk Zone (southern corner west side in orange risk zone). | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Part of site is within Conservation Area. Grade II listed buildings on Rectory Road to south. SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. Development would have an impact on The Gables, as well as the adjacent building. Development could occur on the missing section of Rectory Road only. It could double up because of long rear gardens, to maintain the development rear boundary line and much reduced impact on setting of heritage assets. NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Transport and Roads | Amber | <p>Constrained road network through village centre</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of acceptable visibility along with carriageway widening to 5.5m and footway widening to 2.0m. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Amber | Sewage treatment works 200 metres to north | Amber |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Most of site to rear of existing linear line of frontage development along north side of Rectory Road which would therefore have a poor relationship with existing development. However, there is potential for development on frontage with Rectory Road | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access should be achievable along Rectory Road but will require removal of at least part of hedgerow | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural; no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Residential to east and west and on opposite side of Rectory Road to south. Agricultural land to north, but sewerage treatment works also to north likely to restrict development to the north of the site | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Descends from north to south | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Sections of hedgerow along street frontage. Open aspect to north | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Some trees on boundary, plus habitat in hedgerows | 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 contamination or existing infrastructure | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Visible from Semere Green Lane to north and public right of way through site and from east. Limited views from Rectory Road | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Development of whole site would be intrusive into open landscape to north and not in keeping with frontage development along north side of Rectory Road. However, a settlement limit extension to allow frontage development along Rectory Road could be considered | Amber |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in single private ownership | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Yes. NCC to confirm access improvements required | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | No | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

At a reduced size the site is considered suitable as a settlement limit extension, but heritage, landscape and highways issues and constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Part of the site forms a gap within built development along Rectory Road, with the remainder of site consisting of agricultural land within open landscape to north of existing frontage pattern of development along north of Rectory Road.

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:

Acceptable for a Settlement Limit extension. There is existing frontage development along Rectory Road and therefore it is considered that a settlement limit extension to allow frontage development along Rectory Road would be in keeping with the area. In addition to this, part of site is within conservation area and there are listed buildings located on Rectory Road to south where development of the site could occur on the missing section of Rectory Road only. This would maintain the development rear boundary line and much reduced impact on setting of heritage assets. Whilst highways constraints have been identified, it is considered that these could be resolved through frontage development also.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes (for settlement limit extension)

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0217

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|--|
| Site Reference | SN0217 |
| Site address | Land adjacent to Bridge Farm, Norwich Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | Refused application for one dwelling. |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 3.99 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension | Allocation – less than 200 dwellings which would be achieved at 25dph to reflect local character |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 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 | Ability to provide may be access due to alignment of road and hedgerow NCC HIGHWAYS – Green. Will require a 2.0m footway across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays | Amber |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 800 metres with footways along Norwich Road and Rectory Road, then footway link from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 430 metres Distance to shop / post office 400 metres Local employment? | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 800 metres with footways along Norwich Road and Rectory Road, then footway link from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to public house 520 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Some small areas of identified surface water flood risk in 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 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Intrudes into landscape away from main part of settlement. No loss of high-grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Does not relate well to main part of settlement to south or to sporadic pattern of development to north | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Grade II listed house to north-east NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Green | Norwich Road is of good standard with footway NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Will require a 2.0m footway across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays | 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? | Detached from main part of settlement due to intervening watercourse and Bridge Farm. Estate development would also be out of character with loose pattern of development along Norwich Road to north | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access should be achievable but would result in loss of at least part of hedgerow along highway boundary | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Mainly agricultural with some residential to north and on opposite side of Norwich Road. Potential compatibility issues with farm operation to south | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Slowly rising from south to north | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedge on highway boundary, western boundary is open | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Habitat in hedgerows, plus watercourse in relatively close proximity to south | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Some views through hedge from road | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Site not suitable due to detached nature from main part of settlement | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | 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? | Site is in private ownership and part owned (multiple landownerships) | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | NCC Highways to advise on highways improvements required for the delivery of this site. | Green |
| 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, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

Site Visit Observations

The site is situated to the north of the main village and appears detached from the settlement. There is existing hedge along all site boundaries. Development of this site would not relate well to existing development.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting Local Plan designations.

Availability

The site promoter has advised availability within the plan period.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** option for allocation, 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. Dickleburgh benefits from historic hedge patterns and field networks which will need to be considered if taken forward, especially as access arrangements may result in loss of at least part of hedgerow along highway boundary. Development would require some highway improvements. No other constraints have been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0230

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|---|
| Site Reference | SN0230 |
| Site address | Land east of Norwich Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.90 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension | Allocation – between 15 to 20 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 16.7 dph – 22 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 | May be constraints due to geometry of road NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Will require a 2.0m footway across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays | Amber |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 600 metres, footways along Norwich Road and Rectory Road with footpath between Rectory Road and Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 230 metres Distance to shop / post office 190 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 600 metres, footways along Norwich Road and Rectory Road with footpath between Rectory Road and Harvey Lane Distance to public house 315 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Flood zones 2 and 3 and area of flood risk immediately to north of proposed site LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Mapping indicates that there is a small area on the northern section of the site which is affected by the 3.33% and 1% event of the site as shown in the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. The site appears to be connected to a watercourse network according to the Detailed River Network mapping. | 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 | Green | Potential impact on landscape setting of village. No loss of high-grade agricultural land | Amber |
| Townscape | Amber | Estate development would not relate well to linear development along eastern side of Norwich Road | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites within close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Adjacent to conservation area. Area of archaeological interest NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Norwich Road is of a reasonable standard with footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Will require a 2.0m footway across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Amber | Agricultural and residential but with sewerage treatment works to east | Amber |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Development would have a noticeable impact on setting of village on approach from north, including on conservation area | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access should be achievable onto Norwich Road | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural to east. Residential to south and on opposite side of road to west. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level, but ground level rises to the north. | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Largely open boundaries other than with rear garden of residential property to the south which is a tall thick evergreen hedge | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Close to watercourse which could provide habitat | 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 contamination or existing infrastructure on or adjacent to site | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Open views across site from public highway, which contribute positively to the setting of the village on the approach from the north. | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable due to adverse impact on setting of village on approach from the north | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | 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? | Single private ownership | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Yes. NCC Highways have advised that highways improvements would likely be required for the delivery of this site. | Green |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered suitable in size to be allocated. Access constraints as well as landscape and heritage constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

The site is situated within open landscape that forms part of setting of the village on approach from the north by Dickleburgh Moor. Open views across site from public highway, which contribute positively to the setting of the village on the approach from the north.

