



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Kirby Cane and Ellingham

Contents

SN0019SL	3
SN0303SL	12
SN0304	23
SN0305	34
SN0306	44
SN0344	53
SN0348	63
SN0396	73
SN4002SL	85
SN4018	95
SN4054	105

SN0019SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0019SL
Site address	Land at Old Post Office Land, Kirby Cane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	1988/2744 Erection of one dwelling. Refused, appeal dismissed 2018/0301 Change of use of land to domestic garden
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.18 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Extension to settlement boundary (The site has been promoted for between 1 and 3 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16dph at 3 dwellings 4 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	The 2018 change of use has been implemented so part is considered to be residential, therefore 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	Narrow existing access Old Post Office Lane from Old Yarmouth Road. Access bounded by existing buildings, particularly at the point joining the highway and therefore potential access constraints which may not be able to be overcome. NCC to advise. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Acceptable access not feasible, site accessed via private track, sight lines at Old Post Office La junction with Old Yarmouth Rd cross 3rd party land.	Red

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>Village Shop within 140m</p> <p>Nearest bus stop within 124m. Served by 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston. Bus stop close to the site</p> <p>Primary School 893m</p> <p>Footpath links from the site to the school</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>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. Other promoters have confirmed that there is mains sewage.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC M&W – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Surface water drainage flooding depth 1-100.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Given the location and being mostly bound by existing residential uses, it would have an impact, but this could be reasonably mitigated. River Valley setting.	Green
Townscape	Amber	The site is considered to be backland development which would give rise to issues in terms of residential amenity for existing occupiers, noise disturbance etc. Equally in form and character terms.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Leeth Hill SSSI within 800m Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site, special area of conservation, special protection area to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>There is a listed building 190m to the west, however given the intervening uses i.e. residential development, there would be no detrimental impact on the setting of nearby LB.</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of Old Yarmouth Road. NCC to advise.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Acceptable access not feasible, site accessed via private track, sight lines at Old Post Office La junction with Old Yarmouth Rd cross 3rd party land.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>The nearby LB to the west is separated by existing development and therefore the site would not have an adverse impact on its setting.</p> <p>Backland development and therefore could impact on the form and character of the area, as well as possible impacts on the amenities of existing residential properties which bound the site and access.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The site will be accessed from the highway (Old Yarmouth Road) by an existing private way known as Old Post Office Lane. This serves and runs past five dwellinghouses, including 27 Yarmouth Road and Half Acre. Due to the nature of the existing access there are likely to be constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on Old Yarmouth Road.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	The parcel of land was until recently overgrown. The change of use has been implemented so part of the land is considered to be residential whilst the remainder is vacant.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries to the west, east and south are with existing residential properties mixture of fencing, trees and vegetation. Field boundary and fence to the north.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No significant on-site impact	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site limited due to the existing residential frontage. Will however be visible looking south across the adjacent agricultural field.	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)	Visually contained but development would represent a breakout from the existing linear pattern of development in this part of the settlement. Development could harm existing residential amenity. Concern regarding the access constraints.	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Designated River Valley		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension and is adjacent to the existing boundary however a number of constraints have been identified including appropriate highway access to the site, impact on the townscape and potential impacts on residential amenity.

Site Visit Observations

Adjacent to the development boundary and within good reach of services with footpath links.

Local Plan Designations

River valley setting.

Availability

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

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for a settlement limit extension. The site is well connected and is accessible to local services however significant highways concerns have been identified about access to the site, as well as townscape and residential amenity concerns caused by the backland form of development proposed for the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 6 August 2020

SN0303SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0303SL
Site address	South west corner of Henry's Field, Mill Lane, Ellingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	L/5357 - Residential development. refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.381ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 11 dwellings which equates to 29 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>Potential access constraints existing trees to site frontage. NCC informally have raised concerns that Mill Lane is unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures. NCC to confirm.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, not acceptable. Highway safety concern due to adjacent acute blind bend, no footway to connect with village centre – approx. 160m to site frontage – construction might be possible although highway boundary is unverified. Mill Lane may need widening to achieve the required minimum width of 5.5m. Insufficient frontage to achieve acceptable visibility. The existing short footway at Mill Lane does not provide a continuous facility at the junction with Mill Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - Mill Lane is too narrow, with no footways.</p>	Red

