



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

Rockland St Mary, Hellington and  
Holverston

## Contents

SN0165 .....	3
SN2061REV.....	11
SN2063 .....	19
SN2064REV.....	27
SN2070 .....	36
SN5013 .....	44
SN5039 .....	56

## SN0165

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0165
Site address	Land north of Bramerton Lane & Rookery Hill, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Promoted for development of 10 dwellings which would be a SL extension, however big enough to allocate for 12 – 25 dwellings – <i>assessed as a potential allocation</i>
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10dph (as a SL extension) 25dph (as an allocation)
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 likely to be difficult to achieve  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 350 metres  On route of peak time bus service with nearest bus stop 150 metres  Distance to village shop 500 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall 370 metres  Distance to New Inn public house 2km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some surface water risk on site and also on Bramerton Road and Run Lane	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland  ALC Grade - TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Respects linear pattern of settlements, however intrudes into more open landscape. Close to or within area with high agricultural soil classification	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Respects linear pattern of settlements, however may dilute rural dispersed character of settlement to west off main village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Within 3km buffer distance of SAP, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve to north-east of site	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to south, including grade II* listed church to south-east  HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC highways to advise  CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would extend existing pattern development out into open countryside to west. However, would have an adverse impact on more rural pattern of development to south of junction of Run Lane with Rookery Hill / Bramerton Road including heritage assets	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Unclear as to where access would be achieved given the bending nature of the road past the site frontage and the junction with Run Lane. Footway link would also need to be established which could require loss of trees and hedgerow at south-eastern corner of site	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to north, residential to east and some further residential to west on opposite side of Bramerton Road, agriculture to south with farm on Run Lane	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Undulating site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and trees on some of highway boundary, hedge on northern boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in tree and hedgerows on boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from public highway, including approaching site along Run Lane from south	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Unsuitable due to impact on the landscape and character of this part of Rockland St Mary. May have adverse impact on heritage assets so should get views of Senior Conservation and Heritage Officer if the site is to progress further	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of suitable size to be allocated.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Undulating site which contributes to dispersed rural feel to this entrance to the village. Development of the site would significantly affect this character. There are also potential access issues.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** due to the impact its development would have on the character of the western entrance to the village. Potential access issues also identified.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

## SN2061REV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2061REV
Site address	North of The Street, Rockland St Mary (access between No101 and 103 The Street)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation (Revised to accommodate 12-25 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access from The Street likely to be difficult to achieve  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 910 metres  Distance to peak time bus service 250 metres  Distance to village shop and surgery 450 metres	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall 930 metres away  Distance to New Inn public house 920 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some surface water flood risk in south-east of site  <b>LLFA score</b> – Green (standard planning information required)	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland  ALC Grade TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrudes into open landscape to north away from linear pattern of development. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Does not relate to existing linear pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to the Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve  NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ Potential for protected species, habitats and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to candidate geodiversity site.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	The Street has capacity and adequate footways  Highways score - Green	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would relate poorly to the form and character of the settlement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow access from The Street which may not be sufficient to provide adoptable road. In addition passes very close to existing dwelling and rear garden resulting in residential amenity issues.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south along The Street, agricultural to north. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Drop in levels to north of site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and fences on boundaries with residential properties, open boundary with rest of field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some in hedging	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues likely	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden in views from The Street due to position behind existing development, however potentially visible due to relief of land from the north	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to inadequate access and poor relationship with existing pattern of development and intrusion into open countryside	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size for allocation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is to the rear of linear pattern of development with a very constrained access that is unlikely to be of sufficient size to allow an adoptable highway to be constructed. Development would be out of character and intrusive into the open landscape to the north.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Adjacent to but outside the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE** – Development of the site would intrude into open landscape to the north, away from the existing linear pattern of development of the settlement. This is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. There are also concerns about whether a suitable access to the site could be formed.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