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 other constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development due to landscape and heritage impacts. The site appears to be quite a prominent site, particularly when approaching from the north end of Dickeburgh. Whilst there is existing residential development on Norwich Road, this is frontage development only and well screened by the hedging. It is also identified that the site located adjacent to the Conservation Area and there long-distance views across that site of the wider countryside where development of the site would impact these views.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0256

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|---|
| Site Reference | SN0256 |
| Site address | Land north of 43-81 Rectory Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 2.669 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension | Allocation – between 30 and 35 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 30 dwellings = 12 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 | Constrained access from Rectory Road NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access is too narrow and would not have sufficient visibility. | Red |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 570 metres with footway along Rectory Road and then footpath to Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 610 metres Distance to shop / post office 560 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 570 metres with footway along Rectory Road and then footpath to Harvey Lane Distance to public house 680 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Identified surface water flood risk in part 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 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Intrudes into open landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Development would be to rear of frontage development along Rectory Road | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected site in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Green | No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber | Green |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Constrained route through village NCC HIGHWAYS – red. Access is too narrow and would not have sufficient visibility. | Red |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Sewerage treatment works less than 100 metres to the north | Amber |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | To rear of existing linear line of frontage development along north side of Rectory Road. Development would therefore have a poor relationship with existing development | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Narrow existing access that serves a couple of properties and the sewerage treatment works. Not suitable to serve a development of 12 or more dwellings | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Residential to south and agricultural land on other boundaries but sewerage treatment works 70 metres to the north which could potentially heavily constrain the developable area of the site | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Slight descent from north to south | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedgerow on part of western boundary, other field boundaries are open | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Tree on north-eastern boundary, and on boundary with residential properties. Hedge also provides habitat | 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 contamination or existing infrastructure | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Very limited views into site from Rectory Road due to existing development, however public right of way along northern boundary with views right across site | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable due to relationship with existing pattern of development, constrained access and also potential constraints from sewerage treatment works | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | 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? | Site is private ownership | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | None identified | Green |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

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. Identified desktop constraints include highways and landscape impact issues. Access is too narrow and would not have sufficient visibility.

Site Visit Observations

Site to rear of existing frontage development along Rectory Road in open landscape. Very constrained access and relatively close proximity to sewerage treatment works.

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 an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Even at a reduced scale, development in this location would have an adverse impact on the landscape and highways constraints result in further issues that would hinder the development of this site. It is also identified that the site is in close proximity to sewerage treatment works, which is considered to be unsuitable.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0257

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|--|
| Site Reference | SN0257 |
| Site address | Land north of 81 to 141 Rectory Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | Historic refusal for residential development on part of site |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 4.2 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension | Allocated site |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified At 25 dph this would be up to 200 dwellings, however promoter states that they would seek a lower density to mirror the adjoining development |
| 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 | Constrained access from Rectory Road NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access is too narrow and would not have sufficient visibility | Red |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 570 metres with footway along Rectory Road and then footpath to Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 610 metres Distance to shop / post office 560 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 570 metres with footway along Rectory Road and then footpath to Harvey Lane Distance to public house 680 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available. Query regarding gas supply. | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Identified surface water risk in part 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 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Intrudes into open landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Townscape | Green | Development would be to rear of frontage development along Rectory Road | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Green | No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber | Green |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Constrained route through village | Green |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Amber | Sewerage treatment works less than 200 metres to the north-west | Amber |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | To rear of existing linear line of frontage development along north side of Rectory Road. Development would therefore have a poor relationship with existing development | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Narrow existing access that serves a couple of properties and the sewerage treatment works. Not suitable to serve a development of 12 or more dwellings | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Residential to south and agricultural land on other boundaries but sewerage treatment works 100 metres to the north-west which could potentially constrain the developable area of the site | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Undulates slightly | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Field boundaries are all open | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Some trees on 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) | Overhead power line crosses northern part of site | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Very limited views into site from Rectory Road due to existing development, however public right of way along northern boundary with views right across site | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable due to relationship with existing pattern of development, constrained access and also potential constraints from sewerage treatment works | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | 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 and part owner (multiple landowners) | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | None identified | Green |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is unsuitable for allocation due to its large size, if the site was reduced in size and scale then it would be considered suitable, subject to achieving satisfactory access. It has also been noted that the site is within close proximity to a sewerage treatment works; this could cause issues with regard to amenity for potential future occupiers.

Site Visit Observations

Site to rear of existing frontage development along Rectory Road in open landscape. Very constrained access and relatively close proximity to sewerage treatment works.

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 additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Even at a reduced scale, development in this location would have an adverse impact on the landscape and highways constraints result in further issues that would hinder the development of this site. It is also identified that the site is in close proximity to sewerage treatment works, which is considered to be unsuitable.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0258

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|---|
| Site Reference | SN0258 |
| Site address | Land south of Rectory Road and west of Rectory Lane |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 2.06 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension | Allocation – between 25 and 30 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified 25 dwellings = 12dph (25/ha = 50 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 | Rural roads with some constraints on access NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of 2.0m wide footway at site frontage along with connection to existing pedestrian facility to west of site with a desirable min width of 2.0m, carriageway to be widened to 5.5m at site frontage. Subject to highway conditions in planning application. | Amber |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 800 metres along Rectory Road largely with footway, then footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 820 metres Distance to shop / post office 800 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 800 metres along Rectory Road largely with footway, then footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to public house 890 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed. AW advise sewers crossing the site | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Some identified surface water flood risk along Rectory Road and particularly Rectory Lane | 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 | Green | <p>COUNCIL LANDSCAPE OFFICER - this site is potentially prominent at the edge of the village but is reasonable in landscape terms – the adjacent trees have TPOs.</p> <p>Some intrusion into open countryside to east of village. No loss of high grade agricultural land</p> | Amber |
| Townscape | Green | <p>Follows pattern of small estate development south of Rectory Lane</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green. Fairly straightforward extension to the townscape.</p> | Green |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | <p>No protected sites in close proximity</p> <p>ECOLOGY – Green. Orange risk zone for DLL/Great crested newts</p> | Green |
| Historic Environment | Green | <p>Grade II listed building to south-east</p> <p>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Amber. This would only affect Rectory Barn which is not listed, but can be considered a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p> | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | <p>Rural road with no footway past site frontage</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to provision of 2.0m wide footway at site frontage along with connection to existing pedestrian facility to west of site with a desirable min width of 2.0m, carriageway to be widened to 5.5m at site frontage. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Agricultural and residential | Green |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Development of site would continue existing pattern of small estate development along south side of Rectory Road, although it will extend the built-up extent of the village east. Senior Heritage & Design Officer comments needed on impact on listed building | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access should be achievable from Rectory Road. NCC Highways confirmation needed on whether extension of footway to site can be achieved | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Residential to west, with some residential to north and east along with agricultural land. Agricultural land to south. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Protected trees on Merlewood development to west. Largely open boundaries with Rectory Road and Rectory Lane, although recently planted hedgerow along Rectory Lane | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Protected trees on site to west. Limited habitat otherwise | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on or adjacent to the site | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Views across site from Rectory Lane and Rectory Road | Not applicable |
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | If extension to footway along Rectory Road to site can be achieved and there is no significant harm is concluded to the setting of the listed building, then this is a reasonable site for an extension to 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) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in private and part ownership (multiple landowners) | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | 2m wide extension to footway along Rectory Road to link to site would be required and carriageway widening to 5.5 metres | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated but may be reduced in size slightly to prevent development in excess of 25 dwellings. The site is potentially prominent at the edge of the village but is reasonable in landscape terms. It is noted that the adjacent trees have TPOs.