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>Village Shop within 420m</p> <p>Nearest bus stop less than 400m is 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School 807m</p> <p>No footpath on Mill Lane but from Mill Road there is a footpath all the way to the school.</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>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC Minerals & Waste – site under 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u>, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No surface water flooding identified.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads.</p> <p>Landscape meeting - This site is not considered to be acceptable in landscape terms, there are a significant number of trees on the site which forms an important part of the setting of the village as it is a key rural approach. There are also concerns about the hedgerow on the site.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p> <p>NCC Ecology - Orange habitat zone for DLL and great crested newts.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB located to the south but could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of Mill Lane may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC informally advised the promoter that Mill Lane is unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, not acceptable. Highway safety concern due to adjacent acute blind bend, no footway to connect with village centre – approx. 160m to site frontage – construction might be possible although highway boundary is unverified. Mill Lane may need widening to achieve the required minimum width of 5.5m. Insufficient frontage to achieve acceptable visibility. The existing short footway at Mill Lane does not provide a continuous facility at the junction with Mill Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - Mill Lane is too narrow, with no footways.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB to south. Noted it is separated by the Lane and existing farmhouse.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by semi-detached ex local authority houses set in reasonable sized plots. In a linear form. Therefore, the suggested density would be too high. However, for a SL extension that may not be too much of an issue as it could be reduced. Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing trees to site frontage. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on Mill Lane with no footpaths, which is a narrow country lane, terms of road capacity and lack of footpath provision.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural - classification 3/4	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees/hedgerows to west and south. Open to the east. Residential to the north.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Possibly significant trees along western boundary. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations? Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from Mill Lane, particularly from the south and from open land to east. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.	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)	<p>Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the south of the village, However, given that the site is adjacent to the built environment, whilst there will be a harm it may reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Consider potentially suitable for SL extension subject to mitigation of constraints</p>	Amber/Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open countryside		
Designated river valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services, therefore potentially considered suitable for a SL extension subject to mitigation of constraints. However, there are significant Highways constraints with Mill Lane, which is of variable widths with no footways.

Site Visit Observations

Site would represent a breakout to the south of the village. Whilst the site is adjacent to the built edge of the village, it contains a number of boundary trees and hedging which contribute to the rural River Valley setting of the Ellingham when approaching from The Broads.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside, river valley and adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – Whilst the site is adjacent to the existing Settlement Limit and within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities, this does not outweigh the limitations of the site in highways terms. The site also provides an attractive rural setting within the River Valley landscape, when approaching Ellingham from The Broads to the south.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 07/08/2020

SN0304

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0304
Site address	South east corner of Ellingham Island, opposite Henry's Field, Mill Lane, Ellingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.530ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated Site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 15 dwellings which equates to about 28/29 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>Potential access constraints existing trees to site frontage. NCC informally have raised concerns that Mill Lane is unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures. NCC to confirm.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, not acceptable. Highway safety concern due to adjacent acute blind bend, no footway to connect with village centre – approx. 160m to site frontage – construction might be possible although highway boundary is unverified. Mill Lane may need widening to achieve the required minimum width of 5.5m. Insufficient frontage to achieve acceptable visibility. The existing short footway at Mill Lane does not provide a continuous facility at the junction with Mill Road.</p>	Red

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>Village Shop within 420m</p> <p>Nearest bus stop less than 400m is 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School 807m</p> <p>No footpath on Mill Lane but from Mill Road there is a footpath all the way to the school.</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>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC Minerals & Waste – site under 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u>, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1. No surface water flooding identified.</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB located to the southeast but could be reasonably mitigated HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of Mill Lane may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC informally advised the promoter that Mill Lane is unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures. NCC Highways – Red, not acceptable. Highway safety concern due to adjacent acute blind bend, no footway to connect with village centre – approx. 160m to site frontage – construction might be possible although highway boundary is unverified. Mill Lane may need widening to achieve the required minimum width of 5.5m. Insufficient frontage to achieve acceptable visibility. The existing short footway at Mill Lane does not provide a continuous facility at the junction with Mill Road.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential Horses kept formally on the land to the northwest which bounds the top corner of the site	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB to southeast. Noted it is separated by the Lane and existing farmhouse.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by semi-detached ex local authority houses set in reasonable sized plots. In a linear form. Therefore, the suggested density would be too high. To reduce the numbers for an allocated site, to an appropriate level may bring it below the numbers we require? Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing trees to site frontage. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on Mill Lane, which is a narrow country lane with no footpaths, terms of road capacity and lack of footpath provision.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural – classification 3/4	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	<p>Trees/hedgerows to east. Open to the east and south. Residential to the north.</p> <p>Public footpath to the south and one running across the site to connect to Mill Road.</p>	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Possibly significant trees along eastern boundary. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations? Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	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 line running north – south across the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from Mill Lane, public footpaths, particularly from the south and from open land to west. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.	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)	Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the south of the village. Views of the site are afforded from both Mill Lane and public footpaths around the site. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.	Amber/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)
Open countryside		
Designated river valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services; however, not considered suitable due to adverse impacts on the designated River Valley landscape and highway safety related to the variable widths of Mill Lane and the lack of footways.

