

# Needham, Brockdish, Starston & Wortwell Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

## Contents

SN2036 .....	3
SN2121REVA .....	14
SN4069SL .....	25
SN5029 .....	36
SN5045SL .....	50

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2036
Site address	Bell Field, High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Land is allocated under policy WOR1 for approximately five dwellings
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development (well before the current allocation was adopted)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.31 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Promoted for allocation for a larger number of dwellings. Exact number not specified
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	
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>Potential access constraints</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, would need to demonstrate adequate visibility at Low Road / High Road junction can be secured as well as adequate footway provision which is likely to require some re-alignment of the junction. Low Road would require widening to at least 5.5m between the site and High Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> - NCC has safety concerns for any development accessed via Low Road (due to width and junction back onto High Road) which would need to be brought up to a suitable standard and also the lack of potential safe access points for the site itself. Noted that this is a current Local Plan allocation for approx. 5 dwellings. Site may have potential for 5 dwellings to be accessed via a private drive from High Road; access arrangements may require relocation of war memorial.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 Harleston Primary School 3.2km, Alburgh and Denton Primary School (not catchment school) 2.2km</p> <p>Bus service passes site with bus stop within 100 metres</p> <p>Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 3.5km</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 recreation ground and community centre 380 metres</p> <p>In close proximity to the Wortwell Bell public house</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p><b>NCC Mineral &amp; Waste</b> - Sites over 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Amber	Areas of site that are not already allocated for development are within flood zones 2 and 3	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	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Unallocated part of site is within protected river valley landscape.  No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	In central core of village with in which part of site has already been allocated	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats. Adjacent to candidate County Wildlife Site	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Less than 50m from two Grade II listed buildings and potential impact on other Grade II listed buildings to the south	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is unsuitable in terms of road or junction capacity, although this may be able to be	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>mitigated</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, would need to demonstrate adequate visibility at Low Road / High Road junction can be secured as well as adequate footway provision which is likely to require some re-alignment of the junction. Low Road would require widening to at least 5.5m between the site and High Road.</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential including caravan park. Public house nearby	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Principle of development on part of site has been established through existing allocation	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable given that it has been accepted for current allocation	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site 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)	Caravan park based around lakes to east. Residential properties to north and to west including a public house. Agricultural land to south and south-west. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on boundaries	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees, hedging and grassland on site as well as proximity to water courses and ponds	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
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from highway and from public footpath that cuts across site	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>Wider site would have landscape/habitat concerns in relation to the River Valley landscape (inc. footpath across the site), and trees/hedging around the site, and proximity to watercourses/ponds.</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>	Part of site that is not allocated is 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)		N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to be allocated and within a reasonable distance of the limited services in Wortwell. Part of site is already allocated for 5 units (WOR1); however, the remainder of site not considered suitable due to flood risk. The site is promoted for a small increase in the overall numbers, with an element of affordable housing and a wildlife resource on the area subject to flood risk. However, the allocated site is already 0.4ha and could therefore accommodate 10 dwellings at 25/ha and the policy makes provision for amenity/recreation land outside, but adjacent to the allocated site.

### Site Visit Observations

Wider site would have landscape/habitat concerns in relation to the River Valley landscape (inc. footpath across the site), and trees/hedging around the site, and proximity to watercourses/ponds.

### Local Plan Designations

Site is part allocated (WOR1) and part outside development boundary. Part of site that is not allocated is within River Valley landscape designation and the current WOR1 Policy makes it clear that this is to be brought forward as amenity land.

### Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

### Achievability

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

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

**: Reasonable** – part of the site is already allocated for approximately 5 dwellings in the current Local Plan (WOR1). The site promoter is seeking a small increase in numbers, with some affordable units and an area of wildlife/amenity land. This should be achievable within the existing allocated site, which extends to 0.4ha, and Policy WOR1 already requires provision of amenity space on adjoining land, outside the Settlement Limit. However, any amended Policy would need to emphasise the requirements to protect the setting of the listed pub opposite and the rural gap between the parts of Wortwell centred on High Road and Low Road. Any increase in numbers could also have implications in terms of further highways improvements. The remainder of the site which is not currently allocated is Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, and contributes to the rural gap within the village, and therefore would not be appropriate to allocate for housing.