Site Visit Observations

Site extends into open countryside to east of village but would continue pattern of small estate development along southern side of Rectory Road. Footway on northern side of Rectory Road stops just to the west of the site. Listed building to south-east.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations- Site is adjacent to development boundary.

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** option for allocation, subject to a reduction in the size of the site. Whilst the site extends into the open countryside to the east of the village, the site benefits from good connectivity and relates well to the existing built form of the settlement along the southern side of Rectory Road. Off-site highway works have been identified however these are considered to be achievable. No other constraints have been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0259

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|---|
| Site Reference | SN0259 |
| Site address | Land south of Rectory Road and east of Rectory Lane |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 1.707 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension | Allocation for 20 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 20 dwellings = 11.7dph |
| 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 | Rural roads with some constraints on access NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. 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. | Amber |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | <p>Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 930 metres along Rectory Road largely with footway, then footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane</p> <p>Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 950 metres</p> <p>Distance to shop / post office 930 metres</p> | |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | <p>Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 930 metres along Rectory Road largely with footway, then footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane</p> <p>Distance to King's Head public house 1.2km</p> | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Some identified surface water flood risk on site and on Rectory Lane | 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 | Green | Intrusion into open countryside to east of village. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |
| Townscape | Green | Detached from built-up area of village | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Green | Grade II listed building to south NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Rural road with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. 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. | 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? | Poor relationship with existing settlement and potential impact on setting of listed building to south | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access should be achievable from Rectory Road but considerable extension to existing footway may be required | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Mainly agricultural land but dwellings to south and north-west and north-east. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Largely open boundaries | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Limited habitat potential | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Open views across site from Rectory Lane and Rectory Road | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable due to detached nature of site. | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in private ownership with multiple owners | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Off-site highway improvements to provide footway link likely to be required | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation; however, the site has been promoted for 20 dwellings which is a low density form of development that would not make effective use of the land. Development of the site would be subject to achieving satisfactory access. Landscape and heritage constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site is detached from main settlement in open countryside with access along a rural road with no footways.

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 further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development due to identified highway issues and to its physical separation from the main settlement further west along Rectory Road. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. Heritage assets identified to the south however this could be mitigated against through careful design.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0350

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|--|
| Site Reference | SN0350 |
| Site address | Land west of Ipswich Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 1 hectare |
| Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension | Allocation – approximately 25-30 homes |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 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 | Highway frontage onto Ipswich Road from which access should be achievable NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to frontage development at Ipswich Road, extension of 30mph speed limit and if required, widening frontage footway to 2.0m (25-30 dwellings). Subject to highway conditions in planning application. | Amber |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School approximately 350 metres with footpath on same side of Ipswich Road. Limited pedestrian provision on Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 300 metres Distance to shop / post office 330 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 450 metres Distance to public house 215 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | No identified flood risk LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Mapping indicates that there are no areas of surface water risk as shown in the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. No ordinary watercourse apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible) and no AW sewers. | 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 |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | | B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland ALC: Grade 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Protrude into open countryside south of existing extent of development. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |
| Townscape | Amber | Any estate development would not be keeping with pattern of development in vicinity | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse to south of site NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Green | Road is of good standard with footway NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to frontage development at Ipswich Road, extension of 30mph speed limit and if required, widening frontage footway to 2.0m (25-30 dwellings). Subject to highway conditions in planning application. | 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? | Projects development out from existing village. Would harm setting of listed Manor Farmhouse to south | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access should be achievable from Ipswich Road | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land, no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land to west and on opposite side to east. Residential properties to north and south. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Open boundary with Ipswich Road, hedgerows on other boundaries | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Potential habitat in surrounding hedgerows | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | Overhead power lines along eastern and northern boundaries | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Open views from road. Screened by hedgerows from views from A140 to west | Not applicable |
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable for allocation due to harm to setting of listed building to south | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Private and sole ownership | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Yes. NCC highways have advised potential highway improvement works that would be required for development. | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be considered as an allocated site. Development of the site would be subject to achieving satisfactory access. Heritage impacts upon the Grade II listed building to the south of the site have been noted.

Site Visit Observations

Agricultural field in between listed Manor Farmhouse and main part of village to north, which forms an important part of its setting. Overhead power lines along eastern and northern boundaries of the site, considered will be required into whether these can be buried underground.

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 a **REASONABLE** option for development. The site benefits from good connectivity and relates well to the existing built form of the settlement to the north. Frontage development at Ipswich Road is considered acceptable, where highways improved would be required, but are achievable. These includes an extension of the 30mph speed limit and possible widening frontage footway to 2.0m. Whilst it is noted that the Grade II Listed Building, Manor Farmhouse, is located to south of site, this could be carefully mitigated against through careful design and development being positioned to the north and road frontage.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0361SL

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|---|
| Site Reference | SN0361SL |
| Site address | Land off (garage site) Ipswich Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated (Part within and part outside development boundary) |
| Planning History | Refusal of application to demolish garage and replace with four dwellings (2017/2440) |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.5 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension | Settlement limit extension – up to 10 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified (25dph = 12.5 dwellings) |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield | Largely brownfield |

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Access to the site | Amber | Existing access onto Ipswich Road. However potential visibility constraints if access is to be re-sited NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to vehicular access via existing garage site, securing acceptable visibility and widening footway to 2.0m at site frontage. Southern access to be pedestrian & cycle only due to visibility constraints. (10 dwellings). Subject to highway conditions in planning application. | Amber |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | <p>Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 250 metres with footway along Ipswich Road. Pedestrian provision more limited along Harvey Lane</p> <p>Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 170 metres</p> <p>Distance to shop / post office 200 metres</p> | |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | <p>Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 350 metres</p> <p>Distance to public house 90 metres</p> | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Green | Capacity to be confirmed. | Green |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Amber | Potential contamination from previous garage use | Amber |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Flood Risk | Amber | <p>Previous planning application refused due to surface water flood risk</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Mapping indicates that it is not at risk of flooding as shown in the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. The site is connected to a watercourse network. Therefore the discharge of surface water may be dependent on infiltration testing.</p> | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | Not applicable | Tributary Farmland | Not applicable |
| SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | | <p>B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland</p> <p>ALC: Grade 3</p> | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Brownfield site largely visually contained within settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Green |
| Townscape | Amber | The site would introduce development to the rear of existing frontage development along The Street and Burston Road | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | <p>Close to boundary with conservation area. Grade II listed buildings to north</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p> | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Transport and Roads | Amber | <p>Constrained route through village centre, however good capacity to south</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Subject to vehicular access via existing garage site, securing acceptable visibility and widening footway to 2.0m at site frontage. Southern access to be pedestrian & cycle only due to visibility constraints. (10 dwellings). Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Residential properties | Green |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Development offers the opportunity to visually improve the site and the setting of heritage assets | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Should be achievable given existing uses and access | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Potential redevelopment and demolition issues given previous uses on site | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Surrounding residential uses so redevelopment for residential should be compatible | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level. | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Trees on western boundary and tree belt on southern boundary | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Limited potential for habitat | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | Overhead power lines along eastern boundary | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Views into site constrained by existing structures | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Site has been in active commercial use until recently. As such exploration of potential future commercial uses should be considered for the site prior to residential. It is therefore considered not appropriate to allocate the site and that it should be left to the planning application process to demonstrate that the site is no longer suitable for commercial use | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in private and part ownership | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Yes. NCC Highways require the widening of footway on site frontage | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has acknowledged affordable housing requirements has not provided any evidence of viability if it is required | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified other than tidying up brownfield site | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered suitable for a settlement limit extension, subject to achieving satisfactory access and overcoming previous concerns with surface water flood. The site was previously used as a garage where is potential for contamination.

