

South Norfolk Village Clusters Site Assessment Form – Assessment Criteria

PART 3: SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA based upon the assessment criteria set out in the Appendix A of the 'Norfolk Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (July 2016) methodology

Access to the site		
RED No possibility of creating access to the site	AMBER There are potential access constraints, but these could be overcome through development	GREEN Access by all means is possible
Source: NCC Highways		

Accessibility to local services and facilities – UPDATED ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED No core services within 1,800m of the site, and 3,000m for school access and employment, or no ability to provide/ fund appropriate new core services.	AMBER One or two core services within 1,800m, and 3,000m for school access and employment.	GREEN Access to three or more core services within 1,800m, and 3,000m for school access and employment.
<p>The village clusters assessment includes an expanded list of local services and facilities that are considered to be important considerations in determining the suitability of a site for development. These services and facilities will also have a determining factor in the market attractiveness of a site. In assessing sites against this measure, accessibility to the following core services will be considered (those services/ facilities listed in red form the expanded list):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A primary school• A secondary school• A local healthcare service• Retail and service provision for day to day needs (village shop)• Local employment opportunities (principally existing employment sites, but designated or proposed employment area in a local plan will be considered)• A peak-time public transport service to/from a higher order settlement (peak time for the purposes of this criterion will be 7 – 9am and 4 – 6pm)• Village/ community hall• Public house/ café• Preschool facilities• Formal sports/ recreation facilities		
Source: NCC Education; Village Facilities Audit, Travelline		

Utilities Capacity		
RED No available utilities capacity and no potential for improvements	AMBER No available capacity but potential for improvements to facilitate capacity	GREEN Sufficient utility capacities available
Source: Consultation with providers		

Utilities Infrastructure		
RED N/A	AMBER Utilities infrastructure present on the site that could affect the development potential	GREEN No constraints from utilities infrastructure
Source: UNIFORM, Consultation with providers		

Better Broadband for Norfolk - NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED The site lies outside the proposed fibre installation areas	AMBER The site lies within the proposed fibre installation area	GREEN The site is within the area already served by fibre technology
Source: NCC, http://norfolkcc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Minimalist/index.html?appid=72f1b296dbf642bba45a7aa7ee189a54		

Identified ORSTED Cable Route - NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED The site lies within the identified ORSTED cable	AMBER The site is immediately adjacent to, or partly within, the identified ORSTED cable route	GREEN The site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route
Source: NSIP Application		

Contamination and ground stability		
RED N/A	AMBER The site is potentially contaminated or has potential ground stability issues that could be mitigated	GREEN The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues
Source: Environmental Services, UNIFORM		

Flood Risk		
RED The site is within the functional flood plan (zone 3b)	AMBER The site is within flood zones 2 or 3a (taking into account climate change) and/or is within an area at high, medium or low risk from surface water flooding	GREEN The site is at low risk of flooding (within Zone 1)
Source: UNIFORM, LLFA, Environmental Services, EA		

IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Landscape - UPDATED ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED The site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape that can not be mitigated.	AMBER Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape which could be mitigated.	GREEN Development of the site would have either a neutral or positive impact, but importantly not have an impact on the landscape.
<p>SN Landscape Types and Landscape Character Areas</p> <p>The Landscape Type is a checklist that identifies the Landscape Type as per the 2001 South Norfolk Land Use Consultants Study (updated by the Chris Blandford Associated 2012 South Norfolk Local Landscape Designations Review). The Landscape Types and Landscape Character Areas identify and describe the variations in landscape character across the whole of the district. The Landscape Types present an integrated view of the landscape, identifying the features and attributes that contribute to the special and distinctive character of South Norfolk District.</p> <p>Landscape Character Areas are discrete geographical areas identified within the above Landscape Types and provide an understanding of the character of the landscape. The purpose of the Landscape Character Areas is to identify distinctive features or characteristics that are important to the landscape and to provide guidance on those aspects of the landscape that are most sensitive to change.</p> <p>The RED/ AMBER/ GREEN Site Score will assess the compatibility of a site against the relevant key characteristics identified in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD (2012), which is based on the South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment Types and Areas.</p> <p>To be consistent with the approach taken by the GNLP, land identified as being the most versatile agricultural land will be classified as Amber, irrespective of its impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Source: 2001 South Norfolk Land Use Consultants Study & 2012 South Norfolk Local Landscape Designations Review, https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/residents/planning-and-building/planning-policy/landscape-character-assessments, Landscape Officer, UNIFORM, MAGIC (for Agricultural Land Classification).</p>		