## SN2063

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2063
Site address	Land north of The Street (behind Post Office), Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12.5dph – 25 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access through garden of existing dwelling  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 530 metres  Distance to peak time bus service 380 metres to bus stops  Village shop and surgery in close proximity	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall 550 metres away  Distance to New Inn public house 1.3km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>Minerals &amp; Waste comment</b> – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes 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	Amber	Surface water flood risk on site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland  ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrudes into open landscape to north away from linear pattern of development. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Does not relate to existing linear pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance of SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>HES Score – Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	The Street has capacity and adequate footways  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would relate poorly to the form and character of the settlement	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is through existing garden of No47 which would have potential amenity issues	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south along The Street, agricultural to north. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and fences on boundaries with residential properties, open boundary with rest of field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some in hedging	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues likely	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden in views from The Street due to position behind existing development	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to poor relationship with existing pattern of development and intrusion into open countryside. Potential access issues.	Red

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Under option to a developer/ site promoter	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is a suitable size for allocation, however it would be at a low density.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is to the rear of linear pattern of development with access through the curtilage of an existing dwelling which may result in amenity issues. Development would be out of character and intrusive into the open landscape to the north.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Adjacent to but outside the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Development of the site would intrude into the open landscape to the north, away from the existing linear pattern of development of the settlement. This is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. There are further concerns about whether a suitable access could be formed.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

## SN2064REV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2064REV
Site address	Land south of The Street, Rockland St Mary (rear of surgery)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation – 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 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**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Access through surgery grounds	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 530 metres  Distance to peak time bus service 380 metres to bus stops  Village shop and surgery in close proximity	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall 550 metres away  Distance to New Inn public house 1.5km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No surface water flood risk  <b>LLFA score</b> – Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland  ALC Grade TBC	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrudes into open landscape to south away from linear pattern of development, although mitigated by School Lane to west. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Does not relate to existing linear pattern of development, although mitigated by School Lane to the east  <b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Amber. There are two established clusters to the east end and west end of the village – with this central area still very linear in its grain of development without backland development. Consequently there are not that many accesses in the centre of the village, and with gaps in housing it retain a rural scale. Introduction of a third central clustered area would create more of precedent for other backland areas to be developed in the same vain, fundamentally changing character of the village. I therefore have townscape concerns.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve  <b>NCC Ecology score</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ potential for protected species/ habitats and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to priority habitat.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity.  <b>Senior Heritage &amp; Design Officer</b> – Green.  <b>HES Score</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	The Street has capacity and adequate footways  Highways score – Green	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would not relate to linear pattern of development along The Street heading east from the site. However to the west The Street bends to the south with development along School Lane protruding to the south	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access adjacent to surgery which would be tight – seek clarification with Highway Authority as to whether there is sufficient room for an acceptable access arrangement	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and surgery to north along The Street, agricultural to south. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and tress on boundaries other than southern which ins undefined as part of larger field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in hedges and trees	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues likely	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden in views from The Street due to position behind existing development	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Could be acceptable given existing development along The Street further to the south as the road curves to the west and development protruding to the south along School Lane to the west. However, clarification that access is achievable required	Amber

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Under option to a developer/ promoter	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site to the rear of existing linear pattern of development, however pattern of development to west could mitigate for this to some extent. As a consequence there are some townscape concerns. Access by the side of the surgery looks tight and needs clarifying if achievable.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Adjacent to but outside the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Whilst the site extends into open space beyond the linear pattern of existing development there is existing development to the south of The Street, as the road curves to the west with development protruding to the south along School Lane to the west of the proposed site. It would need to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Highways Officer that an appropriate access into the site, with adequate visibility, can be achieved.

### **UPDATED CONCLUSION FOLLOWING REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION:**

Following the conclusion of the Regulation 19 Consultation, it was discovered that it would not currently be possible to deliver a suitable vehicular access. Therefore, the site was no longer considered to be achievable and has been removed from the Plan.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