Site Visit Observations

Existing commercial site where the use appears to have ceased. However, site was in use until recently and it needs to be demonstrated that there are no potential future commercial use of the site.

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 further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site has been forward for allocated, however due to its location and size it has been considered for a settlement limit extension. It has been concluded that the site is **UNREASONABLE** for a settlement limit and/or allocation. The site is reasonably well connected however highway safety concerns have been identified. The site is an existing commercial site where would be an associated loss of small-scale employment on the site. Whilst the site is considered as brownfield, development of the site would be constrained due to its position behind existing to the north and east (back land development).

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0389

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|--|
| Site Reference | SN0389 |
| Site address | Land north of Harvey Lane, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated – outside development boundary |
| Planning History | No planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 3.3 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension | Allocated site - approximately 100 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 100 dwellings = 30 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 | <p>Constrained site frontage where access would need to be achieved</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site.</p> | Red |
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | <p>Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 660 metres</p> <p>Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 1km</p> <p>Distance to shop / post office 1.2km</p> | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 630 metres Distance to public house 900 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter is unsure that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Amber |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Some identified surface water flood risk on 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 | Green | Development would extend into open countryside resulting in urbanisation of the countryside. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Would relate poorly to existing development | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Green | No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber | Green |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Constrained country lane with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. | Red |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Agricultural and residential | Green |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Would relate poorly with existing development unless intervening field between the site and the recently developed allocation to the west were also to be allocated for development | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access likely to require removal of trees on highway boundary | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land to east, south and west with residential properties to north. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Trees on highway boundary and on eastern boundary. Hedge on western boundary | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Habitat in trees and hedgerows on 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) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Views into site limited by trees and hedgerows, but development would be apparent in views from Harvey Lane to west | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable due to poor relationship with existing development and constrained highway access | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in single private ownership | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Off-site highway improvements are likely to be required but may not be deliverable | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is too large to allocate in the context of the VCHAP, but there are options for reducing in size to a site for 25 dwellings. However, even for a small scale development access from Harvey Lane would be restricted, as this road is a narrow country lane which would be constrained to provide a suitable access and footpath provision. Development in this location would not relate well to the main build area.

Site Visit Observations

Field accessed from country lane detached from existing built-up area. Trees on highway boundary would restrict access. Views into site limited by trees and hedgerows, but development would be apparent in views from Harvey Lane to west.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations - Site is outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further 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. The site is separated from the existing settlement and proposed to be accessed via Harvey Lane which is not supported by Highways. In particular, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. A development of reduced scale would not sufficiently address this concern.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0389

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|--|
| Site Reference | SN0389 |
| Site address | Land north of Harvey Lane, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated – outside development boundary |
| Planning History | No planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 3.3 ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension | Allocated site - approximately 100 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 100 dwellings = 30 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 | Constrained site frontage where access would need to be achieved NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. | Red |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities Part 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 660 metres Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 1km Distance to shop / post office 1.2km | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 630 metres Distance to public house 900 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter is unsure that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Amber |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Some identified surface water flood risk on 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 | Green | Development would extend into open countryside resulting in urbanisation of the countryside. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Would relate poorly to existing development | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Green | No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber | Green |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Constrained country lane with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. | Red |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Agricultural and residential | Green |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Would relate poorly with existing development unless intervening field between the site and the recently developed allocation to the west were also to be allocated for development | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access likely to require removal of trees on highway boundary | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land to east, south and west with residential properties to north. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Trees on highway boundary and on eastern boundary. Hedge on western boundary | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Habitat in trees and hedgerows on 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) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Views into site limited by trees and hedgerows, but development would be apparent in views from Harvey Lane to west | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable due to poor relationship with existing development and constrained highway access | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in single private ownership | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Off-site highway improvements are likely to be required but may not be deliverable | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is too large to allocate in the context of the VCHAP, but there are options for reducing in size to a site for 25 dwellings. However, even for a small scale development access from Harvey Lane would be restricted, as this road is a narrow country lane which would be constrained to provide a suitable access and footpath provision. Development in this location would not relate well to the main build area.

Site Visit Observations

Field accessed from country lane detached from existing built-up area. Trees on highway boundary would restrict access. Views into site limited by trees and hedgerows, but development would be apparent in views from Harvey Lane to west.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations - Site is outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further 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. The site is separated from the existing settlement and proposed to be accessed via Harvey Lane which is not supported by Highways. In particular, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. A development of reduced scale would not sufficiently address this concern.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN0516

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|---|
| Site Reference | SN0516 |
| Site address | Land off Norwich Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | Part of site has outline permission for demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of a mixed use development comprising of 7 affordable homes, 7 custom-build homes and 8 accessible dwellings for older people and a unit for commercial/community use (2018/0980) |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 5.2 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension | Allocation – mixed use development of approximately 80 dwellings, community orchard, community building and small business unit |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified |
| 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 established for existing development but may not be suitable for larger site NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. There would appear to be insufficient frontage to create an acceptable access for the scale of the development possible on the site. | Red |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 560 metres via footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 220 metres Distance to shop / post office 200 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 560 metres via footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to public house 300 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Identified surface water flood risk in site including flow path bisecting site from area with permission and area without | 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 | Green | Potential impact on views of church which is an identified feature of the local landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Development further than that permitted has a potentially poor relationship to the existing settlement | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Grade I listed Church of All Saints to south west along with a number of Grade II listed buildings. Site is also in parts adjacent to the conservation area NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Potential constraints on Brandreth Close from additional development NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. There would appear to be insufficient frontage to create an acceptable access for the scale of the development possible on the site. | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Amber | Agricultural and residential | Amber |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Development extending further west from that permitted has a poor relationship with the existing settlement and could adversely affect the setting of the church and conservation area in views from the west | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access has been demonstrated to be achievable to that part of site with planning permission. Access into the remainder of the site could be achieved from the part of the site with permission. Alternative access from Burston Road would be more constrained | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Site is in or last in agricultural use with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land to north and west. Residential and land linked to residential uses to east and south | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedging and trees on part of northern and southern boundaries | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Potential habit in hedging and trees | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Views into site from public right of way to north of site. Some glimpsed views possible from A140 | Not applicable |
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Site that has planning permission should be included in the settlement limit. The remainder of the site is not suitable as it has a poor relationship with the village extending into open landscape to the west | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is private ownership with multiple landowners | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | The landowner had (2016) entered into a partnership with Flagship Group who were ready to develop site. | Not applicable |
| When might the site be available for development? | Within 5 years | Green |

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is much larger than the scale of development currently being sought, however a small part of the site could be allocated for 12 to 25 dwellings to that already permitted on the site. However, the site is largely detached from the existing settlement by other fields which are assessed separately. As the site already has outline consent, it is considered appropriate for this to be included as a settlement limit extension. Heritage, landscape and surface water risk constraints have also been noted.