Site Visit Observations

It would represent a breakout to the south of the village. Views of the site are afforded from both Mill Lane and public footpaths (Ellingham/E04/2 and /E04/3) on and around the site. Therefore, the landscape harm may be difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley. The site and its frontage trees contribute to the rural setting of Ellingham when approached from The Broads to the south.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside, river valley and adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately – however with a public footpath diversion and overhead lines could delay the availability.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – Whilst the site is adjacent to the existing Settlement Limit and within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities, this does not outweigh the limitations of the site in highways terms. The site also provides an attractive rural setting within the River Valley landscape, when approaching Ellingham from The Broads to the south, as well as from the public rights of way on and near the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 6/08/2020

SN0305

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0305
Site address	Land South of Mill Road, Ellingham Island, Ellingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Site adjacent 2010/2220 - Erection of 7 units of affordable housing. Approved
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.076ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated Site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 32 dwellings which equates to about 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>NCC informally have raised concerns that Mill Road is unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, access to be provide to satisfaction of Highway Authority. Requires 2.0m f/w at site frontage to tie in with existing facility and including crossing points. Visibility improvement at Mill Rd junction with Church Rd may be required. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - this is the best site in this cluster in highways terms.</p>	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>Village Shop within 590mm</p> <p>Bus stop within 550m and is on the bus route for 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School 178m</p> <p>There is a footpath along Mill Road all the way to the school.</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>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	<p>High pressure gas main with a 125m buffer preventing development .</p> <p>Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site</p>	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC Minerals & Waste - site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1. No surface water flooding identified on the site. There is on the road and to the south of the site.</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated unless with a lower density. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads.</p> <p>Landscape meeting - Although there is a hedgerow along the site frontage this is not complete and development in this location would have a less harmful impact on both the landscape character and the setting of the settlement.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Linear development predominately in the immediate vicinity. With two dwellings set back to the rear of existing properties in larger plots.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. CWS located to the west on the other side of Station Road. Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on views of St Mary's Church to the south. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential access constraints. NCC advised that the local network currently is considered unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures. NCC Highways – Amber, access to be provide to satisfaction of Highway Authority. Requires 2.0m f/w at site frontage to tie in with existing facility and including crossing points. Visibility improvement at Mill Rd junction with Church Rd may be required. Subject to highway conditions in planning application. NCC Highways meeting - this is the best site in this cluster in highways terms.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Neighbouring Land Uses		Agricultural/residential and children's play area	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB to south.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by a linear development form. Therefore, the suggested density would be too high. Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on surrounding road network.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural – classification 3/4	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging/tree to the north, residential boundary to the east, open to the south and vegetation to the west with the boundary of the play area.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations? Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	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)	High pressure gas main with a 125m buffer preventing development .	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from Mill Road and particularly from the south and from open land to west. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley	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)	<p>Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the west of the village. Views of the site are afforded from both surrounding footpaths and highway around the site. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.</p> <p>The main issue is the high-pressure gas main and the buffer which makes the site undevelopable.</p>	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
Designated river valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site adjacent to the existing development boundary (adjoining a development of 7 affordable units, completed within the last 10 years) and is well located in terms of access to the local services and facilities in the village. The site is however constrained by a high-pressure pipeline running along the western boundary, which as accompanying easements; it is therefore assumed that dwellings could not be any closer to the pipeline than those that already exist. Otherwise, it appears possible to access the site and it has few other containing features.

Site Visit Observations

The site would represent a breakout to the west of the village. The site has few features, but equally is quite open, and views of the site are afforded from both surrounding footpaths and highway around the site. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside, river valley and adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

Gas main constraints.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Reasonable – The site is well located for access to local services and facilities in the village. The principal constraint on the site is the high-pressure pipeline running along the western boundary, and the associated easements. It is therefore not proposed to allocate any closer to the pipeline than the existing dwellings on Mill Road. Restricting the extent of the site also has the benefit that it will not obscure views of the church to the south or impact too greatly on the River Valley Landscape. The site otherwise has few constraints.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 06/08/2020

SN0306

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0306
Site address	Land adjacent to South Lodge, Old Yarmouth Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	1989/1196 Residential development - Refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.332ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 10 dwellings which equates to 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	Access off Old Yarmouth Road. NCC to confirm the capacity of the road network and the access constraints. NCC Highways – Amber, subject to demonstrating acceptable visibility can be provided. Footway improvement required at Yarmouth Road. Frontage trees may require removal.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Village Shop within 1700m Bus stop within 50m and is on the bus route for 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston. Primary School is within 850m (but is on the other side of the A143)	

