

# Earsham Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

## Contents

SN0218 .....	3
SN0390 .....	14
SN0390REVA .....	25
SN5026 .....	36

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0218
Site address	Land west of Earsham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.46 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation of 80 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

#### SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access to the south via The Street (good visibility)</p> <p>Potential constraints on access from hedgerow. Lack of footway immediately adjoining site.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> -Amber Subject to access at south eastern boundary and frontage development. Will require speed limit to be extended and review of speed reducing feature/entry treatment, including existing feature. Footway required at frontage and north eastwards within highway to connect with existing facilities, including crossing facility to connect with ex facility to south east side of The Street. Improve footway at south east side of The Street for its full length south of Milestone Lane to School Road, may need to use some of existing carriageway. Particular pinch between 22 The Street and Old Ale House needs to be resolved.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p><b>Highways meeting –</b>  Long site frontage, so providing a suitable vehicular access should not be a problem (good visibility/ability to set development back to provide a footway). However limited verge to provide a footway from the site to the village. This is the old A143 pre-bypass, and measures to reinforce the 30mph limit may be needed. Key issue remains the creation of a footpath back to the village</p>	
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Earsham Primary School 600 metres along roads with footways (other than immediately adjoining site). Slightly shorter route available through footpath link to Queensway</p> <p>Village 2 buses per day either going to Great Yarmouth or to Diss  Nearest bus stop located 150meters from the site, along The Street</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Distance to village hall 220 metres</p> <p>Distance to playing field 630 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Queens Head public house 200 metres</p> <p>Local employment: care home, small retail businesses</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Capacity tbc AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Access to all key services, except for gas supply. Electricity lines cross the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Small section to the southern boundary is considered a 'low risk' to surface flooding.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on site  <b>F &amp; W</b> - Few or no Constraints. Small area of ponding in the 1:1000 year rainfall events as shown in the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Not served by AW connection.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley  ALC: Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> Acceptable in landscape character terms however the importance of the hedgerow along the site frontage would need to be confirmed	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is well related to existing development in the village	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in close proximity  <b>NCC HES – Amber</b>  <b>SNC HERITAGE OFFICER –</b> seems fine in Townscape and Heritage terms. A143 is quite well landscaped on south side. There are some views towards the church spire – however these are less important than views from the Waveney Valley to the east	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	No footway along this section of road. Road is of reasonable capacity and offers relatively direct access to A143  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS -Amber</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site could relate well to the existing settlement and is contained in the wider landscape by the A143	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable, but footway link will need to be provided along road into village to connect to existing footway. This appears to be achievable.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Boundary with A143 could require noise mitigation measures. Otherwise residential properties or agricultural land with no compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow along boundary with The Street / Harleston Road. Belt of trees planted on most of A143 boundary. Otherwise largely open	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Two overhead power lines bisect site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from A143 as approach site from west and also from Harleston Road	N/A



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p><b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>Part of site adjacent to village could be suitable for allocation for 25 dwellings subject to footway being able to be provided.</p>	<p>Amber</p>

## 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)
River Valley		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation.	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:	The land is currently subject to an Agricultural Tenancy, but possession can be obtained.	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Will require speed limit to be extended and review of speed reducing feature/entry treatment, including existing feature. Footway required at frontage and north eastwards within highway to connect with existing facilities, including crossing facility to connect with existing facility to south east side of The Street and improvements to footway within village	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Landowner has acknowledged that there are likely to be policy requirements such as affordable housing provision. Confirmed site to still be viable for proposed use taking into account the policy requirements and CIL.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Affordable housing provision and open space	

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

Site as promoted is too large for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings. However, it could be reduced in size. The site is well related to the existing settlement of Earsham and is well linked as it is bounded by the A143 to the north.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Large field adjacent to built up area of village that is severed from the wider landscape by the A143. There is an existing passing place to the south of the site which restricts the speed into the village from the east. There is a 3-wire power cable line which runs across the site. The site appears open within the countryside as views in and out of the site are currently unscreened.