Site Visit Observations

Area of site that does not benefit from planning permission has a poor relationship with the existing village extending into open countryside to the west.

Local Plan Designations

Outside development boundary.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. However, as part of the site already has outline planning permission for residential development it is considered appropriate for this to be included as a settlement limit extension.

The remainder of site is not suitable for development extending further west from that permitted as this would have a poor relationship with the existing settlement and could adversely affect the setting of the church and conservation area in views from the west. Highway constraints have also been identified with potential constraints on Brandreth Close from additional development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 14 December 2020

SN2083

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|--|
| Site Reference | SN2083 |
| Site address | Land west of Norwich Road, Dickleburgh (between Moorlands and Moorfield) |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Outside development boundary |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.89 hectares (GNLP: 0.77) |
| Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension | Allocation of 10 to 15 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified (15 dwellings= 17dph) |
| 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 | Long site frontage onto straight section of road NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Will require a 2.0m footway across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays. | Amber |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 1km, footway along Norwich Road Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 600 metres Distance to shop / post office 590 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 1km Distance to public house 700 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Small area in NE corner of site is in Flood Zone 2 | 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 | Green | Intrusive into open countryside. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |
| Townscape | Amber | Poor relationship to main part of settlement | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Grade II listed building on opposite side of Norwich Road NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Green | Road has reasonable capacity and footway NCC HIGHWAYS –Green. Will require a 2.0m footway across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays. | Green |
| 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? | Poor relationship to main part of settlement and will impact on setting of listed building | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access should be achievable onto Norwich Road | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land or land given to wildlife enhancement to east, residential properties on western side of Norwich Road. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedge on part of highway boundary, eastern boundary is open | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Potential habitat in hedge, also potential issues with wetland project to east | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | Overhead power line on eastern boundary | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Views from Norwich Road and also across new wetland from public rights of way | Not applicable |
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable due to poor relationship to main part of settlement. Could also be detrimental to new wetland area | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is single private ownership | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | NCC Highways have identified that a 2.0m footway will be required across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays. | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated, however it is poorly located in terms of distance to services within Dickleburgh. It has also been noted that a small area of the site is subject to Flood Zone 2 and within close proximity to Dickleburgh Moor. Access/highway issues have also been raised.

Site Visit Observations

Site is detached from main part of settlement. Is also adjacent to new wetland (Dickleburgh Moor) area which development could be detrimental to. Agricultural land or land given to wildlife enhancement to east, residential properties on western side of Norwich Road. No compatibility issues.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside and removed from the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available and within the plan period.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development due to the poor relationship to the main part of Dickleburgh and the impact on Dickleburgh Moor. The site also is constrained by a small area subject to Flood Zone 2, in the north east corner. Highway constraints have identified with regard to achieving visibility and a 2m footway across the site, however these are considered resolvable.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN2084SL

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|--|
| Site Reference | SN2084SL |
| Site address | Land west of Norwich Road, Dickleburgh (south of Moorfields) |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.21 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension | Settlement limit extension – five dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 5 dwellings = 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 | Access opportunities may be constrained by hedge on site frontage NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Will require a 2.0m footway across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays | Amber |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 900 metres, footway along Norwich Road Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 500 metres Distance to shop / post office 490 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 900 metres Distance to public house 600 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Amber | No identified flood risk | Green |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | Not applicable | Tributary Farmland | Not applicable |
| SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | | B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland ALC: Grade 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Intrusive into open countryside. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |
| Townscape | Amber | Poor relationship to main part of settlement | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber | Green |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Road has reasonable capacity and footway NCC HIGHWAYS – Green. Will require a 2.0m footway across site frontage and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays | Green |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Agricultural and residential. Sewerage treatment works to south-east | Amber |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Poor relationship to main part of settlement | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access should be achievable onto Norwich Road | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land on all sides other than residential to north. Confirmation would be needed that no issue with sewerage treatment works 160 metres to south-east. | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Sections of hedgerow on highway boundary. Southern and eastern boundaries are open | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Some habitat in hedgerows, also potential issues with wetland project to east | 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 powerlines on eastern boundary | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Views from Norwich Road and also across new wetland from public rights of way | Not applicable |
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable due to poor relationship to main part of settlement. | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in single private ownership | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | 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) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | NCC Highways have advised that a 2.0m footway across site frontage will be required and assessment of speed limit to determine required visibility splays. | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is unsuitable for a settlement limit extension as this would require a new settlement limit to be created for development along Norwich Road. The site has a poor relationship with the existing settlement. It has also been noted that there are potential highway and landscape issues.

Site Visit Observations

Site is detached from main part of settlement on edge of open landscape where new wetland has been created.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside of and removed from the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

None further identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** extension to the settlement limit as the site has a poor relationship to the existing settlement, this would require the creation of a new settlement limit along this part of Norwich Road. Development in this location would have an adverse impact on the landscape, including the Dickleburgh Moor and highways constraints result in further issues that would hinder the development of this site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN2145

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|--|
| Site Reference | SN2145 (Linked to SN0516) |
| Site address | Land to the west of Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 6.1 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (ee) Allocated site (ff) SL extension | Allocated site – site could be subdivided to accommodate a minimum 25 dwellings (GNLP – 80 dwellings) |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified |
| 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 either from Burston Road or from land to east has constraints NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. | Red |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 400 metres Distance to bus service 350 metres Distance to shop / post office 370 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 500 metres Distance to public house 270 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Red | Northern section of site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 | 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 | Green | Potential impact on views of church which is an identified feature of the local landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Development would have a poor relationship to the existing settlement | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Grade I listed Church of All Saints to west along with a number of Grade II listed buildings. Site is also in parts adjacent to the conservation area NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site. | 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? | Development of site would have a poor relationship with the existing settlement and could adversely affect the setting of the church and conservation area in views from the west | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access from Burston Road is unlikely to be acceptable due to its constrained nature. NCC Highways raise concerns about access | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land to north, south and east (although this land is promoted for residential development in conjunction with this site). Site surrounds residential properties. A140 to west of site which may require some mitigation | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Belt of trees along boundary with A140. Hedging and trees on some of eastern boundary. Trees to north of site. | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | In addition to boundary hedging and trees, there are some trees within the southern part of the site | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Public right of way crosses northern part of site with. Some limited views from Burston Road and glimpsed views from A140 | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable as it has a poor relationship with the village extending into open landscape to the west | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in private ownership | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No | Not applicable |
| When might the site be available for development? | 5 – 10 years. It is envisaged that the first phase of development would involve the adjacent site (GNLP 0516). Development of the SN1245 could then follow. | Amber |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Highway improvements may be required but questionable to whether they can be delivered | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability | Amber |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | Benefits identified as part of strategic site with SN0516 but none identified for allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is too large to allocate in the context of the VCHAP, but there are options for reducing in size to a site for 12 to 25 dwellings. It is also noted that the delivery of the site would be dependent on the development of site SN0516, this is considered to provide a risk and could make the site unviable. Highway/access and heritage constraints have also been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site has a poor relationship with the existing village. Agricultural land is located to north, south and east (although this land is promoted for residential development (SN0516) in conjunction with this site). Site surrounds residential properties. A140 runs to west of site which may require some mitigation.