**\*Site to be retained as a carried forward allocation\***

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

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>	SN2121REVA
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of High Road, Wortwell
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	Prior notification for agricultural building on the site (2019/2530)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	Approx. 1 hectare
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	
<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)*

<b>Is the site located in, or does the site include:</b>	<b>Response</b>
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>Potential constraints on access</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red, access onto High Road is on the inside of a bend. Visibility of at least 2.4m x 120m would be required. Does not appear achievable. Site is remote from village centre. Access would require 2m wide footway across the site frontage appropriate crossing facilities to the northern side.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> - discussions have taken place between the site promoters NCC Highways overall it would appear that development should be achievable using private drives. Adequate visibility taking into account the TPO trees will need to be factored in. Survey of existing traffic speeds needed and extension to the 30mph speed limit.</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 Harleston Primary School 2.7km</p> <p>On bus route with bus stops 170 metres away</p> <p>Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 3km</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 recreation ground and community centre 400 metres</p> <p>Distance to Wortwell Bell public house 450 metres</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	AW TBC AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p><b>NCC Mineral &amp; Waste</b> - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u> , should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Green	Parts of site have identified surface water flood risk  <b>LLFA</b> - Significant mitigation required for severe constraints. Recommend a review of the site and potential removal from the local plan.	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	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation.  No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Estate development on site would not respect adjacent linear character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km and 2 CWSSs somewhat closer  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road is of reasonable standard with footway  NCC Highways – Amber, access onto High Road is on the inside of a bend. Visibility of at least 2.4m x 120m would be required. Does not appear achievable. Site is remote from village centre. Access would require 2m wide footway across the site frontage appropriate crossing facilities to the northern side.	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?	Estate development in this location would not be in keeping with the linear form and character of the adjacent part of the settlement	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways have raised concerns as to whether visibility could be achieved as access would be on to inside of bend	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)	Planning permission for residential properties on adjoining land to east, agricultural land on other boundaries. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)		N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along highway boundary, with trees including one which is subject to a TPO	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 hedges along highway boundary	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
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from public footpath to west as well as glimpsed views through hedgerow from highway	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>Development of the site would extend the village west into the open countryside and also create an area of estate development that does not relate well to the linear pattern of development to the east.</p>	<p>Red</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?		N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		N/A
When might the site be available for development?		
Comments:		

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

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and reasonably located in relation to the limited facilities in Wortwell. Significant Highways concern that the required visibility splays can not be achieved as the site is situated on the inside of long bend in High Road, potentially exacerbated by the TPO tree on the highways boundary. The LLFA consider that significant mitigation measures would be required for the identified surface water flood risk. The development would be out of keeping with the form and character of the area, which is linear, frontage only, not in depth – in any event, this site would extend further west than development on the opposite site of High Road, intruding further into the designated River Valley landscape.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site projects west beyond the existing extent of development along High Road. In addition the existing development of this part of the site is just linear development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but close to the development boundary for Wortwell (and the small area in between has now been developed). The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Unreasonable - Whilst the site is reasonably located for the local facilities in Wortwell, pedestrian access would require a suitable crossing on High Road. However the site has a number of overriding constraints: it has not been demonstrated that suitable visibility splays can be achieved on the inside of the bend in High Road, particularly given the TPO tree on the highway boundary; there are likely to be significant mitigation measures necessary to address surface water flood risk (if this is achievable at all); the site as proposed would be out of keeping in terms of townscape, introducing an uncharacteristic form of estate development; and even reduced to frontage only development, the site would extend the settlement further into the designated River Valley Landscape.

### **UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:**

Following the Regulation-18 consultation the site has been reassessed as a REASONABLE option for allocation in conjunction with SN5029. Key issues resulting in the rejection of the site at the Regulation-18 stage related to in-depth development of the site however whilst a subsequent planning application on the site (2021/2140) was refused it did not raise significant concerns about small scale linear development across the site frontage. In addition the landscape impact of any linear development on the site would be further reduced when viewed in tandem with SN5029 (north of High Road).

