Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Site Assessments

Tivetshall St Mary and Tivetshall St Margaret

Contents

SN0317SL

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0317SL
Site address	Land south of Mill Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic permissions associated with agriculture. Use as contractor's yard - refused
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.15 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(a) Allocated site** **(b) SL extension**	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 7 dwellings = 46 dph (25 dph = 4 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield – vacant following use for o/s storage

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	Field access from School Road. Severe access constraints due to limitations of Mill Road. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access onto Mill Lane unacceptable. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of restricted width, lack of footways and restricted visibility at adjacent road junctions. *(Highways meeting: Access onto Mill Lane is not acceptable – too narrow and poor junction with The Street.)*	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	350m walk to primary school Post office and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service just within 1800m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		450m walk to Village hall, recreation ground and village groups 1800m walk to PH	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity to site. O/H lines cross site. No UKPN constraints. AW advise sewers crossing this site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site lies outside of the proposed fibre installation area.	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Potentially contaminated by previous uses – requires investigation	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along highway	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Ditch close to northern and eastern boundary. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of HAs to east. Impact may be mitigated. **HES** - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network can be mitigated. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access onto Mill Lane unacceptable. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable by reason of restricted width, lack of footways and restricted visibility at adjacent road junctions. *(Highways meeting: Access onto Mill Lane is not acceptable – too narrow and poor junction with The Street.)*	Red
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?	Well separated from HAs on eastern side of The Street. Impacts of developing only this site rather than larger area likely to be reasonably mitigated. If combined with adjacent parcels, cumulative impact should be carefully assessed.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access from Mill Road. Achieving visibility would require some loss of hedgerow. NCC has confirmed that Mill Road is inadequate given narrow width and poor junction with The Street.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Vacant land to south, agriculture to north and west, residential to east.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat. Ground level falls slightly to south	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Established hedgerow to north and west – some significant trees. Ditch to east separates residential.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	See above	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. Contamination due to previous uses 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 prominent in views along Mill Road, from north and from adjoining land to south. Not prominent in views from The Street to the east.	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 close to primary school and village hall. Lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. Would represent a breakout to west but this is contained by established hedgerow on western boundary. Would result in loss of hedgerow to northern boundary but landscape impact limited by small scale. Need NCC Highways to confirm if suitable.	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)**
Open countryside		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes but impact cannot be mitigated.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Under threshold	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

In visual impact and locational terms it is suitable for limited SL extension at lower density than promoted, subject to landscaping and re-location of utilities. However, NCC has confirmed that Mill Road is unsuitable for further development due to its narrow width.

Site Visit Observations

Site close to primary school and village hall. Lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. Would represent limited breakout to west but this is contained by established hedgerow on western boundary. Would result in loss of hedgerow to northern boundary but landscape impact limited by small scale and new landscaping. NCC to confirm if traffic impacts on Mill Road achievable given narrow width.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-3 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered an **UNREASONABLE** extension to the existing settlement limits due to highway concerns. Highways officers have commented on the inadequacy of Mill Road given its narrow width and poor junction with The Street. The site is located close to the school and village hall and adjacent to the settlement limit, although there is a lack of a continuous footpath. Development in this location would represent a breakout to the west and would continue a limited form of ribbon development along Mill Road. Potential contamination from the previous land use will need to be investigated but it is likely that this can be mitigated.

Preferred Site:
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 03 December 2020