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 		Village Hall Recreational ground Public House All with 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues NCC Minerals & Waste – site under 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha,</u> should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No surface water flooding identified on site. Surface water flooding and surface water hazard to the north of the site.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. CWS located to the south but separated by A143 and Old Yarmouth Road.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby Listed Icehouse and locally designated Historic Parkland located to the north. The listed building setting could be reasonably mitigated. The impact on the Historic Parkland may not be reasonably mitigated. HES – Red, within landscape park associated with Ellingham Hall	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of Old Yarmouth Road Lane may not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, subject to demonstrating acceptable visibility can be provided. Footway improvement required at Yarmouth Road. Frontage trees may require removal.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Historic parkland to Ellingham Hall/agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB to north. Noted it is presently separated by trees on the northern boundary of the site. Also impact on Historic Parkland.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by a liner form of development semi-detached and detached dwellings set in reasonable sized plots. Therefore, the suggested density would be too high.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints as there are existing trees to site frontage. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Historic Parkland/Agricultural - classification 3	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees to the north, low wall with mature trees to south, residential properties to the west and east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along southern boundary. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from Old Yarmouth Road, particularly from the south. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.	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)	Remote from the main centre of the village which is separated by A143. No existing development boundary. However, the site is adjacent to the built environment. Represents a breakout from the main village.	Amber/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)
Open Countryside		
Designated River Valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable, due to separation from the main village (and the local facilities) by the A143, with no existing Settlement Limit to extend in this location. Potential adverse impacts on Heritage assets, particularly the as the site sites within the landscape park associated with Ellingham Hall.

Site Visit Observations

Remote from the main centre of the village which is separated by A143. However, the site is adjacent to the built environment. Removal of the low front wall and trees to create an access/develop the site would significantly the alter the character of the location.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and river valley.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – The site is part of a smaller group of dwellings separated from the main village (and the local facilities) by the A143 bypass; as such, there is no current Settlement Limit in this location. The site also lies within the landscaped parkland of Ellingham Hall and forms a long, tree-filled gap on the sparsely developed northern side of the Old Yarmouth Road, and it is considered that the negative landscape and heritage impacts could not be reasonably mitigated.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11/08/2020

SN0344

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0344
Site address	Land to the east of Church Road, Kirby Cane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.64 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated Site (The site has been promoted for between 35-45 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	35 – 45 dwellings equates to 21 to 27 dph 41 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints. Level changes, proximity to the junction of Church Road and A143. NCC have raised concerns that the possibility of creating a suitable access to the site is severely constrained.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access via A143 not acceptable. Frontage at Church Road too short to adequately separate turning movements from A143 junction & too short to provide acceptable visibility splays. 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.</p>	Red

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>Village Shop within 500m</p> <p>Nearest bus stop less than 350m 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School 1.24km</p> <p>Footpath runs on the opposite of Church Road and all the way to the school.</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>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises unsure water, mains sewage and electricity available to site. However other promoters have advised that the village is served by the above.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC M&W – The site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Surface water flooding identified on the highway Church road and A143 junction.	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 with Parkland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		<p>C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland</p> <p>ALC – Grade 3</p>	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. The mitigation measures that would be required to protect future occupiers from noise would have a detrimental impact on the form and character of the area. A reduced sized site would remain detached from the main settlement and would this would therefore not address the townscape impacts arising from development of this site.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site, special area of conservation, special protection area to south east	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LBs but could be reasonably mitigated. Historic Environment has advised of constraints - Pewter Hill Anglo Saxon cemetery and Roman site. HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of local road network, that may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC advised that the local road network is considered unsuitable in terms of road capacity and lack of footpath provision.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access via A143 not acceptable. Frontage at Church Road too short to adequately separate turning movements from A143 junction & too short to provide acceptable visibility splays. 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.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	<p>Agricultural and the A143 located adjacent to the site to the north. Therefore, there could be noise and disturbance to the future occupiers from the main road. Mitigation could be provided however if this requires acoustic fencing the height that will be required would have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area.</p>	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LBs if the site progresses. It is noted that there is not a listed building with 200m of the site and there are intervening land uses.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. The land slopes to the south. This part of the village is characterised by a linear form either side of Church Road. Development on this site would not complement the existing form of development.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. Level changes, proximity to the junction of Church Road and A143.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and highway	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site rises west to east	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and trees	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Possibly significant trees along the boundaries. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations? Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated. To be assessed by a Landscape Officer if the site progresses.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site, special area of conservation, special protection area to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Can be seen from the A143, in places and will be visible from Church Road. Extensive mature trees to the south.	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 adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. Well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from A143 and Church Road. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.	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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is excessive in size but could be reduced to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. However, significant highways constraints have been identified and it is not considered that these could be reasonably addressed. The site is well connected but is detached from the main settlement and would represent a significant breakout into the countryside. It would have a significant landscape impact.

