



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Scole

Contents

SN0338R.....	3
SN0339SL	11
SN0511	20
SN0527REV.....	28
SN2066	36
SN4022	45
SN4023	53
SN5053SL	62

SN0338R

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0338R
Site address	Land at Rose Farm, Bungay Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions relating to agricultural use
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.59 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 14 dwellings = 24 dph (25 dph= 15 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access to farmyard. NCC HIGHWAYS – Safe access not achievable, not possible to achieve acceptable visibility. NCC HIGHWAYS -on a 'sweeping' bend in the former A143, would need to determine visibility, particularly to the east when exiting the site.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school within 900m walk Employment opportunities within 1800m Retail services Bus service (including peak)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advises sewer crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	Green	Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Previous use may result in some contamination. To be assessed	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Identified area of identified SW flood risk along western boundary with highway	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Amber	A5: Waveney rural river valley ALC: grade 3	Abmer

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental landscape impact which could be mitigated through boundary treatment SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER – Note the loss of the existing farm buildings but no landscape concerns.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated through appropriate density and layout	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ponds outside eastern and western boundaries. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development would not have any detrimental impact on designated heritage assets NCC HEC - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts identified.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture. Storage buildings to be demolished	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to larger parcel of land to east. Other boundaries enclosed by hedgerow.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees within boundary hedgerows. Ditch along western boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines crossing site. Potential contamination from previous use should be investigated	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site open to wider views from east and prominent in views from road	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Impacts on landscape and townscape likely to be mitigated. Ecological and flood risk constraints will limit development of western side. NCC to confirm highways impacts.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered suitable for allocation for 10-15 dwellings, subject to satisfactory access. The site relates well to existing services and existing residential development. Ponds have been identified outside eastern and western boundaries, where protected species could be present. Development of the site requires the demolition of existing farm outbuildings.

Site Visit Observations

Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Impacts on landscape and townscape likely to be mitigated. Ecological and flood risk constraints will limit development of western side.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

SN0338R is a sub-section of SN4023.

Highways initially raised concerns with regards to the suitability of the existing access and whether a safe access could be achieved. Visibility requirements need to be determined and assessed, particular to the east when existing the site. Whilst ecological constraints have been identified, it is considered that any detrimental impacts could be mitigated through careful design and if needed, limit development in the western section of the site. Development of the site requires the demolition of existing farm outbuildings.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 30 July 2020

SN0339SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0339SL
Site address	Land at Street Farm, west of Low Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.34 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 15 dwellings = 44 dph (25 dph= 8.5 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	Existing access from Low Road. NCC HIGHWAYS - Site boundary does not link with adopted highway. Low Road is inadequate to cater for development by reason of its inadequate width & lack of pedestrian provision. No possibility of creating suitable access to the site.	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>Primary school within 900m walk</p> <p>Employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Retail services</p> <p>Bus service (including peak)</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 		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer, gas and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Identified area of identified SW flood risk along western boundary with highway	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5: Waveney rural river valley ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental landscape impact in designated river valley which could be mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would not reflect existing pattern of development. Impacts could be limited by reduced site	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development would harm character of conservation area. Impacts could be limited by reduced site NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Density promoted would harm character of CA and of designated river valley. Significantly reduced site area (in line with dwellings to north) would allow for sensitively-designed limited infill	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow lane. NCC to confirm	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/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)	Open to larger parcel of land to west. Residential development to north and south. Intermittent hedgerow along highway boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees within boundary hedgerows. Ditch along western boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines along highway boundary	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Wider views restricted by development along Low Road and by A140 to west	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Impacts on heritage assets and landscape/townscape not likely to be reasonably mitigated unless site area reduced. Highway constraints would also limited development.	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site as promoted not suitable for SL extension due to considerations of highways, landscape/townscape and heritage assets. Significant reduction in site area in line with western boundary of dwellings to north would likely allow limited infill which better assessed against DM policies.

Site Visit Observations

Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Impacts on heritage assets and landscape/townscape not likely to be reasonably mitigated unless site area reduced. Highway constraints would also limit development.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, river valley, conservation area.