SN0318

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0318
Site address	Pear Tree Farm, west of The Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(c) Allocated site** **(d) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10 dwellings = 17 dph (25 dph =15 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. Access from The Street would need to be widened requiring demolition of the barn. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Limited frontage precludes acceptable access onto The Street. No continuous footway linking with the catchment primary school. *(Highways meeting: Would need to be considered together, as SN0319 currently has no access point. Access to both would need to be via The Street and will require the demolition of the barn on The Street to create a suitable access/visibility. Whilst there are no footways there are large verges so walkers could step off the carriageway.)*	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	350m walk to primary school Post office and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service within 1800m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		500m walk to Village hall, recreation ground and village groups PH within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity to site. O/H lines along eastern boundary and across site. No UKPN constraints. AW advise sewers cross this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site lies outside of the proposed fibre installation area.	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub-station.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Potentially contaminated by previous uses.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Site is at low risk of flooding.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. **SNC Landscape Officer** - no landscape issues but concern about the townscape character.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. **SNC Landscape Officer** - no landscape issues but concern about the townscape character. **SNC Heritage Officer** – Amber. Site has bungalows on east and north which will be a factor and will lower density.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on designated and non-designated HAs but the impact could be reasonably mitigated. **HES** – Amber **SNC Heritage Officer** – Green. No impact on heritage assets to east.	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC confirmed access would need to be from The Street through demolition of the old barn. Although there are no footways there are verges for walkers. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Limited frontage precludes acceptable access onto The Street. No continuous footway linking with the catchment primary school. *(Highways meeting: Would need to be considered together, as SN0319 currently has no access point. Access to both would need to be via The Street and will require the demolition of the barn on The Street to create a suitable access/visibility. Whilst there are no footways there are large verges so walkers could step off the carriageway.)*	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture/residential/vacant	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Well separated from HA to south on eastern side of The Street. Impacts of developing this site rather than the larger site are likely to be reasonably mitigated. If combined with adjacent parcel, cumulative impact should be carefully assessed.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing narrow access onto The Street would need to widened through demolition of the old barn.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Vacant	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Part of larger parcel of vacant land to north and west with residential to east – compatible.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat.	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to larger parcel of land to north and west. Hedgerow to south and residential boundaries to east.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within southern boundary and scattered across site although these not high quality.	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 eastern boundary. Previous uses and dilapidated nature of site suggest potential for contamination – requires investigation	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site not prominent in views along The Street. Visually contained from wider views by boundary hedgerow of larger parcel.	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 close to primary school and limited local services. Lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. Promoted as a smaller part of SN0319, would represent a more limited breakout to west into open countryside which would be screened from wider views and so limiting landscape impact. Otherwise, well connected to existing settlement. Impact on residential amenity could be limited by design and layout including single storey which would restrict density. Access, potential contamination and utilities infrastructure likely to be main constraints to development. NCC to confirm traffic impacts on The Street and feasibility of safe access.	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)**
Open countryside		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
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?	Yes but possible remediation costs due to previous uses may affect viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Suitable for allocation for low density development subject to satisfactory access, necessary site remediation and design/layout to protect existing residential amenity.

Site Visit Observations

Site close to primary school and limited local services. There is a lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of this settlement. Promoted as a smaller part it would represent limited breakout to west which would be screened from wider views and so limiting landscape impact. Otherwise, well connected to existing settlement. Impact on residential amenity could be limited by design and layout including single storey which would restrict density. Access and potential contamination likely to be main constraints to development. NCC to confirm traffic impacts on The Street and feasibility of safe access.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 5 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

It should be noted that this is not an additional site, it is a smaller part of site SN0319 with the same proposed access point from The Street and, if allocated it would be instead of SN0319.

The site is located close to the school and village hall and adjacent to the settlement limits. Although there are no footways there are verges for walkers to step off the carriageway. The site would read as part of the existing village with existing residential development to the east and development would be visually contained by field boundaries to the west and south with limited open views. Therefore, whilst development would disrupt the existing linear pattern the site would allow infill without incursion into open countryside. Potential contamination from the previous use will need to be investigated but it is likely that this can be mitigated. Highways officers have confirmed that access would need to be widened from The Street through demolition of the disused barn.

Preferred Site:
Reasonable Alternative: Yes
Rejected:

Date Completed: 03 December 2020

SN2041

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2041
Site address	Land east of Tivetshall
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	18.9 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(e) Allocated site** **(f) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 472 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 The Street and School Road. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Allocation too large for location. Frontage too small to provide safe access. Local road network suffers restrictions in width and no continuous footway to catchment school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	320m walk to primary school from nearest access on School Road Post office and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service within 1800m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		500m walk from School Road access to village hall, recreation ground and village groups PH within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints. AW advise sewers crossing this site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site lies outside of the proposed fibre installation area.	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Site in flood zone 1. Area of identified flood risk in SW section.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Due to scale of development promoted, detrimental impacts that would be unlikely to be mitigated through design	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	Due to scale of development promoted, detrimental impacts that would be unlikely to be mitigated through design	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Pond close to western boundary. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on designated and non-designated HAs but the impact may be mitigated. **HES** - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Allocation too large for location. Frontage too small to provide safe access. Local road network suffers restrictions in width and no continuous footway to catchment school.	Red
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?	Development as promoted likely to harm open setting of HAs to north and south. AAI on southern boundary so investigation required. Technical officer to advise.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field accesses onto The Street and School Road. NCC to confirm if improved access achievable for scale of development promoted	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)	Residential and agriculture - compatible	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	G/L rises from School Road then generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows including some significant trees, residential boundaries. PRoWs running north-south through eastern section of site.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within boundary hedgerows. Ponds north of boundary with Croft Farm and along southern boundary. Woodland outside eastern 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 or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site prominent in wider views from adjoining agricultural land to north and east. Not prominent in immediate views from either highway.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site relatively close to primary school and limited local services but lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. Development at scale promoted would be excessive in respect of size of settlement or numbers sought and would be a significant breakout to east with harmful landscape and townscape impacts. Likely to have significant 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)
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not suitable for allocation due to its excessive scale, lack of connectivity and impacts on townscape, landscape, heritage, ecology, and setting of PRoWs. Safe access is not achievable and development at this scale would be harmful to highway safety using either access point.