Local Plan Designations

Outside development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available following development of site SN0516.

Achievability

No further identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE**. The site is considered to have a poor relationship with the existing village and development could adversely affect the setting of the church and conservation area, in views from the west. Highway constraints have also been identified where no suitable access to the site is achievable. A development of reduced scale would not sufficiently address these concerns. The site promoter has also highlighted that the site would only be available following development of site SN0516, which raises deliverability constraints.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 14 December 2020

SN3017

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|---|
| Site Reference | SN3017 |
| Site address | Land north of Harvey Lane / Langmere Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated |
| Planning History | Historic refused applications for residential development |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 1.52 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (gg) Allocated site (hh) SL extension | Allocated site – approximately 28 dwellings with POS |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified 25dph = 37 swellings |
| 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 | Constrained highway onto which access would need to be achieved NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Narrow carriageway & no footway, improvements not feasible within highway | Amber |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 435 metres Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 760 metres Distance to shop / post office 810 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 360 metres Distance to public house 670 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Identified surface water flood risk on 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 | Green | Bounded on two sides by existing development reduces landscape impact. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Green |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Townscape | Green | Adjacent to estate development of a similar scale to that which would be achieved here | Green |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Second World War pillbox on site frontage that can be considered undesigned heritage asset NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Constrained country lane with no footways NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Narrow carriageway & no footway, improvements not feasible within highway | Red |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Agricultural land residential | Green |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Development would continue existing pattern of small estate development along north side of Harvey Lane. Pillbox could be retained as part of development. | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access along Harvey Lane is very constrained and was highly contentious when the previous allocation was developed to the west. Likely highway objection | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Residential to west and north, agricultural land to east and south. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Open boundary onto highway. Eastern boundary is currently undefined as part of same field | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Little potential habitat on 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) | None other than pillbox | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Open views across site from public highway | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | In form and character terms development of the site could be acceptable, however access is unlikely to be acceptable. Highway Authority have commented that improvements not feasible | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in single private ownership | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | (Site was under option to Hopkins Homes) | Not applicable |
| When might the site be available for development? | Immediately. Site could be developed following the completion of the neighbouring site to the east. | Green |

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated, subject to achieving satisfactory access. The site is relatively connected, there is an existing small scale estate development to the east. Heritage and highways constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Adjacent to existing pattern of small scale estate development along Harvey Lane. Harvey Lane is a narrow constrained lane with little pedestrian provision which would be difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to current development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The site is reasonably well connected however highway safety concerns have been identified. The site would be accessed via Harvey Lane which is a narrow and constrained lane with little pedestrian provision which would be difficult to mitigate and where improvements are not feasible within existing highway.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN4043SL

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|---|
| Site Reference | SN4043SL |
| Site address | Allotment Gardens north of Dickleburgh Church (and west of Brandreth Close) |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Unallocated site |
| Planning History | No planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.5 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (ii) Allocated site (jj) SL extension | Settlement limit extension – less than 12 dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified 25dph = 12.5 dwellings |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield | Greenfield |

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

| Is the site located in, or does the site include: | 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 very constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No identified access to highway | Red |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 500 metres by Rectory Road and then footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 140 metres Distance to shop / post office 125 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 500 metres by Rectory Road and then footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to public house 230 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Amber | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are not readily available | Amber |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Western part of site has identified surface water flood risk LLFA – Amber. Mitigation required for heavy constraints with significant information required. The site is affected by and adjacent to a significant flowpath. | 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 | Green | Site is relatively contained in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Green |
| Townscape | Green | Development is adjacent to small estate development that could be replicated on this site | Green |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Amber | <p>Potential for priority / protected species and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to village green</p> <p>ECOLOGY – Green. Potential for priority/protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain. Adjacent to Village Green</p> | Amber |
| Historic Environment | Amber | <p>Southern part of site within conservation area. Grade I listed church to south-east and other grade II listed to east and south-east of site</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p> | Amber |
| Open Space | Amber | Loss of allotment site | Amber |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | <p>Site not directly served by adopted highway</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Green. No identified access to highway</p> | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Agricultural and residential | Green |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Potential impact on setting of church, although there has already been some impact by the development to the east. A small estate development on this site could be acceptable if access can be achieved. | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access would rely on third party land, which could be forthcoming if site SN0516 was to be allocated | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Previous allotment use. Would need consideration of whether alternative allotment provision has been made elsewhere | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land to west and residential to east. Land to north has outline planning permission for residential development | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedging and trees on boundary | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Hedging and trees provide habitat | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on or adjacent to site | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Site is well contained visually. | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Would only be suitable for inclusion in the development boundary if much larger site is allocated to north due to access issues | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in private ownership (site is part of a trustee with multiple trustees) | 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. Owned by Dickleburgh Town Lands Trust but all members support the proposal for the site. | Green |

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is suitable in size for a settlement limit extension, the site is situated within an existing residential settlement. However, access for the development is heavily constrained without development of adjoining land (potential third party land access). Landscape, heritage and surface water flood impacts have also been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Former allotment site that is visually well contained. However, access for residential development is highly constrained without development of adjoining land. Site is redundant.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside and removed from current development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** extension to the settlement limit. The site is a former allotment site that is visually well contained, however access for residential development is highly constrained without development of adjoining third party land. Development in this location would also have a harmful impact on designated heritage assets to the south-east of the site (Grade I listed church and other grade II listed buildings), the southern part of site is also within the Dickleburgh Conservation Area. The western part of site has also been identified having surface water flood risk.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN4056SL