Availability

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

Achievability

No constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** extension to the existing settlement limit due highway constraints. The site is accessed via Low Road, an unadopted road which is considered inadequate to cater for residential development due to its narrow width and lack of pedestrian footway. Highways have considered that as promoted, there is no possibility of creating a suitable access to the site. Landscape/townscape constraints have also been identified which may impact development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 30 July 2020

SN0511

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0511
Site address	East of North Road and north of Ransome Ave
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Site already allocated for up to 15 dwellings (SCO 1)
Planning History	N/A
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.02 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 35 dwellings = 35 dph (25 dph= 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	Green	<p>Existing access from adjoining development. Access constraints could be overcome through development</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Site has limited frontage with highway which would preclude access direct onto Norwich Road. Only accessible through adjacent development - Flowerdew Meadow. Off-site works required to enhance pedestrian facilities and re-enforce traffic speeds on Norwich Road.</p> <p>(Additional) NCC HIGHWAYS – Existing Local Plan allocation, would need to consider the potential to upgrade the existing access to cater for increased numbers. Potential for development to act as a gateway and reinforce the change in speed limit. NCC would potentially require a crossing on the Norwich Road to access the Primary School, along with a part-time 20mph.</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>Primary school within 100m walk</p> <p>Employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Retail services</p> <p>Bus service (including peak)</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 		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer, gas and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Small area of identified SW flood risk in SE corner	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Visually contained site Detrimental landscape impacts of development could be mitigated SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER – Earlier pre-app on this site remains valid – MEM2019/0863. There is a PRoW along the southern boundary – any development on this site would require careful design.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development should reflect existing pattern of development and respond to edge of settlement location. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impacts on designated heritage assets NCC HEC - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts identified	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access through adjoining development is achievable	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grassland	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow along boundaries. Residential development to east and south. PRoW along southern boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees along northern boundary and close to SE corner	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of utilities constraints	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site generally enclosed and not prominent in views from road	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Opposite school. Landscape and townscape impacts could be mitigated through design and boundary treatment.	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)
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is already allocated for up to 15 dwellings under current allocation SCO 1. The site is considered to be suitable for allocation of up to 25 dwellings only to ensure appropriate density, reflecting location and adjoining development. Development will also be subject to achieving satisfactory access.

Site Visit Observations

Site very accessible. Close to existing services including bus route. Opposite school. Landscape and townscape impacts could be mitigated through design and boundary treatment.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

SN0511 would be a densification on existing allocation SCO1. SCO1 was allocated for 15 homes based on expected on-site constraints. It appears that these can now be overcome and 25 homes delivered (a 10 home uplift).

The site is well connected to the existing services within the village and relates well to the existing development. The site has limited frontage where access direct onto Norwich Road is prohibited, the site would need to gain access through adjacent development (Flowerdew Meadow). It has also been noted that NCC would potentially require a crossing on the Norwich Road to access the Primary School, along with a part-time 20mph. There is an existing ProW to the southern boundary which would need to be considered to mitigate impact.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 30 July 2020

SN0527REV

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0527REV
Site address	Land south of Bungay Road, Scole
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Pre1974 – residential development - refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dwellings = 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	Amber	Access proposed from Bungay Road which also serves sewage treatment plant. NCC HIGHWAYS –Red Development does not control enough frontage to secure adequate visibility. Hedge would need to be removed at adjacent frontage.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school within 600m walk Employment opportunities within 1800m Retail services within 2000m Bus service (including peak)	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advises sewer crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises water, mains sewer and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Surface water flow path through western section of site and area of identified risk adjacent to Bungay Road	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 ALC: grade 4	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is contained. Development could have a detrimental landscape impact within river valley which could be mitigated.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated through appropriate density and layout	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on character of adjoining CA and setting of LBs to north and west NCC HES – Amber Roman burials found adjacent	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local highway network. NCC HIGHWAYS –Amber Development does not control enough frontage to secure adequate visibility. Hedge would need to be removed at adjacent frontage.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agriculture/residential. Sewage treatment plant to south of site	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Adjoins conservation area and LBs to north of proposed access and to west of site. Potential for harm to character and setting.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm feasibility of improvements that would be required close to existing junction	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture and amenity.	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential. Sufficient separation from sewage treatment plant to south of site	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to north and east. Open boundary to south	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees within boundary 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	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is generally contained but open in some wider views from south.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Impacts on landscape and townscape likely to be mitigated. Constraints relating to flood risk, heritage and access likely to restrict development significantly.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter confirming same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm if access improvements required	Amber