## SN2070

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2070
Site address	West of the Oaks, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6 dph – 5 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Potential constraints in delivering access. Poor connectivity to the settlement.  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 1.2km, with majority along fast rural road not suitable pedestrian use  Bus stops for peak time bus service close by, but poor pedestrian connectivity  Distance to village shop and surgery 1.4 km with part of this along fast rural road not suitable pedestrian use. Footways once you are within main part of settlement	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Village hall 1.2km, with majority along fast rural road not suitable pedestrian use.  Playing field 2.5 km on opposite side of settlement  Distance to New Inn public house 3km on opposite side of settlement	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Unclear from information available	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk issues	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrusive into open countryside. High value agricultural soil classification	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Poorly related to existing settlement	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in proximity  <b>HES Score – Amber</b>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Fast rural road with no footways  <b>CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is remote from settlement and therefore has poor relationship with existing development	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be difficult to achieve given nature of road. Visibility requirements may require removal of trees and hedges	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to south and on opposite side to north. Residential to east. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely level site	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with trees on northern, western and eastern boundaries. Southern boundary is undefined as part of wider field	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of exiting infrastructure or contamination that would prevent development	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from public highway	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable as remote from settlement with erosion of rural character of area	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Conclusion</b>	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?	Single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence	n/a
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Not adjacent to any existing development boundary so not suitable as an extension and too small to allocate.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site remote from settlement and rural in character.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and remote from development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

**UNREASONABLE** - Not suitable to be included in development boundary due to poor connectivity and remoteness from the settlement

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

## SN5013

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5013
Site address	Land north of New Inn Hill, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1989/1788/O for 4 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 19/09/1990. 1989/0916/O for 16 dwellings refused 21/06/1989.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.83
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15-19 21 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>Access should be achievable from New Inn Hill, there is an existing unused gated access to west of frontage. Await Highway Authority consultation.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Satisfactory access likely to require significant removal of mature hedge and affect substantial trees. Site remote from local facilities with poor standard footway, little if no scope for improvement to satisfactory standard.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Distance to Rockland St Mary school 1,700m</p> <p>Peak time bus service passes site along New Inn Hill with bus stop 200metres away</p> <p>Distance to village shop and surgery 1,400m</p> <p>All connected by a footpath</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Village hall 1,400m Playground 1,100m Distance to New Inn public house 100 metres, possible access to rear.	Green
Utilities Capacity		Promoter states: Mains water has previously been connected to the site, electrical supply available adjacent to highway, an extension to the water sewer beneath New Inn Hill is likely to be necessary, air source heating will be the default obviating any need for gas supply.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known issues.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known issues.  <b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - site under 1ha 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 if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Surface Water Flood Risk: 1:1,000 across the north (rear) of site due to dyke on adjacent allotment site and area to north-west boundary 1: 30 &amp; 1:100 through the lowest part of the site.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Site is adjacent to the Broads IDB. The site is affected by minor ponding in the 3.33% and 1.0% AEP events, concentrated to the site boundary. The site is affected by a minor flow path in the 0.1% AEP event, cutting the site northwest-east. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows east off the site.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland  Immediately adjacent to Broads Area, runs along the eastern boundary.  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>The site would be particularly visible travelling westwards past the staithe and, whilst part of it may be seen in the context of the existing buildings, as a whole it would change the character of the area. It would have a significant impact on the landscape and a negative impact on the setting of Rockland Broad and Staithe.</p> <p><b>Broads Authority:</b> Valley slope location on BA boundary. Small site but has Wheryman's Way passing by. Also on approach to Broads visitor attractions. Site has some potential to adversely affect the local landscape character and the setting of the Broads. I suggest we ask that the allocation policy includes a requirement for Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment and that we are consulted on the selection of viewpoints. Also seems somewhat distant from the main part of the settlement.</p>	Red