Site Visit Observations

Not adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. Well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the north of the village. Views of the site are afforded from A143 and Church Road. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

he site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** site for allocation. As promoted it is excessive in size and therefore a smaller site area has also been considered as part of this assessment. Significant highways concerns, in particular creating a safe access into the site, have been identified as well as landscape concerns arising from the detached location of the site. It is not considered that either the highway safety concerns or the landscape impact could be reasonably overcome.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11/08/2020

SN0348

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0348
Site address	Land to the South of Old Yarmouth Road, Kirby Row, Kirby Cane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No recent planning history (historic refusals for residential development)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.65ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for approximately 20 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Approximately 20 dwellings which equates to 31dph 16 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>No existing access from highway to the site. Initial highway comments indicate that there may be potential constraints on the site but these could be overcome. Off-site highway improvements would be required including provision of footpath.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. May be feasible to form access subject to adequate visibility being available, provision of frontage 2.0m wide footway and modification to existing speed limit. Visibility north from Old Yarmouth Rd to Church Rd constrained, little scope for improvement.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting: would appear broadly acceptable in highways terms, main concern would be visibility re the speed of traffic exiting the bypass from the north, but there appears to be scope to realign the carriageways within the existing highways)</i></p>	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>Village Shop within 500m</p> <p>Nearest bus stop is 255m is 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School is within 1800m</p> <p>No footpath on Mill Lane but from Mill Road there is a footpath all the way to the school.</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>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>Desktop investigations in relation to contamination have been undertaken and no issues found. No known ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC M&W – the site is less than 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If the site progresses as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1. Surface water flooding 1 -100 in the top northwest corner and 1-1000 across the site from west to south and east covers about 50%.</p> <p>LLFA – Significant mitigation measures required for heavy constraints. A flow path present in the 1:1000 year rainfall events as identified on the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps, runs from North West to South East crossing the site. Watercourse is not apparent on DRN mapping (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Safe dry, emergency access and egress across the site should also be considered. Not served by AW connection. In SPZ2 for groundwater protection so will need to be considered when designing SUDS.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development could have a detrimental impact on landscape. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads. SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - Potentially acceptable in landscape terms as it could retain the setting of the settlement.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development could have a detrimental impact on townscape but it is considered that this could be mitigated. Density considerations? SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. SSSI Leeth Hill to the east of the site 700m. With 3000m of the Ramsar site located southeast - south of Gillingham Road, Geldeston.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed building to the southwest of the site but is separated by existing development SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of local road network, that may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. May be feasible to form access subject to adequate visibility being available, provision of frontage 2.0m wide footway and modification to existing speed limit. Visibility north from Old Yarmouth Rd to Church Rd constrained, little scope for improvement. <i>(Highways meeting: would appear broadly acceptable in highways terms, main concern would be visibility re the speed of traffic exiting the bypass from the north, but there appears to be scope to realign the carriageways within the existing highways)</i></p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>The listed building to the south is separated by intervening land uses.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The site is adjacent to the development boundary. This part of the village is characterised by a linear form either side of Church Road. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on road network.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Residential boundaries to the west mixture of fencing and hedges, open to the north and south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	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)	Overhead lines along the site frontage	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from Old Yarmouth Road when viewed from the north and east. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.	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)	Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the northeast of the village. The site is open and visible in long views across the landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm could be difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.	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)
Designated River Valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and relates reasonably well to the existing settlement. The site is well connected to local services and could be enhanced to create a gateway to the village. Development of the site would be constrained by identified areas of surface water flooding and access arrangements for the site would also require careful consideration. Updated highways comments suggest that there may be scope for addressing the earlier highway safety concerns identified.

Site Visit Observations

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the northeast of the village. The site is open and visible in long views across the landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley, however it could also be a gateway site.

Local Plan Designations

River valley setting.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

Surface water flooding across the site may affect both the viability and/ or quantum of development that is achievable on the site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** option for allocation at this stage, subject to further discussions with the LLFA about the identified flood risk across the site and the mitigation measures that would be required to address this. Updated highways comments identify possible solutions to earlier highway safety concerns and whilst there would be a landscape impact to development in this location it could also provide an opportunity to enhance a gateway approach to the settlement.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 11/08/2020

SN0396

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0396
Site address	Land at Kirby Row, Newgate Lane, Kirby Cane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	1979/1799 Parsonage House and garage – refused 1976/2456 Site for four dwellings – refusal 1974/2298 Use of land for the erection of four dwellings – refused 1974/0392 Use of land for residential development - refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for approximately 25 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dwellings equates to 30/31dph 20 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Potential access constraints, as creating a suitable access to the site is severely constrained. NCC to confirm.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Not acceptable, visibility from Newgate south to Mill Rd highly constrained by building on corner. No access to public highway – Newgate is unadopted has no footway and is out of scope for improvements. <i>(HIGHWAYS MEETING - Newgate narrow, with very limited/inadequate footways and with very poor visibility at the junction (particularly to the south, which is blocked by the Post Office). Newgate adjacent to the site is an unadopted road, so would need to establish whether there is proven ownership, and whether they would be willing to offer it for adoption).</i></p>	Red