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter confirming same	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size and scale for allocation. The site is well connected to services. Constraints relating to heritage, landscape, flood risk and access have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Impacts on landscape and townscape likely to be mitigated. Constraints relating to flood risk, heritage and access likely to restrict development significantly.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting Local Plan designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Issues of restrictive covenant and access to sewage treatment plant would require resolution.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development, due to unresolvable access/highway constraints. The site is proposed to be accessed from Bungay Road which also serves a sewage treatment plant, where there is restrictive covenant that could affect the deliverability. The site also adjoins the Scole conservation area where there are also LBs to north and to west of site, development may have potential harm to character and setting. A development of reduced scale would not sufficiently address these concerns.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 30 July 2020

SN2066

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2066
Site address	1 Bridge Road, Scole
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions relating to restaurant use. Pre-1974 refusal for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Density unspecified (25 dph = 13 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access onto The street. NCC to confirm if access constraints could be overcome through development. NCC HIGHWAYS - Safe access not feasible due to limited frontage and lack of visibility. Footway in immediate vicinity is restricted in width.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Primary school within 600m walk Employment opportunities within 1800m Retail services Bus service (including peak)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advises sewer crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer, gas and electricity available to site and that main sewer crosses site. No UKPN constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Part of site within the area already served by fibre technology. Part of site not recorded on BBfN map	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site is unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Surface water flow path through centre of site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Rural River Valley	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5: Waveney rural river valley ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is contained. Development could have a detrimental landscape impact within river valley which could be mitigated.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated through appropriate density and layout	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site within CA. Development could have detrimental impact on character and on setting of LBs to west and along southern boundary. NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Significant impact on local highway network	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Amenity/residential/commercial.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Within CA and LBs on western boundary. Seek comment form HES and heritage	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm feasibility of improvements that could be achieved to existing junction. Promoter advises other access possibilities but no evidence submitted	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential/smallholding	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential/commercial. Potential amenity impacts on future occupiers from commercial use would limit development	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat, sloping to SE corner	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Intermittent hedgerow. Boundary fencing	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees within site	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Promoter advises main sewer crosses site. O/H lines along N boundary	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is generally contained but open in some wider views from south.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Constraints relating to flood risk, heritage and access likely to restrict development significantly.	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		
Conservation area		
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any 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 but enquiries received	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter confirming same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm if safe access is achievable	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No. Statement from promoter advising not feasible	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable scale for allocation. However, constraints relating to heritage, and access have been identified.

Site Visit Observations

Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Constraints relating to flood risk, heritage and access likely to restrict development significantly.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, conservation area, designated river valley.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Proposal for alternative access would involve third party land.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The site is situated to the rear of existing properties off Bridge Road to the west. The site is a registered small holding with current agricultural and horticultural activities taking place where whilst there is an existing access onto the highway, this access is constrained in width, limited frontage and visibility. An alternative access would be required on third party land which has not been assessed. The site is also within the conservation area where there is a Listed Building immediately to the west (associated dwelling to land being promoted). There are further Listed Buildings to the south where development could impact upon their setting.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 30 July 2020

SN4022

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4022
Site address	Land east of Norwich Road, Scole
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5.2 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 110 dwellings = 22 dph (25 dph= 130 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing field access at northern end. NCC HIGHWAYS - SN4022 (not currently a shortlisted site) – this is a substantially larger site to the north of SN0511, accesses directly on to the former A140 therefore unlikely to be a problem, has the same potential as SN0511 to act as a gateway to the village and reinforce the 30mph speed limit.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities Part 1: <input type="checkbox"/> Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Local healthcare services <input type="checkbox"/> Retail services <input type="checkbox"/> Local employment opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary school within 100m walk Employment opportunities within 1800m Retail services Bus service (including peak)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer, gas and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Identified area of identified SW flood risk along western boundary with highway	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental landscape impact which could be mitigated	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Development would represent significant breakout to north. Detrimental impacts could not be reasonably mitigated	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Pond outside northern boundary. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development would harm setting of designated heritage assets which could not reasonably be mitigated NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Would harm rural setting listed buildings to north and west.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to larger parcel of land to east. Other boundaries enclosed by hedgerow.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees within boundary hedgerows. Ditch along western boundary	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of utilities constraints	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site open to wider views from east and prominent in views from road	Not applicable
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Trod along most of western boundary. Opposite school. Impacts on townscape and heritage assets not likely to be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The wider site is significantly too large in the context of the Village Clusters document. A reduction in scale, with development directed to the southern end of the site, is considered to be suitable for allocation. The site is immediately to the north of the allocated housing site in the adopted Local Plan. Access and heritage constraints have been identified but considered to be mitigated through design.