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	This is an edge of settlement position where development has evolved in a sporadic nature around the staithe. It may be possible to accommodate individual dwellings within this form however a larger area of housing would be out of character with this incremental growth and would have an adverse impact away from the main part of the village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations on the site but adjacent to Broads Area and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve around Rockland Broad. Rockland Dyke lies close to the east. There are other drains and hedges connecting the site to this wider area and species surveys will be required as it is land which has been dormant for some time.</p> <p>Would also need to assess the impact of additional development on the Broads Area in terms of increased recreational impact.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. Any discharge of water or liquid waste that is discharged to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream will require Natural England (NE) consultation. Residential development of 50 units or more or any residential developments outside of existing settlements/ urban areas with a total net gain in residential units will also require NE consultation. No priority habitats onsite (MAGIC). Edge of amber risk zone for great crested newts</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<b>HES</b> – Amber. Significant cropmarks within site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No  Adjacent Open Space: Rockland Allotments, along eastern boundary & Green Lane provision for young people to north-west	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Rural road network, Highway Authority to assess the impact.  Public footpath opposite and to east and west, wider accessibility for recreation.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Satisfactory access likely to require significant removal of mature hedge and affect substantial trees. Site remote from local facilities with poor standard footway, little if no scope for improvement to satisfactory standard.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Allotments to east. Residential to west. Grass/wood to north, field to south.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site is away from the main part of the village but is within a smaller cluster of development around the staithe. However, the dwellings in this location are more sporadic and a concentration of development here would have a significant impact.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Old, gated access existing with other residential access nearby to west and south, will need Highway consultation.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Unused grassland.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to west and south-east, allotments to east, agriculture to north and south-west. Entrance to the staithe carpark to east.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is relatively level along the road side but with a severe slope from the road down to the south and north. The lowest point is the north-eastern corner adjacent to the allotments.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and trees along all boundaries. Strong hedge along frontage with mature trees will need to be considered if requires any removal for access. It is scrappy in places but the overall impact is of a very rural frontage which adds to the character of the area.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	<p>Woodland area to north-west and north, hedges on perimeters.</p> <p>Rockland Broad is nearby and connected to the staithe by Rockland Dyke. This is an internationally protected area and there are dykes and hedges running nearby which create routes for species to use. This would need to be carefully considered and the Ecology officer consulted.</p>	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	<p>No evidence of utilities or contamination.</p> <p>Contamination unlikely but would need some investigation, to determine past uses.</p>	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	<p>Currently limited views in because of hedge on road and the slope away. However, there would be some hedge removal to achieve an adequate access which would open the site up. There are also views from public allotments and staithe car-park to east. If developed it would be visible along the road frontage, particularly from the east given the slope.</p> <p>Views out are limited to the south however from within the site the wider views are extensive to the north and east. From the highest point at the south-west corner you can see across Rockland Broad.</p>	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>The site is well connected to the village by footpath, and distances are acceptable to walk. However, it is separate from the main part of the village and it would have a significant impact on the landscape and as a wider setting for the Broads Area.</p> <p>Would need to Ecologist's advice on the impact of hedge removal and impact/presence of species/habitat in close proximity to Broads and internationally protected sites.</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)
None		
Adjacent Broads Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Need to consider the impact on the Broads Area	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is unsuitable for development. The site is subject to several constraints; highways, heritage, flood risk and landscape impact. The culminative impact of these issues will result in an unacceptable form of development in this location.

### Site Visit Observations

The site is well connected to the village by footpath, and distances are acceptable to walk. However, it is separate from the main part of the village, and it would have a significant impact on the landscape and as a wider setting for the Broads Area.

### Local Plan Designations

Defined as Countryside. Located adjacent to the Broads Area

### Availability

The landowner/developer has advised that the site is available.

### Achievability

No further constraints identified.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for development. The Highway Authority have provided their comments on the site and have advised that in order to achieve a satisfactory access a significant number of mature trees and hedging will need to be removed. It has also been noted that whilst there is a footpath connecting the site to the main part of the village, this footpath is substandard where there is little or no scope for improvement to a satisfactory standard. In addition, the site contains significant crop marks which would need to be considered and could potentially limited the developable area. There is also an area of flood risk located to the north of the site which would also limit the developable area on site. The site would also be particularly visible travelling westwards past the staithe and, whilst part of it may be seen in the context of the existing buildings, it would change the character of the area. It would have a significant impact on the landscape and a negative impact on the setting of Rockland Broad and Staithe.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/22

SN5039

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5039
Site address	Land south of The Street, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Largely outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.16
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	50 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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



### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Existing access from the Street but it is constrained between existing dwellings. It is also close to the junction with School Lane which is narrow with limited visibility. The promoter also owns No 4 The Street to the east and states that the site access could be extended across the front to create the necessary visibility splay.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Insufficient frontage to provide acceptable visibility. Acceptable footway does not appear feasible.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> - access very close to the junction of School Lane with The Street. Does not appear possible to get adequate visibility splays in.</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"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Bus stop opposite, peak time bus service</p> <p>Distance to Rockland St Mary school 190 metres</p> <p>Village shop 290 metres, doctor's surgery in close proximity on The Street</p>	N/A
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	<p>Village hall/parish room in close proximity</p> <p>Distance to New Inn public house 1.7km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		Promoter states that it is immediately adjacent to The Street with ready access to all utility supplies.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No evidence and promoter states no issues.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 Small area of low risk of surface water flooding around access to site.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints, on-site flood risk is minor ponding. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	<p>B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 2</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>The site cannot be seen from the road frontage and is contained to the north and west by existing development. It encroaches to the south into the open countryside however, the land slopes away to the south and this site would be seen against the dwellings to the north and west and the shortlisted site is adjacent to the east.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - Similar in landscape terms to SN2064REV; need to consider boundary with open land to east and south - to be secured in specific allocation policy text.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	<p>The site is behind existing development. The existing village is largely linear but at this western end there is an example of a nearby cul-de-sac to the east of School Lane which this site could mirror. Also adjacent to a Preferred site SN2064REV.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design:</b> No issues - perhaps preferable to extending the village with linear development</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Site is an arable field with a few trees around perimeter so there is limited habitat potential on site.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber.</p> <p>No PROW nearby. Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream, or residential development over 50 units, and residential over 50 units outside existing settlement area will require Natural England consultation. No priority habitats onsite. Amber risk zone for great crested newts.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No designations on site. There is a Grade II listed building to the west on School Road. This is attached to the adjacent dwellings and with an established rear boundary development would not adversely affect it.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage &amp; Design</b> – No issues - intervening development between the site and St Mary's Church to the west; listed building immediately to west of site - benefits from long rear garden, therefore unlikely to have significant impact.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber. Close to cropmarks of Bronze Age burial mounds.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>The Street has capacity and adequate footways. No continuous footpath to the school but it is very close along School Lane which is the only pedestrian route currently used.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. Insufficient frontage to provide acceptable visibility. Acceptable footway does not appear feasible.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impact on heritage assets. Could be assimilated into the village in a similar form to the development on the west of School Road. Although the site is large for the village and could be reduced in size.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The access to The Street is between dwellings and close to the junction with School Road. There is additional land, two adjacent accesses, which appears to give sufficient width for a road. Can a footpath be achieved? Require Highway Authority advice on suitability.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture with a brick built barn and walls some near the entrance. These would need to be removed for access, unless the barn can be retained, no major concerns.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agriculture – compatible uses.  Would need to consider the rear of the dwellings to the west as they have no buffer and have windows on the boundary line.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level with a gentle slope south.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Various residential properties, with an unfarmed area adjacent to residential boundaries to north and east which is laid to grass and neatly maintained - included in the site.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature group of trees to north. Small pond at access. Barn with possibility of bats.  Close to the Broads Area and designated sites.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	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)	None evident.  Barn indicates previous use on site, long ceased.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is behind dwellings and there are no views from the road. There would be views from the rear of existing properties. Long views out over fields to south.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	This is a large site which is behind existing dwellings. If an adequate access can be achieved a smaller area could relate to the existing built-up part of the village as there are no significant constraints.	Amber

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years  Land is rented to a tenant farmer on 3 year contract which ends October 2022.	Green

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



## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is suitable for allocation, subject to achieving a suitable access with sufficient visibility.

### **Site Visit Observations**

This is a large site which is behind existing dwellings. If an adequate access can be achieved a smaller area could relate to the existing built-up part of the village as there are no significant constraints.

### **Local Plan Designations**

The is located adjacent to the settlement limit defined for Rockland. There are no other conflicting designations.

### **Availability**

The promoter has advised that the site would be available within 5 years; land is currently rented to a tenant farmer on 3 year contract which ends October 2022

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered REASONABLE for allocation, subject to achieving a satisfactory access with sufficient visibility. The Highway Authority have highlighted concerns with the insufficient site frontage to provide visibility. However, the promoter has advised that the applicant owns neighbouring land where access could be achieved. Prior to allocation, the ownership of this land and measures to ensure visibility will need to be agreed with highways. No other major issues have been raised at this stage and therefore it is considered that subject to highways approval, a carefully designed scheme could be implemented on site.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 28/04/2022