**Preferred Site:** Yes  
**Reasonable Alternative:**  
**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 21 December 2020  
Date Updated: 10 May 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>	SN4069SL
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Scole Road, Brockdish
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Outside development boundary
<b>Planning History</b>	There have been a number of historic refusals for residential development, the most recent dismissed on appeal (2006/1596)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.18 hectares
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension</b>	Settlement limit extension – 2 to 3 dwellings
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	16dph (4 dwellings)
<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)*

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

#### SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Established access suitable for minor residential development.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> - Green. No acceptable walking route to catchment school at Harleston</p> <p><b>Highways Meeting</b> - Would provide an extension to the built form. No safe walking route to school (which is 6km away). Highways would have no issues with SL extension for 2 dwellings, subject to adequate visibility and access</p>	Green
<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> </ul>	Amber	<p>Harleston Primary School is 6km away</p> <p>Bus service passes site with bus stops within 100 metres</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
○ Peak-time public transport			
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Brockdish village hall 100 metres  Distance to The Old Kings Head public house 360 metres	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	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.  <b>NCC Minerals</b> – site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk on highway past site.  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Surface water flooding. Site adjacent to significant flooding (flowpath). Must be considered when doing a site assessment. Standard information required.	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	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high-grade agricultural land.  <b>SDC Landscape Officer</b> - Acceptable in landscape terms	Amber
Townscape	Green	Would continue existing pattern of development.  <b>SDC Heritage Officer</b> - no heritage objection to SN4069. During the Conservation Area Appraisal consultation for Brockdish a couple of years ago there was concern at removing the corner area of housing (chalet bungalows) from the CA and that this was somehow connected to allowing this site to be developed in future. However, I can see no heritage reasons why it couldn't be and the	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Conservation Area remains on the north side so its setting will still be taken into account.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south-east <b>NCC Ecology</b> - Green. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain. Close to Brockdish Common and Adj. Meadow CWS and Registered Common.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	In conservation area and opposite Grade II listed building. <b>SDC Heritage Officer</b> - no heritage objection to SN4069. During the conservation area appraisal consultation for Brockdish a couple of years ago there was concern at removing the corner area of housing (chalet bungalows) from the CA and that this was somehow connected to allowing this site to be developed in future. However, I can see no heritage reasons why it couldn't be and the conservation area remains on the north side so its setting will still be taken into account. <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road is of a reasonable standard with footway. <b>NCC Highways</b> - Red. No acceptable walking route to catchment school at Harleston. <b>Highways Meeting</b> - Would provide an extension to the built form. No safe walking route to school (which is 6km away). Highways would have no issues with SL extension for 2 dwellings, subject to adequate visibility and access	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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?	A small development of one or two dwellings could potentially be accommodated on this site without having an adverse impact on the historic environment or townscape	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access which should be satisfactory for minor residential development	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site 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)	Residential to east and on opposite side of Scole Road to north	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)	Domestic fencing with hedging on eastern boundary	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Evergreen hedging on highway boundary, other bushes and trees on other 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)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views are limited into site other than through access	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>Potential for a small additional amount of development through a settlement limit extension</p>	<p>Green</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 single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)		N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately/Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		

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

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

Site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is well contained visually but even if evergreen hedging were to be removed there is potential for site to accommodate one or two dwellings in the context of the existing pattern of development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Brockdish. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

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

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

REASONABLE for extension to settlement limit. The site is adjacent to the settlement limit, and although it is 6k to the primary school it does have access to other facilities. It is in the main part of the village and would be an extension to the built form respecting the existing pattern of development with only a very localised and limited impact on the river valley and Conservation Area. There is an existing access and any loss of Leylandii along the frontage would not be detrimental.

### **UPDATED CONCLUSION POST REGULATION-18 CONSULTATION:**

Ongoing discussions with the LLFA have raised concerns about the impact development of this site could have on an existing, active off-site surface water flowpath. As such the site has been reviewed and is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for extension to the settlement limit.