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>Village Shop within 200m</p> <p>Nearest bus stop less than 200m is 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School 881m</p> <p>No footpath on Mill Lane but from Mill Road there is a footpath all the way to the school.</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>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Other promoters advise water, mains sewage and electricity available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC M&W – a site under 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood zone 1. Surface water flooding;- 1:100 across the site frontage and into top northeast corner. 1:1000 across the top of the site (north)</p> <p>Surface water flood hazard running along the road in front of the site.</p> <p>LLFA – Few or no constraints. Standard information required. Ponding present in the 1:100 and 1:1000 year rainfall events as identified on the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps, runs from West to East crossing the site. Access and egress across the site should be considered. Watercourse present along boundary of site (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Not served by AW connection. Within SPZ 2.</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	Rural River Valley	Not applicable

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley ALC – Grade 3/4	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads. SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - This site is acceptable in landscape terms	Green
Townscape	Green	Development could have a detrimental impact on townscape but this could be reasonably mitigated. Density considerations. SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Listed building located to the west but is separated by intervening uses. Listed building located to the south (located to the south of Mill Lane). Separated by intervening land uses. SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER – Green HES - Green	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on functioning of road network that may not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Not acceptable, visibility from Newgate south to Mill Rd highly constrained by building on corner. No access to public highway – Newgate is unadopted has no footway and is out of scope for improvements. (HIGHWAYS MEETING - Newgate narrow, with very limited/inadequate footways and with very poor visibility at the junction (particularly to the south, which is blocked by the Post Office). Newgate adjacent to the site is an unadopted road, so would need to establish whether there is proven ownership, and whether they would be willing to offer it for adoption).</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LBs. Noted they are separated by intervening uses.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by small estates/cul de sacs. The site is contained, with development to the west/east and south of the site. Predominately detached dwellings in reasonable sized plots. Therefore, the suggested density would be too high.</p> <p>Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints – visibility and private road? NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on Newgate lane, which changes into a narrow track in front of the site.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees to the west, hedge to the north, trees and hedge to the east – boundary with residential property. Fencing and hedge to the south.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Possibly significant trees along eastern boundary. As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations? Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 900m of Leeth Hill SSSI. Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into the site limited due to existing residential bounding the site. Will however be visible looking south across the adjacent agricultural field.	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)	Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. The site is visually contained and an estate type development would be more characteristic of this part of the village. Therefore, whilst there will be a landscape impact, it could be reasonably mitigated.	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Designated River Valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation although the density proposed for the site is considered to be excessive in this location. The site relates reasonably well to the settlement but has some flood risk and landscape constraints. Significant highway concerns have been identified, including achieving an access to the site and overall highway safety issues.

Site Visit Observations

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. The site is visually contained and an estate type development would be more characteristic of this part of the village. Therefore, whilst there will be landscape harm, it could be reasonably mitigated.

Local Plan Designations

River Valley.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

Significant access constraints have been identified which may affect the achievability of this site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The site relates reasonably well to the settlement and is adjacent to existing development. Some landscape and flood risk concerns have been identified however significant highway issues have been raised, including difficulties achieving an acceptable access to the site (which is currently accessed via an unadopted track), and visibility concerns at the Newgate Lane/Mill Road junction.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 11/08/2020

SN4002SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4002SL
Site address	Otto's Wood, north end of Lockhart Road Ellingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	L/5595 – Erection of two dwellings – refused L/4385 – Residential development – refused L/5405 – Residential development - refused L/5048 – Residential development - refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.263ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Settlement boundary extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5 dwellings which equates to 19 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		Access via hammerhead of the estates road (Lockhart Road). Potential constraints. NCC to advise. NCC Highways - Green	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 		Village Shop within 410m Nearest bus stop less than 400m is 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston. Primary School 1000m From Mill Road there is a footpath all the way to the school.	

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 		Village Hall Recreational ground Public House All with 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity		Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed. AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability		The site is unlikely to be contaminated as wood and no known ground stability issues NCC Minerals & Waste – site under 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha,</u> should be included within any allocation policy.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No surface water flooding identified on the site. Flood zones 2 and 3 to the land north of the site. LLFA - Few or no constraints.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment		Given the location and being mostly bound by existing residential uses, there would be an impact in wider views, but this could be reasonably mitigated. However, the loss of a wood within is protected by a group TPO would have a significant Impact on the character of the area and immediate landscape.	Amber/red
Townscape		Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		Development may have a detrimental impact on protected species, especially due to the loss of the woodland and may not be able to be reasonably mitigated. Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston). NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment		There is a listed building 200m to the east, however given the intervening uses i.e. residential development, there would be no detrimental impact on the setting of nearby LB. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space		Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads		Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on surrounding road network. NCC Highways - Green	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses		Residential/agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>The nearby LB to the east is separated by existing development and therefore the site would not have an adverse impact on its setting.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the hammerhead for an existing estate development and therefore is could be considered as a rounding off of that development and the impact on townscape could be reasonably mitigated.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on surrounding road network.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Wood	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively flat with a gradual slope towards the west	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mixed residential boundaries to the east and south. Trees and hedgerows to the west. Open in part and bounding residential property to the north.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Site is covered by a group/area TPO, therefore, to develop the site will require the removal of those trees which would have a significant impact on the character of the area and landscape.</p> <p>Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which may not be reasonably mitigated, due to loss of trees/habitat.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	<p>Would be viewed from the south via the estate road, more limited views from Old Yarmouth Road.</p> <p>Loss of the wooded area covered by a group/area TPO would adversely affect the character of the landscape.</p> <p>Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.</p>	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)	Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would however require the loss of a wood covered by a group TPO, therefore, the harm to the visual amenities and landscape would not be able to be mitigated, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.	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)
Open countryside		
Designated river valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not considered suitable due to potential adverse impacts on landscape, loss of a woodland, and also the associated potential habitat loss.