Site Visit Observations

Site relatively close to primary school and limited local services but lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. Development at scale promoted would be excessive in respect of size of settlement or numbers sought and would be a significant breakout to east with harmful landscape and townscape impacts. Likely to have significant impact on local highway network – NCC to confirm.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development would commence within 5 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered **UNREASONABLE** due to its excessive scale, 18.9 ha (472 dwellings) in relation to the existing village. The possibility of smaller parts being developed has been considered but no alternatives have been found reasonable. Areas of the site are located close to the school and village hall and adjacent to the settlement limits, but the majority is not well connected. Development in this location would excessively disrupt the existing linear form of the village, extending the village into the open countryside to the detriment of its landscape setting. The School Road access is detached from the village and would not be acceptable as it would extend into the open countryside on a narrow rural road. Access from The Street is very restricted would involve the removal of a hedgerow/trees adjacent to the Listed Building. In both instances, development at this scale would be harmful to highway safety using either access point.

Preferred Site:
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 09 December 2020

SN2042REVA

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2042REVA
Site address	Land south of Rectory Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 ha
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	Existing access through adjoining farmland from Tinkers Lane not part of this site. Potential access constraints onto Rectory Road but these could be overcome. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Limited frontage likely to preclude safe access. Would require 2m frontage footway, extension of speed limit and removal of frontage hedge. No footways in the village linking to the catchment school. Site remote from services and not appropriate for development.	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	1km walk to primary school Post office and peak bus service within 1800m Limited employment opportunities within 1800m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground and public house within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. O/H lines and telegraph poles along northern boundary. No UKPN constraints.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site is within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along highway and on land outside site to east and south. **LLFA** – Green. Few or no constraints	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated. **NCC ECOLOGY** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of HAs to north, but impact may be mitigated. **HES** - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Limited frontage likely to preclude safe access. Would require 2m frontage footway, extension of speed limit and removal of frontage hedge. No footways in the village linking to the catchment school. Site remote from services and not appropriate for development.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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?	Site separated from designated HAs on north side of Rectory Road. Impact could be limited through design and landscaping	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access achievable onto Rectory Road and impact on local network.	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 to south and east, residential to other boundaries.	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)	Northern boundary mostly enclosed by hedgerow. Site open to larger parcel of farmland to east and south.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow and trees along western boundaries with residential. No natural delineation to the south or east.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines and telegraph poles on northern boundary.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site prominent in views from Rectory Road, Tinkers Lane and adjacent farmland. Screened from residential 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)	Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge at points - characteristic of settlement. Lack of connectivity affects access to other local services too. Site as promoted would have significant landscape and townscape impacts. Would be limited by reduced site area. NCC to confirm if access achievable.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not ***s***uitable for allocation due to lack of connectivity to services and its distance from the settlement limit. It does not reflect the linear form of existing development and will have a negative impact on the landscape. Further reduced site area with eastern boundary pulled in but would not follow a natural boundary.

Site Visit Observations

Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge at points - characteristic of settlement. Lack of connectivity affects access to other local services too. Site as promoted would have significant landscape and townscape impacts, these have been reduced by reducing the site area but are still of concern. NCC to confirm if access achievable.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-3 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site lacks connectivity to the village, as it is located at the southern edge some distance from the settlement limit. It does not reflect the existing form and character of development as the majority of the site is located behind the road frontage. It would also visually extend the village into the countryside and would be detrimental to the landscape setting of the village with no naturally delineated boundaries. The frontage could not achieve adequate visibility for access.