### **Preferred Site:**

### **Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 23 December 2020

Date Updated: : 11 May 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5029
Site address	Land at Mill Hill, High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None Opposite: three new bungalows.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6 15 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

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

#### SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Directly from High Road. Appears that adequate visibility could be achieved. Would need to avoid the TPO Trees.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green. Subject to satisfactory access, may require tree removal. Footway widening required for full site frontage.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> - discussions have taken place between the site promoters NCC Highways and overall it would appear that development should be achievable using private drives. Adequate visibility taking into account the TPO trees will need to be factored in. Survey of existing traffic speeds needed and extension to the 30mph speed limit.</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>	Amber	<p>Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.7km, Alburgh and Denton Primary School (not catchment school) 2.7km</p> <p>On bus route with bus stops 170 metres away, linking to market towns in the Waveney Valley.</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>Distance to recreation ground (with formal sports facilities) and community centre 380 metres</p> <p>470m to the Wortwell Bell public house</p> <p>1.65km to Pura Vida garden centre/coffee shop.</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>No known constraints.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter indicates, as far as is known, majority of noted services are available from High Road.	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	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues and unlikely given it is an agricultural field.</p> <p><b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Surface Water Flood Risk 1:1000 to west part of site, would need investigating.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Surface water flooding would not prevent development, mitigation required. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>The site is affected by a moderate flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site south-north. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows north off of the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to some moderate/major flooding.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk.</p> <p>Any water leading from off-site to on-site should be considered as part of any drainage strategy for the site.</p> <p>Access to the site may be affected by the on-site and off-site flood risk.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Rural River Valley	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	A5 Waveney Rural River Valley  Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Would extend the settlement further to the west, into the open countryside where the landscape is more exposed. There are long views towards Redenhall church from several vantage points. The wider field is undulating, but generally flat and lower-lying at the point of the proposed site.</p> <p>Whilst access may be possible through the TPO trees it would alter the landscape along this frontage on the approach to the built-up area; however, the impact needs to be considered in the context of also preferring the site on the south side of High Road (frontage of SN2121REVA)</p> <p><b>SNC Landscape Officer</b> - Some TPO trees along the site frontage of SN5029; southern end of SN5029 would need to be sufficiently landscaped; additional tree planting could be used to create an appropriate gateway to the village and compensate for the loss of any non-TPO trees to make the access for the site - could allow for a more spacious development with a small extension to the proposed site area</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	<p>Follows the linear form of the village along High Road but would continue to elongate the built form.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage Officer</b> – No issues.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>SSSI within 2km</p> <p>No habitat within the site as open monoculture field.</p> <p>TPO along frontage; row of 7 oaks and one to south side of road. Access would be through this line of trees.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Green.</p> <p>SSSI IRZ but residential and water discharge not identified as requiring NE consultation. No priority habitats onsite. No PROW onsite. Not in GI corridor. Green risk zone for GCN.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets.</p> <p>Long views of Redenhall church.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage Officer</b> – No issues.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Road is of a good standard with footway.</p> <p>PRoW to east of adjacent dwellings.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access, may require tree removal. Footway widening required for full site frontage.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture, compatible.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments 11/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No immediate impact on the historic environment but would elongate the settlement further into the open countryside.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears to be achievable, if can avoid the TPO and there is a footpath along the frontage.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Sits at a lower point in the undulating valley landscape, the site itself is generally flat.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No boundaries, oaks trees along the entire frontage and a newly planted hedge along the east side.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	TPO and other oak trees on the road frontage.	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 contamination or utilities.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views are open in all directions, although the road frontage is partially screened by the oak trees and the site sits at a lower point in the landscape. The site also needs to be seen in the context of additional proposed development south of High Road on SN2121REVA. However, it is a visible site and would impact on the River Valley landscape.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments 11/02/22	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>The limited services within the village are within walking distance, with a footpath along High Road. A regular bus service also runs to nearby market towns, including an approx. 10 min journey to Bungay town centre.</p> <p>The site would impact on the River Valley landscape, which is open with some wide views, although the site sits behind a line of oak trees at a lower point in the undulating topography.</p> <p>Any access would need to carefully consider the impact on the oak trees (both those covered by TPOs and those which aren't).</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)
Waveney River Valley		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>	Would impact on the River Valley landscape	Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (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)	No	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided but no evidence supplied.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The landowner states they have been in discussion with Wortwell Parish Council and, in addition to the housing land, is proposing that 0.5 hectares of land adjacent to the western edge of the village playing field be provided as a 'dog exercise area' – for which they	N/A