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|--|--|
| Site Reference | SN4056SL |
| Site address | Land east of Ipswich Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Outside development boundary |
| Planning History | Refusal for six dwellings (2019/1691) |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.49 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (kk) Allocated site (ll) SL extension | Settlement limit – six dwellings |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unspecified |
| 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 | Long site frontage onto which access should be achievable NCC HIGHWAYS – Green. Frontage footway linking with existing facility required. | Green |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 370 metres with footway along Ipswich Road. Pedestrian provision more limited along Harvey Lane. Distance to bus stop with peak times services to Norwich and Diss service 290 metres Distance to shop / post office 350 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 440 metres Distance to public house 200 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Capacity to be confirmed. | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Amber | Promoter has raised queries whether services to the site are readily available | Amber |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | Some identified surface water flood risk on highway LLFA – Green. Few or no 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 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Development would intrude into open landscape to south. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Frontage development could relate to existing pattern of development | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Amber | No protected sites in close proximity ECOLOGY – Green. Potential for priority/protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain. Adjacent to Village Green. | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Grade II listed building on opposite side of Ipswich Road to south NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Green | Road has reasonable capacity with footway NCC HIGHWAYS –Amber. Frontage footway linking with existing facility required. | 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? | Extending frontage development south could be achieved in keeping with the form and character. However, consideration would be needed to minimise impact on setting of listed building to south-west | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Safe access should be achievable from Ipswich Road | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land to east and south and in part to west on opposite side of Ipswich Road. Residential properties to north. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Trees and hedgerow along north-western boundary. Several individual trees along eastern boundary. | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Habitat to trees and hedgerows | Not applicable |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles) | No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on site | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Open views across site from Ipswich Road | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Small settlement limit extension could be acceptable if site is not allocated as part of wider site SN0498 | Amber |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Is the site in private/ public ownership? | Site is in private ownership with multiple owners. | Not applicable |
| Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | There is a legal agreement in place that on a planning permission the land will be sold to Orchard Homes to develop the land in accordance with the approved planning approval. | Not applicable |
| When might the site be available for development? | Immediately | Green |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | None identified | Green |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Affordable housing would not be required for this size of site or scale of development | n/a |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension, subject to achieving a satisfactory access. It has been noted that a small settlement limit extension could be acceptable if site is not allocated as part of wider site under SN0498.

Site Visit Observations

Site forms open countryside to south of village, but could be suitable for an extension to the south consisting of an extension to the existing linear pattern of frontage development. Trees and hedgerow along north-western boundary with several individual trees along eastern boundary.

Local Plan Designations

The site is outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a suitable option for a settlement limit extension, if the wider site SN0498 is not allocated. Whilst the site forms part of the open countryside to the south of the village, the site lends itself to a settlement limit extension consisting of an extension to the existing linear pattern of frontage development in this location. No other constraints have been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 14 December 2020

SN4057

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|---|
| Site Reference | SN4057 |
| Site address | Land west of garage site, Ipswich Road, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Outside development boundary – unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.7 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (mm) Allocated site (nn) SL extension | Allocation – number of dwellings not specified |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 17 dwellings at 25 dph |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield | Part greenfield, part brownfield |

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Access to the site | Amber | Access is constrained by existing garage site (although this is also promoted so could provide the access point – SN0360) NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No identified access to highway. Burston Road not suitable for access. | Red |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Amber | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 365 metres Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 265 metres Distance to shop / post office 320 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 435 metres Distance to public house 180 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Amber | Potential for contamination given link to previous garage site | Amber |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Some identified surface water flood risk LLFA – Amber. Significant mitigation for severe constraints with significant information required. The site is affected by and adjacent to a significant flowpath. | 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>) | | B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland ALC: Grade 3 | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Largely contained within settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Green |
| Townscape | Amber | Development would be to rear of frontage development along Burston Road and Ipswich Road and not consistent with the existing form of development in evidence | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Amber | Includes priority habitat (traditional orchards). Potential for protected / priority species and habitats and for biodiversity net gain ECOLOGY – Amber. Includes Priority Habitat - Traditional orchards. Potential for protected/priority species and habitats and for Biodiversity Net Gain | Amber |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Conservation area to north of site NCC HES – Amber | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | No immediate connection to adopted highway. Highways to comment on road network NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No identified access to highway. Burston Road not suitable for access. | 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? | Development would not be reflective of frontage development along Burston Road and Ipswich Road | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Ability to access site would depend on former garage site coming forward to allow access onto Norwich Road | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Some structures on site but any issues should be able to be overcome. Existing buildings would require removal. Contamination issues? | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Agricultural land to south, residential properties to north. If former garage to east is to be removed then no compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Hedging and trees on southern boundary | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Potential habitat in trees and hedging | 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) | Some potential for contamination but unlikely to prohibit development of site – this could affect the viability of the site however. | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Site is well contained from public views | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not suitable as access cannot be achieved without garage site coming forward – see SN0361 | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is potentially of a size that could be allocated but is located to the rear of road frontage development so would constitute backland development. Access to the site has been identified as a significant issue and is reliant on the clearance and allocation of another site currently being promoted – SN0361. In ecological terms the site is also identified as having a Priority Habitat across all/ part of it and is therefore considered to be sensitive.

Site Visit Observations

Site is to the rear of existing frontage development along Burston Road and Ipswich Road. Access is entirely dependent on garage site on Ipswich Road – see SN0361. Existing hedging and trees along the southern boundary of the site.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to an access to the site being possible, however there would be additional costs associated with the clearance of this site which could impact on the viability of development in this location.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for allocation. Access to the site would be dependent on an additional parcel of land and whilst this may be achievable development of the site would result in backland development that is unsympathetic to the existing pattern of development. Potential ecological constraints have also been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN4070SL

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|---|
| Site Reference | SN4070SL |
| Site address | Land to the side and rear of Kings House, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Outside development boundary – unallocated |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.3 hectares |
| Promoted Site Use, including (oo) Allocated site (pp) SL extension | Settlement limit extension |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 7 dwellings at 25 dph |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield | Greenfield |

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Access to the site | Red | Access to the site is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. No identified access to highway. | Red |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Green | Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 500 metres by Rectory Road and then footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to bus stop with peak time services to Norwich and Diss 140 metres Distance to shop / post office 125 metres | |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | Distance to Dickleburgh village hall and recreation area 500 metres by Rectory Road and then footpath from Rectory Road to Harvey Lane Distance to public house 230 metres | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Amber | Wastewater capacity to be confirmed | Amber |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available | Green |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Site within an area already served by fibre technology | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues | Green |
| Flood Risk | Amber | Some identified surface water flood risk LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required. | Amber |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | Not applicable | Tributary Farmland | Not applicable |
| SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | | B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Green | Site is contained within settlement. No loss of high grade agricultural land | Green |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Townscape | Amber | Backland development | Amber |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Amber | <p>Potential for priority / protected species and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to village green</p> <p>ECOLOGY – Green. Potential for priority/protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain. Adjacent to Village Green</p> | Amber |
| Historic Environment | Amber | <p>In conservation area. Grade I listed church immediately to south and Grade II listed former public house immediately to east. Other listed buildings nearby</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p> | Amber |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Red | <p>No direct access to public highway. Local highway network constrained through village centre</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Green. No identified access to highway.</p> | Green |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green | Residential and place of worship | Green |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | Backland development that wouldn't relate well either to existing development along The Street or the recent development to the north. Also likely to adversely affect the setting of the church to the south | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access is constrained but may be possible to achieve a private drive for one or two dwellings | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Church to south and residential to north and east. No compatibility issues | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Site is largely level | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | Trees and hedging | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | Potential habitat in trees and hedging | 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 contamination or existing infrastructure | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | Site is well contained visually | Not applicable |

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--|----------------------|
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Not recommended to be included in settlement limit given backland nature of site and impact on the setting of the church and other heritage assets | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Conclusion | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green |

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery | Green |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Unknown at this time | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | Unlikely to be a policy requirement for affordable housing due to the appropriate scale of development on the site | n/a |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None identified | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension however access constraints have been identified. Development of the site would also have an impact on nearby designated heritage assets.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well contained visually but is backland site where development wouldn't relate well to existing development and could have adverse impact on setting of heritage assets, particularly the Grade I listed church to the south.