Preferred Site:
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 01 December 2020

SN2042REVB

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2042REVB
Site address	Land south of Rectory Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
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)	Up to 11 dwellings = up to 22 dph (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 through adjoining farmland from Tinkers Lane not part of this site. Potential access constraints onto Rectory Road but these could be overcome. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access would require 2m frontage footway, extension of speed limit and removal of frontage hedge. No footways in the village linking to the catchment school. Site remote from services and not appropriate for development.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	1km walk to primary school Post office and peak bus service within 1800m Limited employment opportunities within 1800m	
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall (with groups), recreation ground and public house within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity to site. O/H lines and telegraph poles along northern boundary. No UKPN constraints.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site is within the area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along highway and on land outside site to east. **LFFA** – Green. Few or no constraints	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any detrimental impacts on protected species or ecological network could be reasonably mitigated. **NCC ECOLOGY** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of HAs to north but impact may be mitigated. **HES** - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated	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?	Site separated from designated HAs on north side of Rectory Road. Impact could to be limited through design and landscaping	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access achievable onto Rectory Road and impact on local network.	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 to south and east, residential to west.	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)	Northern boundary mostly enclosed by hedgerow. Site open to larger parcel of farmland to east and south.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow and trees along western boundaries with residential. No natural delineation to the south or east.	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	O/H lines and telegraph poles on northern boundary.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site prominent in views from Rectory Road, Tinkers Lane and adjacent farmland. Screened from residential 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)	Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge at points - characteristic of settlement. Lack of connectivity affects access to other local services too. Site as promoted would have significant landscape and townscape impacts. Would be limited by reduced site area. NCC to confirm if access achievable.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not suitable for allocation due to lack of connectivity to services and its distance from the settlement limit. It does not reflect the linear form of existing development and will have a negative impact on the landscape. Further reduced site area but this would not follow a natural boundary.

Site Visit Observations

Walking route to school lacks footpath provision although wide verge at points - characteristic of settlement. Lack of connectivity affects access to other local services too. Site as promoted would have significant landscape and townscape impacts, these have been reduced by reducing the site area but are still of concern. NCC to confirm if access achievable.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-3 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered **UNREASONABLE** due to its lack of connectivity to the village, being located at the southern edge some distance from the settlement limit. It is a reduced site area and does run along the road frontage, reflecting the existing form and character of the adjacent development. In this respect it is more acceptable than the associated larger site: SN2042A. The alternative site also results in a longer frontage which could meet highway visibility requirements although would result in the loss of the hedgerow. However, it would visually extend the village into the countryside and would be detrimental to the landscape setting of the village with no naturally delineated boundaries.

Preferred Site:
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 01 December 2020

SN2103

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2103
Site address	Land north of School Road
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 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 15 dwellings = 17 dph (25 dph = 23 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 from School Road. School road narrows to the east at this point. Potential access constraints and loss of frontage hedgerow. NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access to site subject to c/w widening to 5.5m and provision of 2.0m f/w at frontage. Surrounding highway network restricted in width, restricted visibility at junctions and lacks footway. *(Highways meeting: School Road narrows significantly in front of this site. Creating a suitable access would lose all/most of the trees and hedges along the site frontage. Footway link is achievable. Could potentially turn School Road as the primary road into the new development, depending on how much traffic uses School Road beyond the site.)* *NCC to confirm whether it has any traffic info which would support turning School Road into site SN2103 and making the remainder of School Road beyond the site a side road.*	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	100m walk to primary school Post office within 1800m Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service just within 1800m but no footpath provision	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall, recreation ground and village groups within 1800m 2km walk to PH	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity to site. O/H lines and telegraph poles along southern boundary. No UKPN constraints. AW advise sewers crossing this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Part of the site lies outside of the proposed fibre installation area. Remainder is under consideration for upgrade	Amber/Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along highway. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.	Amber