### **Local Plan Designations**

The site is well related to the existing settlement of Earsham and is well linked as it is bounded by the A143 to the north. Outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Earsham.

### **Availability**

The site is promoted by Agent on behalf of Landowner and appears available based on the information provided.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

This site was preferred for allocation on the basis that the site is well related to Earsham village and facilities. Development of the site is subject to achieving a satisfactory access to the south eastern boundary, off The Street. The site benefits from a long site frontage where providing a suitable vehicular access should be sufficient (good visibility/ability to set development back to provide a footway). Whilst development of the site may have impacts upon the landscape and townscape, it has been identified that these could be mitigated. The site is within Flood Zone 1 where a small section to the southern boundary is considered a 'low risk' to surface flooding, given the size of the site it is considered that development is still achievable.

**POST REGULATION 18 UPDATE:** Following a review of the comments received during the Regulation-18 consultation, as well as ongoing discussions with technical consultees, the status of site SN0218 has been reviewed and the site has been reclassified as a reasonable alternative (shortlisted). On balance the visual impact arising from the development of this site will have both a landscape and townscape impact, particularly when viewed from the A143. In addition, an updated submission on an alternative site within Earsham (SN0390REVA) has resulted in that site becoming a preferable site for delivering an allocation within this settlement with fewer impacts arising.

### **Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:** Yes

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 14 January 2021

Date Updated: 29 April 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher

**SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form**

**Part 1 - Site Details**

<b>Detail</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0390
<b>Site address</b>	Land east of School Road, Earsham NR35 2TB
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	Historic applications for residential development
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	2.6 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Allocated site GNLP– approximately 50 dwellings (mix of affordable and market
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	30dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

**Part 2 - Absolute Constraints**

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

#### SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access options are constrained, with access shown from School Road being narrow access track.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</b>                      Visibility at access constrained by 3rd party land. Doesn't appear to be feasible to provide an acceptable access road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting –</b>                      Access would need widening which requires third party land, could not currently accommodate an estate road. Highways would also require a validated highway boundary to show that they can achieve suitable visibility to the south/north. Otherwise development is likely to be limited to what can be achieved off a private drive. Need to clarify ownership of the hedge; need to be able to demonstrate ownership up to the highway boundary (hedgeline); inclusion of The Rectory land adds potential to create an estate scale development; removal of the hedge</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		in its entirety would be preferred as it would increase visibility of the development.	
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Earsham Primary School – immediately north</p> <p>Village has 2 buses per day either going to Great Yarmouth or to Diss</p> <p>Nearest bus top – 250meters from site along The Street</p> <p>Residential care home – 350 meters from site</p> <p>Medium level opportunities for local employment – pub, jewellers, nursing home, car services.</p>	Amber
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Distance to village hall 400 metres</p> <p>Distance to playing field 220 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Queens Head public house 450 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	To be confirmed through consultation	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Query over the availability of all key services.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Majority of site is within Flood Zone 1. Eastern part of site in flood zone 2	Amber