Site Visit Observations

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would however require the loss of a wood covered by a group TPO, therefore, the harm to the visual amenities and landscape would not be able to be mitigated, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside, river valley and adjacent to development boundary.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – whilst this site is suitably located within the village, with good access, the site is heavily treed and covered by a group TPO. The loss of trees would be detrimental to the amenity and character of the area, which is within the defined River Valley, with the added potential ecological/biodiversity implications of losing the woodland habitat.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 13/08/2020

SN4018

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4018
Site address	Land to the west of Church Road, Ellingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.48ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	0.48 of the site is land to be made available for the school for parking and playing field. Suggested a minimum of 12 dwellings. So assuming 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		<p>Access would be via Church Road, a narrow Road with no footpaths. It is likely that appropriate visibly and off-site improvements could be achieved. NCC to advise.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green, carriageway widening to 5.5m min required along with visibility improvement at Station Rd/Church Rd and 2.0m frontage wide footway to school.</p>	Green
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p>Part 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 		<p>Village Shop within 1800m</p> <p>On the 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School located to the north separated by a road.</p> <p>No footpath but one running from the school back into the centre of the village.</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village Hall Recreational ground Public House All with 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues NCC Minerals & Waste - site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No surface water flooding identified on the site. Surface Water flooding depth 1:1000 identified on the land to the south of the site. LLFA - Few or no constraints.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment		Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may not be reasonably mitigated. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads.	Amber
Townscape		Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>CWS located to the west on the other side of Station Road.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Amber
Historic Environment		<p>Development could have detrimental impact on views of St Mary's Church to the south.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space		Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads		<p>Potential impact on functioning of local road network, that may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC advised that the local network currently is considered unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, carriageway widening to 5.5m min required along with visibility improvement at Station Rd/Church Rd and 2.0m frontage wide footway to school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses		Primary School and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB to south.</p> <p>The site is detached from the main part of the village. Mill Road is characterised by a linear development form.</p> <p>Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on surrounding road network.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural – classification grade 3/4	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural and Primary School	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open boundaries, with the highway adjacent to the east and north. Remainder of the agricultural field to the west and south.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Prominent in views from surrounding road network and the surrounding landscape due to open nature of the site. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.	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 adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village. Well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the west of the village. Due to the open nature of the site and the flat landscape around it long views of the site are afforded from both surrounding footpaths and highway around the site. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.	Amber/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)
Open countryside		
Designated river valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Likely off-site highway improvements. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Creation of a car park and playing field for the primary School	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is detached the current development boundary by approx. 200m, and clearly separated from the main part of the village by playing fields and agricultural land, part of which is constrained from development by a high-pressure pipeline. The site is adjacent to the Primary School and playing field, and is within a reasonable walking distance of other services/facilities. Whilst there are limited on-site constraints, the site is set in very open River Valley landscape. The site promoter has suggested the site could deliver additional play area and parking for the Primary School, but it is not evident that there has been engagement with the school/NCC and this would make the developed area further detached.

Site Visit Observations

It would represent a breakout to the west of the village. Due to the open nature of the site and the flat landscape around it long views of the site are afforded from both surrounding footpaths and highway around the site. The landscape harm would be difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley and clearly visible from the Broads and the edge of the Conservation Area along Geldeston Road.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside, river valley and adjacent to development boundary

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – the site is adjacent to the primary school and playing field and a walkable distance to other local facilities, and has few on-site constraints. However, the site would clearly be a detached group of houses, 200m+ from the nearest dwellings, with the development potential of the intervening land limited by a high-pressure pipeline. The site is set within a very open River Valley landscape, clearly visible in views from The Broads and the edge of the Conservation Area along Geldeston Road to the south, and numerous other footpaths and highways. The site promoter has suggested the site could deliver an additional play area and parking for the primary school, but it is not evident that there has been engagement with the school/NCC and this would make the developed area further detached.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 13/08/2020