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design. **SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER** - Significant loss of trees and hedgerows would be an issue on this site.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be mitigated through design	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ponds close to eastern boundary. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on setting of HA to east. Impact could be mitigated. **HES** – Amber **SNC Heritage Officer** – Amber. Some impact on Elm Tree Farm, but some distance and already a lot of landscape within the curtilage and to side of the LB.	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	School road narrows significantly here. NCC to confirm if could turn road into site and make remainder of School Road into a side road. Access into site would lose all/most of frontage hedge/trees. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Access to site subject to widening to 5.5m and provision of 2.0m f/w at frontage. Surrounding highway network restricted in width, restricted visibility at junctions and lacks f/w. *(Highways meeting: School Road narrows significantly in front of this site. Creating a suitable access would lose all/most of the trees and hedges along the site frontage. Footway link is achievable. Could potentially turn School Road as the primary road into the new development, depending on how much traffic uses School Road beyond the site.)* *NCC to confirm whether it has any traffic info which would support turning School Road into site SN2103, and making the remainder of School Road beyond the site a side road.*	Red
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?	Some impact on Elm Farm to east which would lose more isolated setting. However, well separated and viewed within sizeable curtilage. Retain boundary hedgerow to limit impact.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access achievable and impact on local network. Any access likely to impact on significant trees on in south western corner. NCC to confirm if access/visibility achievable without removal.	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 to north, residential to other boundaries.	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)	Northern boundary open to farmland. Hedgerow (including some significant trees) to other boundaries.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Significant boundary trees – assess for TPO. Ponds outside eastern boundary – further investigation required.	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 and telegraph poles on southern boundary.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visually contained with limited open views from north. Prominent in views along School Road.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site close to primary school and village hall but lack of footpath provision along narrow lanes affects accessibility to other local services. Impacts on townscape, landscape and heritage could all be mitigated through design and landscaping to include retention of eastern boundary hedgerow and limited removal along southern. NCC to confirm if access achievable while retaining significant trees	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
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 possible to turn School Road into site SN2103, and making the remainder of School Road beyond the site a side road.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Suitable for allocation as it is adjacent to the settlement limits and close to the school. Subject to satisfactory access and retention of significant trees and hedgerow on southern and eastern boundaries.

Site Visit Observations

The site is close to the primary school and village hall but the lack of footpath provision along narrow lanes affects accessibility to other local services. Impacts on townscape, landscape and heritage could all be mitigated through design and landscaping to include retention of eastern boundary hedgerow and limited removal along southern. NCC to confirm if access achievable while retaining significant trees.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-3 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered **REASONABLE**. The site is located close to the school and village hall and adjacent to the settlement limits. Development in this location would read as part of the existing village and is visually contained with limited open views from the north. There would be some impact on Elm Farm to east which would be mitigated if the eastern hedgerow and trees were retained and enhanced. Highways officers have confirmed that all/most of the frontage hedge/trees would need to be removed to achieve an access into the site. School Road narrows to the east at this point and there are potential access constraints which it is may be possible to overcome through a reconfiguration of the local road layout but this would need to be agreed with NCC Highways.

(NCC highways to confirm if could turn road into site making this the primary road and make remainder of School Road to the east into a side road.)

Preferred Site:
Reasonable Alternative: Yes
Rejected:

Date Completed: 01 December 2020

SN3006

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3006
Site address	North of Croft Lea, east of The Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(m) Allocated site** **(n) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12- 25 dwellings = 13 - 27 dph (25 dph =23 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 from The Street. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through development. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Limited frontage precludes safe access being provided. No footways in the village linking to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	500m walk to primary school Post office and limited employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service within 1800m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		500m walk to Village hall, recreation ground and village groups PH within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity to site. No UKPN constraints.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site lies outside of the proposed fibre installation area.	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is at low risk of flooding	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*	Not applicable	Tributary Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impacts may be mitigated through design.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts that may not be mitigated through design.	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Ponds outside site boundaries. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development may have a detrimental impact on designated and non-designated HAs but the impact may be mitigated. **HES** - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm if impact on local network could be mitigated. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Limited frontage precludes safe access being provided. No footways in the village linking to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services.	Red
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?	Development as promoted likely to harm setting of LB to south of adjoining barns. Technical officer to advise.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access onto The Street. NCC to confirm if improved access achievable while retaining significant boundary tree.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grazing	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agriculture - compatible	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow to north, south, east and to highway. Some trees within hedgerow and significant trees on highway boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees within boundary hedgerows. Pond in SE corner and also outside northern site 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 or contamination.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site prominent in views along The Street. Visually contained from wider views by boundary hedgerows	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 relatively close to primary school and limited local services but lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. Development as promoted would not reflect linear pattern of development and would represent break out to east that would introduce suburban layout. Likely to impact on setting of designated HA to south. Site screened from wider views which would limit landscape impact. Access, ecology and trees are the main constraints to development. NCC to confirm traffic impacts on The Street and feasibility of safe access. Agent also promoting development of front section of site only. Likely to have acceptable townscape impact subject to design but access, heritage and trees would remain constraints.	Amber

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not suitable for allocation due to lack of connectivity and intrusion into open countryside to the detriment of the landscape. It would be out of character in this location and would have a negative impact on the nearby heritage assets and through the loss of trees.