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		and small part in flood zone 3	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley ENV 3	Amber
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER-</b> Some landscape concerns about this site however these would be reduced if the eastern section of the site was omitted from development. Some concerns about the views across the open landscape as well as the proposed pattern of development – a landscape assessment would be required.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would not relate well to existing settlement as there is no estate development on this side of School Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Potential impact on the protected presence of protected species. Watercourse is located to the east of the site boundary. Mature vegetation along eastern boundary.  Watercourse to the east of the site boundary.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential impact on nearby (within 200 metres of site) 2 listed buildings.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>This could be mitigated through careful design and proposed landscaping.</p> <p><b>NCC HES – Amber</b></p> <p><b>SNC HERITAGE OFFICER-</b>  More concerned about this site – there are good views along School Road south towards the church which neatly terminated the view. Although there has been some linear development along the east side of School Lane – it retains a strong rural character with the hedgerow. Branching out development to the east would establish more development on this side of Earsham which has historically benefitted from the Waveney Valley floodplains preventing development. There will be views of the church and its spire from the footpaths to the east along the Waveney Valley (Spires are unusual in East Anglia).</p> <p>Also historically there may have been some visual connections from the Bigod Castle site in Bungay across the site to the church. Also, the church site also has potential Saxon connections and could have been a camp.</p> <p>There is also the setting the listed The Close – which is currently a farmyard cluster setting within wider setting of rural fields.</p>	
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is constrained with School Road being narrow in places and congested at school drop-off / pick-up times</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</b></p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p> <p><b>Highways meeting – Amber</b> The location is better than the original score suggests</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	School, agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would not relate well to existing settlement as there is no estate development on this side of School Road and would also intrude beyond existing extent of development into valley floor. Also potential impact on listed building to south depending on extent of development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is very constrained and unlikely to allow for an acceptable access road. NCC Highways also note that visibility at access is constrained by third party land	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	School to north, residential properties to west and to south. Agricultural land otherwise. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and trees on most boundaries	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries. Adjacent to watercourses that form part of flood plain	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden from School Road as to rear of existing development. Possible longer views from end of Church Road and Earsham Dam where development would appear obtrusive	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is situated to the rear of existing residential dwellings in an already built up area. View to the east are of the open countryside and agricultural fields.  The access is constrained and would need to be upgraded.	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)
Waveney River Valley ENV3		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvements to be required – footpath and access.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Landowner has acknowledged that there are likely to be policy requirements such as affordable housing provision. Confirmed site to still be viable for proposed use taking into account the policy requirements and CIL.  No viability assessment has been submitted.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Affordable housing provision and open space.	

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

The site is well related to the existing settlement and located to the rear of existing dwellings located off School Road. To the west of the site there is an area of land located within Flood Zone 2/3 (initially included within the GNLP submission). Landscape and heritage constraints have also been identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Access appears to be narrow. The rear gardens of the residential properties located on School Road would back onto the eastern boundary of the site. There is an existing footpath which runs from the site into the village and extends to the centre of Bungay to the north.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Earsham. Within area defined as Countryside and A5 Waveney River Valley ENV3.

### **Availability**

The site is promoted by Agent on behalf of Landowner and appears available based on the information provided.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site in a preferable location for an allocation but is currently constrained by a narrow access, suitable for a private drive only. Therefore, at this stage it is considered as a settlement limit extension.

It is proposed that only the eastern field is developed in order to avoid food risk areas and mitigate landscape impact. Consideration will need to be given to views along School Road, south towards the Listed Church where there are potential Heritage concerns.

If access issues can be resolved then the site is can be expected to be suitable for allocation for a development in the region of 25 homes on a site of approximately 1ha.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 30 December 2020