SN4054

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4054
Site address	Lane adjacent to 123 Old Yarmouth Road, Ellingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	<p>2012/1826 – Conversion of redundant (flower arranging) outbuilding into 2 holiday lets – approved</p> <p>2012/0237 – Change of use of enclosed meadowland adjacent existing caravan site into caravan storage area – approved</p> <p>2011/1598 – Change of use of enclosed meadowland adjacent existing caravan site into caravan storage area – refused</p> <p>2009/1494 – Retrospective application for storage area for standing of a digger and trailer – approved</p> <p>2008/2129 – Change of use for storage yard, tools in a container and vehicular equipment and standing of a caravan for use as a mess hut – refused</p> <p>2007/0155 – Provide a storage area for touring caravans – approved</p> <p>1988/3102 – Erection of 3 detached dwellings – refused</p> <p>1981/0591 – Erection of 4 dwellings - refused</p> <p>1975/3109 – Excavation of a lake for trout fishing for personal use of owner - approved</p> <p>L/4113 – Residential development - refused</p>
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Not know so assuming 25 dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site		<p>Access via Old Yarmouth Road. There are two points the first being the existing access which is restricted by existing development and the second point which would be a better option as only restricted by the built environment to the west. NCC to confirm the capacity of the road network and the access constraints.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, subject to demonstrating acceptable visibility can be provided. Footway improvement required at Yarmouth Road.</p>	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 		<p>Village Shop within 1550m</p> <p>Bus stop within 50m and is on the bus route for 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School is within 750m (but is on the other side of the A143)</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>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure		Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. Can't confirm re mains sewage, however another promoter has confirmed that this part of the village does have mains drainage.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Contamination & ground stability		<p>Given the previous use as a nursery and present use storage there is potential for some contamination. No know ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC Minerals & Waste – site under 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u>, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Amber
Flood Risk		<p>Flood zone 1. Flood zone 2 cuts across the bottom part of the southeast corner of the site. Surface Water Flooding depth 1:1000 to the bottom southeast corner and eastern boundary. Surface Water Flooding depth 1:100 on the land to the south of the promoted site.</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints.</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	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment		Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which may be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape		Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape.	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		<p>Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated</p> <p>CWS located to south separated by A143.</p> <p>NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Series of ponds on site.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment		<p>Listed Icehouse and locally designated Historic Parkland located to the north separated by Old Yarmouth Road and intervening uses. Any impact on the listed building and Historic parkland setting could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space		Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads		<p>Potential impact on functioning of Old Yarmouth Road Lane may not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, subject to demonstrating acceptable visibility can be provided. Footway improvement required at Yarmouth Road.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses		Residential/agricultural/fishing lakes	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB and Historic Parkland to the north. Noted it is separated by trees, Old Yarmouth Road and intervening land uses.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by a liner form of development semi-detached and detached dwellings set in reasonable sized plots. The proposal represents backland development which is out of character with the existing development. Equally, the development could give rise to a detrimental impact on the amenities of the existing residential development via noise and disturbance especially if the existing access is proposed to serve the development.</p>	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Mixed use of showroom/storage and caravan storage	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/fishing lakes with licenced caravan site/agricultural	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively flat, land falls slightly from the road.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mixed Residential boundaries to the north, also trees/hedge to the road, trees to the west and hedge/trees to east. Fishing lakes with trees beyond to the south.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along eastern boundary, loss of substantial hedgerow to the site frontage. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site itself is contained. May be possible to view from the highway in longer views looking towards the east. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.	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 adjacent to the development boundary, separated from the main part of the village by A143. Well related to services. Visually contained but development would represent breakout from existing pattern of settlement. Development would be likely to harm existing residential amenity. Concern regarding potential access constraints. Do not consider that the constraints identified can be mitigated and therefore is not suitable for allocation	Amber/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)
Open countryside		
Designated river valley		
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	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site forms part of a detached group of dwellings and other buildings, separated from the main part of Ellingham by the A143 bypass, which does not currently have a Settlement Limit. The site is reasonably well related to services, particularly the primary school, although others (such as the village shop) are at the limit of the required distances. The site is brownfield, although currently used for caravan storage and a small showroom, so the majority could revert to greenfield relatively easily. Whilst there are two accesses, these are both narrow and close to neighbouring residential properties. Development would be backland, with potential impacts on residential amenity.

Site Visit Observations

The site is visually contained but development would represent breakout from existing pattern of settlement. Development would be likely to harm existing residential amenity. The existing accesses are very constrained, and the part of the site with road frontage has a substantial hedge and trees, the loss of which would change the character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

Within the open countryside and river valley.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Unreasonable – although the site is brownfield, the majority is used for caravan storage, which could relatively easily revert to greenfield. The site has good access to some services (such as the primary school), but is at the limits of reasonable distances for others. The site adjoins a detached part of the settlement which currently has no defined Settlement Limit, separated from the main village by the A143 bypass. Access would require the removal of a substantial road frontage hedge and the site contains a number of trees, the loss of which would alter the character of the area. Development would be largely backland, on land which sits lower than the existing road frontage properties, with potential amenity issues.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 13/08/2020