Local Plan Designations

The site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable if an access to the site could be formed.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is an **UNREASONABLE** extension to the settlement limit. Development of the site would represent backland development that would have a poor relationship with existing development. Access to the site is a key constraint. Development in this location would also have a harmful impact on designated heritage assets to the south of the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17 September 2020

SN6003SL

Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail | Comments |
|---|--|
| Site Reference | SN6003SL |
| Site address | Land south of Harvey Lane, Dickleburgh |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status) | Outside development boundary |
| Planning History | No relevant planning history |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted) | 0.14ha |
| Promoted Site Use, including (qq) Allocated site (rr) SL extension | Settlement Limit Extension |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | Unknown – assume 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 | Access from Harvey Lane. Footpaths located on other side of the road close to existing development, but some distance away and site does not stretch to this area. NCC Highways comments – Red: Does not appear possible to achieve acceptable visibility | Amber |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport | Amber | <p>Distance to Convenience Store 800m</p> <p>Distance to Dickleburgh Primary School 400m</p> <p>Distance to Bus Stop 1200m</p> <p>NCC Education comments – Green: School locally has capacity for additional pupils but the route to school from this location would not be safe, based on narrow lane development is proposed to lead off, there are no linked pavements or cycle ways.</p> <p>Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (NHS) ‘RAG’ rating – Red: Further than 1200m walking distance to nearest GP practices (Churchill Surgery, Pulham Market, Lawns Medical Practice, Diss & Parish Fields Practice, Diss)</p> | |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities | | <p>Distance to Village Centre 300m</p> <p>Distance to Village Centre equipped play area and playing field 300m</p> <p>Distance to The Crown Public House 600m</p> | Green |
| Utilities Capacity | Green | <p>No known specific issues.</p> <p>Anglian Water comments – Green: Dickleburgh Rectory Rd WRC has capacity. However site is beyond the current built envelope of the settlement.</p> | Green |
| Utilities Infrastructure | Green | No known specific issues. | Green |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Better Broadband for Norfolk | | Available in IP21 area. | Green |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route | | Not within identified cable route or substation location. | Green |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green | No known contamination or ground stability issues. Community Protection and Environment Comments - No known contamination issues. | Green |
| Flood Risk | Green | No known issues. NCC LLFA comments – Red : Major flooding risk from surface runoff. No internal or anecdotal flooding on site, some anecdotal within 500m. No watercourse within or close to site. No surface water sewers within or close to site. Source Protection Zone 3. Deposits of Diamicton. Infiltration potential requires geotechnical survey, infiltration should be used where possible. | 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 |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>) | | <p>Waveney Tributary Farmland: Large scale open landscape on higher ground with some distant views. Round tower and isolated churches are distinctive landmarks and often significant in rural views. Moats and earthworks are a feature usually associated with old halls and farms. Historic parkland and associated halls and mansions occur throughout the area. Distinctive, regular, historic field pattern around Dickleburgh & other villages. Settlement occurs throughout the character area with villages frequently linear along roads and some villages being more compact and set around village greens as at Pulham Market and Burston. Less concentrated settlement to the east and west of the area. Large farm and processing units present in the wider landscape are often visually dominant. Older farm buildings characteristically red brick and pantiled. Building styles include a mix of traditional to the more suburban edges.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Value 3</p> | |
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Amber/Red | New development should maintain the rural character of development of small villages in the agricultural landscape. Development should be focussed around greens and loosely follow roads. This site sits outside and does not relate well to the existing built area of Dickleburgh. It would also result in development on the opposite side to the road than what is already established. | Amber/Red |

| Impact | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Townscape | Amber/Red | As above, the site does not relate to the townscape of Dickleburgh. It is not enclosed by existing development and does not follow the settlement pattern. | Amber/Red |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | The site is bordered by established trees and hedgerows. The field does not present any clear habitats for species. An ecological assessment would be needed to establish if it is frequented by species. | Green |
| Historic Environment | Amber | Ivanhoe, Hall Road (Grade II) located to the east. Will need to be confirmed if development on the site will affect the setting on this building. NCC Historic Environment comments – Amber . Historic England Comments - There are no designated heritage assets nearby. No comments. Site somewhat disconnected from village. | Green |
| Open Space | Green | No loss of public open space. | Green |
| Transport and Roads | Amber | Site is accessed by narrow country road with no direct footpath access. Bus services are limited and not particularly close to the site. NCC Highways comments – Red : Local highway network narrow without footways, not suitable to support further development. | Amber |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Amber/red | Site is surrounded by open countryside and agricultural fields. Existing development is located close by to the north west. | Amber/red |

Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape? | A WWII Pillbox resides to the north west of the site on the opposite side of the road. It is exposed to the wider landscape however development on the site would be unlikely to have any direct effect. The site is not well related to the existing development due to the wide spaces between the site and the existing development. | Not applicable |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations? | Access would require the removal of hedgerows. The road is narrow but straight. Discussions should be had with Highways to ensure suitable access can be created. | Not applicable |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues) | No issues, agricultural use. | Not applicable |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | The site is surrounded by open countryside with little landscaping blocking views. Some relatively new residential development has been built to the north west, however this does not immediately border the site. Any development on this site would not be enclosed or well related to the existing village. | Not applicable |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels) | Flat, no issues. | Not applicable |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development) | All boundaries are exposed to the open countryside with the exception of the northern boundary facing the road, which is made up of hedgerows and trees. | Not applicable |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | The site does not include any clear habitats and appears to be mostly maintained grassland. The only likely habitats will be those found within the trees and hedgerows along the northern border. | 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 clear issues. | Not applicable |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape | East, south and western views all face out into open countryside. Northern view includes some development in the distance, but again is mostly open countryside. Views into site made up of mostly open countryside. | Not applicable |
| Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | The site is exposed to the open countryside and does not relate well to the existing village. Access may be possible. No clear issues relating to the impact on historic environment or loss of habitats. | Red |

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Conclusion | 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) | Unknown | Not applicable |
| When might the site be available for development? | Immediately | Green |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability) | Comments | Site Score (R/A/G) |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate) | No evidence provided | Red |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI) | Unknown but highways improvements may be required. | Amber |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable? | No evidence provided | Red |
| Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site? | None provided | |

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is located outside of Dickleburgh and is exposed to the open countryside on all sides. The site does not relate well to the existing development. The site is flat and does not appear to have any serious issues relating to the historic and natural environment. Access may be an issue as the site will need to be accessed from a narrow country lane.

Site Visit Observations

The site is very isolated and does not relate well to Dickleburgh. The site is very exposed to views in all directions. No clear issues with the natural and historic environment.

Local Plan Designations

The site will not conflict with any Local Plan designations.

Availability

No evidence has been provided to support the availability of the site.

Achievability

No evidence has been provided to support the achievability of the site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is exposed to the open countryside and does not relate to the existing village. Access to the site may be challenging and pedestrian access may not be possible. Development on this site would likely be detrimental to the landscape character.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 29/06/23