Site Visit Observations

Site well connected to existing services including bus route. Trod along most of western boundary. Opposite school. Impacts on townscape and heritage assets not likely to be reasonably mitigated.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The wider site is significantly too large in the context of the Village Clusters document. However, subject to a reduction in scale with development being restricted to the southern end of the site only, the site is considered to be **REASONABLE** for allocation. There are few constraints on the site. The site is located to the north of existing allocation SCO1 where access would be directly via the former A140 and unlikely to be a problem. Whilst it would extend into the countryside, the site would be read largely against the backdrop of existing housing which has potential to act as a gateway to the village from the north.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 30 July 2020

SN4023

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4023
Site address	Land south of Bungay Road, Scole
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions relating to agricultural use in NW part of site
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	8.22 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 160 dwellings = 20 dph (25 dph= 205 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing field accesses from Bungay Road and A143. NCC HIGHWAYS- Green No access to A143, subject to two points of access with acceptable visibility and pedestrian access at north west corner of site with suitable pedestrian crossing. 2.0m wide frontage footway required.	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	Primary school within 900m walk Employment opportunities within 1800m Retail services Bus service (including peak)	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advises sewer crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewer and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Site unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Area of identified SW flood risk in NW section and along southern boundary with A143	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 ALC: grade 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development at scale promoted would have significant detrimental impacts which could not be reasonably mitigated. (Score is based on a reduced scale in line with the aims of the VCHAP).	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development at scale promoted would have significant detrimental impacts which could not be reasonably mitigated. (Score is based on a reduced scale in line with the aims of the VCHAP).	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Two ponds in NW section. Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Designated heritage assets on North side of Bungay Road and AAI in centre of site. Development could have a detrimental impact which could be mitigated NCC HEC - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact of scale as promoted on local network. NCC HIGHWAYS- Amber	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	LBS to N of Bungay Road and AAI in centre of site. HES and technical officer to comment	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture. Storage buildings to be demolished in NW section	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture/residential	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Ground level falls from west to east	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to most boundaries. NW section adjoins residential development	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Possibly significant trees within boundary hedgerows to west and south. Ditch along southern boundary at western end. Two ponds in NW section.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines crossing western side of site. Potential contamination from previous use in NW section	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site open to wider views from north and east and prominent in views from road	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Edge of settlement but still reasonably well connected to existing services including bus route. Landscape and townscape impacts not likely to be mitigated at scale promoted. Ecological and flood risk constraints will limit development of western side. NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving safe access and impact on local highway network	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site not considered suitable for allocation due to excessive scale of development and resulting landscape, townscape and highways considerations, including impact on character of designated river valley. These impacts would be limited by significant reduction in site area towards north west section only (in line with SN0338R).

Site Visit Observations

Edge of settlement but still reasonably well connected to existing services including bus route. Landscape and townscape impact not likely to be mitigated at scale promoted. Ecological and flood risk constraints will limit development of western side. NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving safe access and impact on local highway network.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, designated river valley.

Availability

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

Achievability

No further constraint identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is subject to a reduction in size and on the basis that SN0338 has been shortlisted. The larger site significantly exceeds the aspirations of the VCHAP in terms of the scale of development and therefore is not considered reasonable, but that a smaller site to the north west would. The site would also be subject to achieving a satisfactory access along Bungay Road where sufficient visibility would need to be determined.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 30 July 2020