Date Updated: 3 May 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher



## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0390REVA
Site address	Land east of School Road, Earsham, NR35 2TF
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic applications for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Area reduced to 1.25 hectares, additional land included to frontage.
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At least 25 dwellings 38 at 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	<p>Access has been revised to address previous concerns by including the rectory on School Road. The rectory has been included which provides a wider frontage plot for the site access.</p> <p><a href="#">NCC Highways meeting</a> - need to clarify ownership of the hedge; need to be able to demonstrate ownership up to the highway boundary (hedgeline); inclusion of The Rectory land adds potential to create an estate scale development; removal of the hedge in its entirety would be preferred as it would increase visibility of the development.</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Earsham Primary School – immediately north</p> <p>Village has 2 buses per day either going to Great Yarmouth or to Diss</p> <p>Nearest bus stop – 250metres from site along The Street</p> <p>Residential care home – 350 metres from site</p> <p>Medium level opportunities for local employment – pub, jewellers, nursing home, car services.</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Distance to village hall 400 metres</p> <p>Distance to playing field 220 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Queens Head public house 450 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and water recycling centre likely to be needed to be upgraded.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	To be confirmed; promoter queries over the availability of all key services.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>Await consultation with LLFA.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley ENV 3	Amber
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high-grade agricultural land.</p> <p>A landscape assessment and landscaping scheme would be required, possibly with a landscape buffer to the east.</p> <p><i>Previous (SN0390): Some landscape concerns about this site however these would be reduced if the eastern section of the site was omitted from development. Some concerns about the views across the open landscape as well as the proposed pattern of development – a landscape assessment would be required.</i></p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	Townscape impact arising as there is no estate development on this side of School Road.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>Possible impact on the presence of protected species due to presence of a watercourse to the east but outside the site boundary.</p> <p>Some vegetation along boundaries, open to the east.</p> <p>Would require further investigation and enhancement/mitigation.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Potential impact on nearby (within 200 metres of site) 2 listed buildings. This could be mitigated through	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>careful design and proposed landscaping.</p> <p><b>NCC HES – Amber</b></p> <p><i>Previous (SN0390): More concerned about this site – there are good views along School Road south towards the church which neatly terminated the view. Although there has been some linear development along the east side of School Lane – it retains a strong rural character with the hedgerow. Branching out development to the east would establish more development on this side of Earsham which has historically benefitted from the Waveney Valley floodplains preventing development. There will be views of the church and its spire from the footpaths to the east along the Waveney Valley (Spires are unusual in East Anglia).</i></p> <p><i>Also historically there may have been some visual connections from the Bigod Castle site in Bungay across the site to the church. Also, the church site also has potential Saxon connections and could have been a camp.</i></p> <p><i>There is also the setting the listed The Close – which is currently a farmyard cluster setting within wider setting of rural fields.</i></p>	
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is constrained with School Road being narrow in places and congested at school drop-off/pick-up times. Easy access into Bungay.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> - need to clarify ownership of the hedge; need to be able to demonstrate ownership up</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		to the highway boundary (hedgeline); inclusion of The Rectory land adds potential to create an estate scale development; removal of the hedge in its entirety would be preferred as it would increase visibility of the development.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	School, agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>The reduced site area is an improvement on the previous submission. Although it still does not relate well to the existing townscape as there is no larger development on this side of School Road, there is modern frontage development adjacent and the reduced area could be contained by landscaping.</p> <p>The potential impact on listed building to south has been significantly reduced; needs to be considered by the Heritage Officer.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	<p>Access can be achieved from road frontage, will need to await NCC Highways to advise if adequate.</p> <p>This area is highly congested at school start and end. The site could offer some potential mitigation to this – this should be investigated with Highway Authority.</p>	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land. Will require demolition of the rectory. However, this is an unremarkable building, and it would not be a loss in terms of architectural merit.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	School to north, residential properties to west and to south. Agricultural land otherwise. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	<p>Hedges and trees on most boundaries.</p> <p>Open to the adjacent field to the east.</p>	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries. Relatively close to watercourses that form part of flood plain	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden from School Road as to rear of existing development. No longer views from Church Road to the south which is a no-through road and has mature hedge to north, views from the north from Earsham Dam	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>The site is situated to the rear of existing residential dwellings in an already built-up area. It is next to the school and other services are available in the village.</p> <p>Views to the east are of the open countryside and agricultural fields and there will be some impact on the landscape however the reduced site area is a significant improvement.</p> <p>Access appears achievable through the demolition of the rectory and would relate to the existing village.</p>	Green



## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Waveney River Valley ENV3		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation, some impact.	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways improvements to be required – footpath and access.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Landowner has acknowledged that there are likely to be policy requirements such as affordable housing provision.  Confirmed site to still be viable for proposed use taking into account the policy requirements and CIL. No viability assessment has been submitted.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Affordable housing provision and open space.	