Townscape		
RED Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on townscapes which cannot be mitigated	AMBER Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on townscapes which could be mitigated	GREEN Development of the site would have either a neutral or positive impact, but importantly not have a detrimental impact, on townscapes
Source: Conservation Area Appraisals, UNIFORM, Conservation Officer		

Biodiversity & Geodiversity		
RED Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on designated sites, protected species or ecological networks which cannot be reasonably mitigated or compensated as appropriate	AMBER Development of the site may have a detrimental impact on a designated site, protected species or ecological network but the impact could be reasonably mitigated or compensated	GREEN Development of the site would not have a detrimental impact on any designated site, protected species or ecological networks
Exceptions: UNIFORM, MAGIC for consultation zones, Consultation with NE, NWT, EA		

Historic Environment		
RED Development of the site would cause substantial harm to a designated or non-designated heritage asset or the setting of a designated or non-designated heritage asset which cannot be reasonably mitigated	AMBER Development of the site could have a detrimental impact on a designated or non-designated heritage asset or the setting of a designated or non-designated heritage asset, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated	GREEN Development of the site would either have a neutral or positive impact, but importantly not have a detrimental impact on any designated or non-designated heritage assets
Source: UNIFORM, HES, Conservation Officer		

Open Space		
RED Development of the site would result in a loss of open space which is either not surplus to requirements or could not be replaced locally	AMBER Development of the site would result in a loss of open space which is surplus to requirements or could be replaced locally	GREEN Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space

Source: UNIFORM

Transport and Roads		
RED Development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads that cannot be reasonably mitigated	AMBER Any potential impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads could be reasonably mitigated	GREEN Development of the site will not have a detrimental impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads
Source: UNIFORM; NCC Highways		

Neighbouring Land Uses		
RED Neighbouring/ adjoining uses to the proposed site would be incompatible with the proposed development type with no scope for mitigation	AMBER Development of the site could have issues of compatibility with neighbouring/ adjoining uses; however, these could be reasonably mitigated	GREEN Development would be compatible with existing and/or adjoining uses
Source: UNIFORM, Online satellite mapping		

Site Visit Observations – NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED There are overriding constraints that mean the site is unacceptable	AMBER There are some constraints or limitations, however there is the potential that further information or investigation could address them	GREEN There are limited constraints and likely acceptable

Local Plan Designations – NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED The site lies within an existing land use designation which is proposed for retention (e.g., employment use)	AMBER N/A	GREEN Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations
Source: UNIFORM		

PART 6: SITE SCORE - AVAILABILITY AND ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Site Ownership

Marketing

Timescales for Development – NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED Whilst the site has been promoted through the Call for Sites, indications are that the site would not be developed within the required time period, or the site has previously been allocated but has not been subject any discussions with Officers about its delivery.	AMBER There is no known reason that the site could not progress within the time period of the Plan. For sites previously allocated but not developed, discussions have taken place with the promoter/ a developer indicating a firm commitment to its delivery within the Plan period.	GREEN The site is known to be available immediately (within the first 5-years of the Plan period) and has no significant constraints or encumbrances which may prevent development in a timely manner. If requested, the site promoter has confirmed site availability within this period.

Evidence submitted to support site deliverability – NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED Evidence that has been requested to support the deliverability of the site and (a) has not been provided or (b) demonstrated that delivery of the site is not viable whilst meeting other policy criteria (e.g. an appropriate housing mix).	AMBER Some evidence to support the deliverability of the site, including infrastructure that will be required to facilitate the development has been submitted. Additional evidence still likely to be required to demonstrate the full policy-compliant deliverability of the site and its infrastructure.	GREEN The site promoter has provided appropriate evidence supporting the deliverability of the site, confirming the viability of the site including the provision of all known infrastructure required to facilitate policy-compliant delivery of the development.

On-site/ off-site Improvements – NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

RED The extent of either the on-site or off-site improvements that are required to mitigate the development of the site are substantial and are considered to make the site undeliverable.	AMBER Significant on-site or off-site improvements may be required to mitigate the development of the site. Further evidence may be required for the site to progress further.	GREEN Limited on-site or off-site improvements works are considered to be necessary to mitigate the development of the site. The site is still considered to be a viable development site.
Viability of Affordable Housing – NEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		
RED The promoter of the site has indicated that the site will not achieve the required affordable housing contribution.	AMBER The promoter of the site has advised that the affordable housing contribution can be met on site but has not provided evidence to support the delivery of affordable housing.	GREEN The site promoter has provided appropriate evidence to support the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution on-site.