Site Visit Observations

Site relatively close to primary school and limited local services but lack of continuous footpath which is characteristic of settlement. Development as promoted would not reflect linear pattern of development and would represent break out to east introducing suburban layout. Likely to impact on open setting of designated HA to south. Site screened from wider views which would limit landscape impact. Access, ecology and trees are main constraints to development. NCC to confirm traffic impacts on The Street and feasibility of safe access. Agent also promoting development of front section of site only. Likely to have acceptable townscape impact subject to design but access, heritage and trees would remain constraints.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 5 years.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered **UNREASONABLE** due to its lack of connectivity to the village and its intrusion into the open countryside, impacting on both a heritage asset and the local ecology. Whilst it is relatively close to the school and village hall and adjacent to the settlement limits it is physically less well connected due to it being largely behind existing development. It would disrupt the existing linear form of the village and visually extend the village into open countryside which would be detrimental to the landscape setting of the village. Development of this scale would be out of character and would impact on the setting of designated Listed Building to the south. Access is achievable from The Street but this would require the loss of the frontage hedgerow and trees which would further adversely impact on the Listed Building.

Preferred Site:
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 09 December 2020

SN4006

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4006
Site address	Land west of Hales Street
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Historic residential refusal
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 ha
Promoted Site Use, including **(o) Allocated site** **(p) SL extension**	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 dwellings = 12 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	Amber	Existing field access from Hales Street. Potential access constraints but these could be overcome through standard improvements. NCC to confirm if access is achievable. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Not clear how safe access can be achieved. Remote, no safe walking route.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities *Part 1:* ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	3km walk to primary school Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Peak bus service. Bus stops within 100m	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities			Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises water, foul drainage and electricity to site. O/H lines and telegraph poles along northern and eastern boundary. boundary. UKPN sub-station in NE corner. AW advise sewers crossing this site.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Within a proposed fibre installation area.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or sub station	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely to be contaminated and no known stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. SW flood risk identified along highway to north No identified flood risk. **LLFA** – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.	Amber

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

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area *(Land Use Consultants 2001)*		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC: grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts may be reasonably mitigated through design	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Ponds in NW corner may reduce developable area. Detrimental impacts could be reasonably mitigated. **NCC ECOLOGY** – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on designated or non-designated Has. **HES** - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Site remote from primary school and most local services with lack of footpath provision. **NCC HIGHWAYS** – Red. Not clear how safe access can be achieved. Remote, no safe walking route.	Red
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 detrimental impact on designated or non-designated HAs	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing field access from Hales Street. NCC to confirm if safe access achievable and impact on local network. Any access onto B1134 would be affected by UKPN infrastructure.	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 to north and west, residential to south and east.	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 with trees to all boundaries – intermittent to west.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some significant boundary trees – assess for TPO. Site also intersected by treeline. Ponds in NW corner – further investigation required.	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 and telegraph poles on northern and eastern boundaries.	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site located on junction and prominent in views from north and along B1134. Also prominent views along Hales Street.	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 remote from primary school and most local services with lack of footpath provision. Impacts on townscape and landscape could be mitigated through design and landscaping to include retention of eastern boundary hedgerow. Trees within site, ecology and UKPN infrastructure would constrain development. NCC to confirm if access achievable.	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)
Open countryside		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/ A/ G)**
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Proposal to start marketing.	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	**Comments**	**Site Score (R/A/G)**
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting statement from promoter	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes, overhead lines and telegraph poles along the northern and eastern boundary, a UKPN sub-station to take into account.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Statement from promoter advising same	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Not suitable for allocation due to its remote location and lack of connectivity to local services as it is site away from the main part of the settlement. It is also partially constrained by trees, ponds and utilities on the site.

Site Visit Observations

The site is remote from the primary school and most local services with lack of footpath provision. Impacts on townscape and landscape could be mitigated through design and landscaping to include retention of eastern boundary hedgerow. Trees within site, ecology and UKPN infrastructure would constrain development. NCC to confirm if access achievable onto Hales Street.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside.

Availability

Promoter has advised availability within plan period.

Achievability

Promoter has advised development achievable within 1-3 years .

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** for allocation due to its very remote location away from the village and lack of access to services, in particular the distance to the primary school along unlit rural roads with no footpaths. There are site constraints; overhead lines and telegraph poles along the northern and eastern boundary, a UKPN sub-station in the NE corner, ponds in NW corner and mature trees within the site. These site constraints could be mitigated but would reduce the developable area. Any impacts on townscape and landscape could be mitigated through design and landscaping to include retention of the eastern boundary hedgerow.

Preferred Site:
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 01 December 2020