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

The site is well related to the existing settlement and located to the rear of existing dwellings off School Road. Landscape and heritage impacts will need to be mitigated.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Access now appears achievable from the frontage. The rear gardens of the residential properties located on School Road would back onto the eastern boundary of the site. There is a good network of footpaths close to the site which extend to the centre of Bungay to the east.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but immediately adjacent to the development boundary for Earsham. Within area defined as Countryside and A5 Waveney River Valley ENV3.

### **Availability**

The site is promoted by an Agent on behalf of the Landowner and appears available based on the information provided and the amendments made.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is in a sustainable location for an allocation with access to local services in Earsham and also with easy access to Bungay. The previously constrained narrow site access has been addressed by the inclusion of the rectory and its curtilage. A smaller area was previously considered acceptable as a Preferred Site and now, with an adequate access, it is reasonable to include the whole western field as a Preferred Site.

Developing the western field only would avoid flood risk areas and mitigate landscape impact. Consideration will need to be given to wider views along School Road, and south towards the Listed Church where there are heritage assets.

The site can be expected to be suitable for allocation for a development in the region of 25-30 homes on a site of approximately 1.25ha.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5026
Site address	Land south of Old Railway Road and north of The Street, Earsham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Frontage garage and bungalow inside development boundary Majority is grassed area to north and outside development boundary
Planning History	1980/1833/O for residential development, refused 23/07/1980.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.19
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	30
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

#### SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Existing access to commercial garage to south from The Street, would require removal of garage. The garden space linking to the north parcel of land is too narrow and not adequate for an access.</p> <p>There is an informal access from Marsh Lane which is an unadopted, shingle, single track Lane.</p> <p>Promoter suggests access could be possible from the north via the A143.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. No access to A143. Access would be required at The Street, existing buildings limit visibility, satisfactory provision not possible, proximity to adjacent junction affects ability to form safe access.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Earsham Primary School; 270m</p> <p>Bus stop; 581 service; 100m</p> <p>Village 2 buses per day either going to Great Yarmouth or to Diss</p>	N/A
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	<p>Village Hall; directly opposite</p> <p>Distance to playing field 320 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Queens Head public house 50 metres</p> <p>Local employment: care home, small retail businesses</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		<p>Promoter indicates that all services have capacity.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates that all services are available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	<p>No known stability issues.</p> <p>Contamination unlikely on land to rear as it has not been developed.</p> <p>Land on frontage would need investigation for contamination as it</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>was last used as a commercial garage. The age of the building suggests there may be asbestos present.</p> <p><b>Minerals &amp; Waste:</b> Safeguarding area (sand and gravel) partially within Safeguarding consultation area for permitted mineral extraction site. Site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 Surface Water Flooding in north-west corner of site between Marsh Lane and a drain. Also Marsh Lane has surface water flooding.</p> <p><b>LLFA:</b> At risk of surface water flooding. Would not prevent development, mitigation required and standard information at planning stage.</p> <p>The site is affected by minor ponding in the 3.33% and 1.0% AEP events. The site is affected by a minor/moderate flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site south-north in the west of the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk and has the potential to be developed.</p> <p>Any water leading from off-site to on-site should be considered as part of any drainage strategy for the site.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>We are aware of internal flood records in the wider area associated with 'The Street'.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p> <p>Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland</p>	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
<p>SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p>	N/A	<p>A5 Waveney Rural River Valley</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification: Grade 3 – good to moderate.</p>	N/A
<p>Overall Landscape Assessment</p>	Green	<p>The site is contained within the built-up area of the village. It is in the wider River Valley designation but would not encroach into the countryside and would not affect the wider landscape.</p> <p><b>Broads Authority:</b> Approx 150m from BA boundary. Little intervisibility likely. A143 intervenes but Angles Way passes close to west of site. Suggest a reference to the proximity and sensitivity of the Broads in any allocation policy.</p>	Green
<p>Townscape</p>	Green	It is adjacent to the development boundary on three sides and be	Green