SN5053SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5053SL
Site address	Land north of Scole Engineering, Diss Road, Scole IP21 4DN
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary 2020/1236/O for 6 dwellings approved with conditions 22/10/2020.
Planning History	2019/1439/O withdrawn – included whole garage site. Re-submitted as 2020/1236/O reduced area only for garage to front
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.14
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	3-4 3-4 at 25dph
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 Adjacent across Diss Road to the south.
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>Could be achieved if through site to front when developed.</p> <p>Unlikely to be achievable if garage remains.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green. Would need to demonstrate safe access and provide frontage footway widening.</p>	Green
<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>Primary school within 900m walk</p> <p>Employment opportunities within 1800m</p> <p>Retail services</p> <p>Bus service (including peak), Bus Stop opposite side of road.</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"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Public house, village hall and recreation ground within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity		Information unavailable.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Close to existing development.	Green
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	<p>Contaminated Land; use as garage with underground fuel tanks. Also located on a secondary aquifer overlying a principal aquifer. Although this did not prevent development of the garage site. Investigation and remediation required.</p> <p>NCC Minerals & Waste - 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.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1: Low risk Adjacent to south: small area of Surface Water Flood low risk.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. We are aware of multiple internal flood records associated with Norwich Road.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p> <p>Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland</p>	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
<p>SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p>	N/A	<p>A5 Waveney Rural River Valley</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Within the built-up part of Diss Road this site would not have an adverse effect on the landscape.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	<p>The site is in a built-up frontage at the entrance to the town. The adjacent garage frontage buildings are utilitarian and will be removed when the approved development commences. This site does not have buildings but is closely related to the garage site and has been used to store cars/part etc and so residential development will tie into the front of the site as well as tidying up this site at an important gateway to the town.</p> <p>Would need the front site to be developed and the best way is if the two were brought forward together.</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations. Limited habitat given existing use.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. PROW Scale FP31 runs along southern boundary. No priority habitat onsite. Consultation with NE not required for residential development or discharge of water. Amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in GI corridor.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>In Scone Conservation Area. Grade I and II listed buildings Scone Inn to east, Previously did not consider approved proposal would adversely affect these designations.</p> <p>Also have been significant archaeological finds nearby from Roman occupation. Would need HES input.</p> <p>HES – Amber. Adjacent to Scheduled Monument.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Good connection with surrounding local network and close to Diss.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Green. Would need to demonstrate safe access and provide frontage footway widening.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	<p>Residential either side, garage with permission to redevelop for residential, field to rear.</p> <p>Compatible if developed, but not if garage remains.</p>	Amber

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated March 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	It would have a positive impact on the townscape as it would tidy the site up on an approach into the town and bring the site into a compatible residential use.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No access to the site in isolation, because it is to the rear of the garage.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Part of garage site, storage of materials, cars etc. Underused.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, garage and field.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat but elevated above the garage with a retaining wall.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Yes, rear northern boundary and to east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Very limited as commercial use; noise disturbance, hard surfacing.	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)	Will need investigation for contamination as associated with garage use and used for storage.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views currently limited into from road and will be similarly restricted if housing built in front. Will be some views out as it is higher than the garage site. Cannot determine if are views from site into adjoining residential or hotel uses.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated March 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>Garage site adjacent to front has permission for 6 dwellings. Originally it was submitted for 8 with this site included but withdrawn as advised outside development limit and lack of information justifying loss of economic use.</p> <p>Likely to be a reasonable site but only if considered together with the garage site to south, otherwise would be compatibility and access issues.</p>	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)
Waveney River Valley		
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – but enquiries received.	N/A
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)	Indicated is deliverable but no evidence to support.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable scale for a SL extension and is well related to the existing settlement of Scole and adjacent to the existing SL. However, the site is located adjacent to an existing garage no direct access can be gained to the site without the use of the garage. It is noted that the garage has permission for redeveloped for 6 dwellings and therefore any scheme would need to take into consideration this consent. It is considered that without the development of the garage site, the proposal SL extension would not be suitable.

Site Visit Observations

There is no access to the site in isolation due to its location to the rear of the garage. The garage does have permission for 6 dwellings, although this is implemented at the time of writing. Views are currently limited into the site from Diss Road to the south and will be similarly restricted if housing built in front. There will be some views out of the site as it is higher than the garage site.

Local Plan Designations

Within open Countryside and adjacent to development boundary of Scole

Availability

The site is promoted by the landowner and appears available based on the information provided.

Achievability

No further constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a **REASONABLE** extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is well related to the main settlement and is located adjacent to the existing settlement limit. The site is located to the north of an existing garage, which currently has consent for 6 dwellings although this has not been implemented. Development of the site would require access via the garage site as there is no direct access to the site via Diss Road. The site is also located within the conservation where any future application would need to take into consideration the impact on the local character.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 28/04/2022