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		contained by the A143 to the north. It would be assimilated and in principle would have no adverse effect on the townscape.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. Land to rear currently grass with tree belt adjoining, potential for habitat – possibly bats. Would need investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Green.</p> <p>Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires consultation with Natural England.</p> <p>Site on Green Infrastructure Corridor. Site in amber risk zone for great crested newts but isolated from any ponds (surrounded by housing and main road). Stream through site.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Listed building directly opposite on The Street, several LBs on The Street, including the Queens Head pub on the corner with Marsh Lane, &amp; The Old Forge. Removal of the utilitarian garage and car sales and replacing with well-designed development would visually improve the area.</p> <p><b>HES - Amber</b></p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Within the village, close to the main street. Close to the A143.</p> <p>Earsham FP4 runs close to the north east corner from across the A143 through the top of Kingsway and to The Street.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green. No access to</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		A143. Access would be required at The Street, existing buildings limit visibility, satisfactory provision not possible, proximity to adjacent junction affects ability to form safe access.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential on three sides. A143 and tree belt to north. Some road noise from A143.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments 11/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is within the physical boundaries of the recognised village and is contained by the A143 to the north. It will not negatively impact on the townscape.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The garage and bungalow have frontage access. However, the suggested route through the gardens is too narrow where it connects the two parts of the site. Need to clarify with Highway Authority.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Would require demolition of the garage and bungalow to the front. It would mean the loss of a business but residential would be more compatible. The business was not operating when the site visit was done.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential. An access through the two gardens as proposed would not be compatible with the adjacent residential uses.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Significant trees and hedges around the site, also a hedge to the west within the site. There is a tree belt to the north which serves as a buffer to the main road.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat within the trees and hedges. Also, a wetter area to the north-west which may have additional habitat.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence, unknown. Would need investigation for contamination given current garage use to south.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments 11/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	No long views. Limited public views into and out of the site because it is contained within the built-up area. However, there are numerous dwellings surrounding which have views into the site.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>The site has good access to the village facilities and the market town of Bungay is close by. It is a sustainable location.</p> <p>It reads as part of the village and would infill an area up to the A143 with no impact on the landscape.</p> <p>The front area is within the development boundary where the principle of development is acceptable subject to consideration of the loss of a commercial use. However, it is unclear whether access is achievable to the rear grassed area and whether it is more appropriate to deal with the two parts of the site separately.</p> <p>Some surface water flooding which may exclude part of the site to the north-west.</p>	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)
River Valley		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Two private, separate owners.	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – have had enquiries	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)  Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green
Comments:		N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter has stated site is deliverable, no evidence submitted. Would need to take account of demolition, possible asbestos removal, achieving a suitable access.  At least two different landowners.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	No suitable access can be achieved.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided on site, no evidence of viability.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

The site is a suitable size for allocation. The site is well located in relation to access to village services and the A143 to Bungay. However, the site is heavily constrained in achieving a suitable and safe access. The site is also subject to surface water flood risk; a flow path cuts the site south-north in the west of the site. This would limit development within this area.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site is made up of agricultural land to the north and a commercial garage to the south. Access via the A143 is not suitable and therefore access would be to the south via The Street, where the existing visibility is poor creating safety issues. It is also unclear whether the site could be accessed to the south as the rear garden of existing properties off The Street appear to limit passage.

### **Local Plan Designations**

The front area of the site is within the development boundary with the remaining of the site defined as Countryside and A5 Waveney River Valley ENV3.

### **Availability**

The site is promoted by an Agent on behalf of the Landowner and appears available based on the information provided.

### **Achievability**

No further constraints identified.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for development. Whilst the site is partially located within the development boundary for Earsham and within proximity to existing services, access to the site is considered unachievable. The Highways Authority have advised that direct access from the A143 is not suitable and therefore access would need to be achieved to the south, via The Street which creates safety concerns from a Highway Authority point of view; existing buildings limit visibility, satisfactory provision not possible, proximity to adjacent junction affects ability to form safe access. The site is also constrained by surface water flood. In addition, to create an access from The Street this would require the demolition of the existing garage. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate the garage is no longer viable.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022