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
	state there is an identified need in the village, and for which a public consultation has been undertaken (on 17 July 2021).	

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

The site is at the western edge of Wortwell, within walking distance of the local facilities in the village and the bus stops for routes to the market towns in the Waveney Valley. The site forms part of a wider agricultural field, at a lower point in the undulating landscape. The site sits behind a group of roadside oak trees, some of which are covered by TPOs. Whilst the site would extend the linear form of development, this is in the context of a similar extension being proposed to the south of High Road, on SN2121REVA; the sites are being promoted jointly as an allocation-scale proposal in order to deliver affordable housing. Subsequent to the submission and the site assessment, the site promoter has undertaken further work to help demonstrate that a suitable access can be achieved with either the loss of no trees, or non-TPO trees only. The site will also need to address the surface water flood risk which affects the site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The limited services within the village are within walking distance, with a footpath along High Road. A regular bus service also runs to nearby market towns, including an approx. 10 min journey to Bungay town centre.

The site would impact on the River Valley landscape, which is open with some wide views, although the site sits behind a line of oak trees at a lower point in the undulating topography.

Any access would need to carefully consider the impact on the oak trees (both those covered by TPOs and those which aren't).

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside and River Valley landscape, which would need to be reflected in any policy for the site.

### **Availability**

The site promoter has confirmed that the site would be available immediately.

### **Achievability**

The site promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable, with affordable housing provided in conjunction with the site opposite (SN2121REVA), but no supporting evidence supplied.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Preferred (in conjunction with SN2121REVA) – site is reasonably well located in terms of the services and facilities within Wortwell, all of which lie within 1.8km, with footways. The site is also within walking distance of bus stops which connect to market towns in the Waveney Valley, including a 10 min journey to Bungay town centre. The main concerns with the site are the intrusion into the River Valley landscape and ability to access the site with minimal loss of frontage trees. With regard to the former, the site continues the linear pattern of development on High Road, sits behind the roadside oak trees, and is at a lower point in the topography. The site also needs to be considered in the context of SN2121REVA, to the south, which will no longer be open if allocated in conjunction (which is proposed by the two site owners, in order to deliver affordable units). However, sensitive

boundary treatment of the site will be required. Subsequent to the submission and the site assessment, the site promoter has undertaken further work to help demonstrate that a suitable access can be achieved with either the loss of no trees, or limited non-TPO trees only.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 03/05/2022

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5045SL
Site address	Land north east of High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.3ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8
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>Open frontage to High Road with no restrictions, appears that visibility could be achieved (conifer trees referred to in highways response have recently been removed).</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Green. Subject to satisfactory access, may require tree removal. Footway widening required for full site frontage.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> - Need to improve the frontage footway and extend the 30mph, however there will be no allocation policy for a site of this scale, so will need to be dealt with through the application process</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>	Amber	<p>Distance to Alburgh and Denton Primary School (not catchment school) 2,650m</p> <p>Bus service passes site with bus stops in close proximity along High Road, linking to market town in the Waveney Valley.</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>Distance to recreation ground (with formal sports facilities) and community centre 1,050m</p> <p>Distance to The Wortwell Bell Public House 630 metres</p> <p>500m to Pura Vida garden centre/coffee shop.</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Utility capacity to be confirmed</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all 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	Green	<p>Unknown, unlikely as is an undeveloped piece of land.</p> <p><b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	
Flood Risk	Green	<p>No identified flood risk on the site.</p> <p>Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3, and Internal Drainage Board Area to south-east across High Road.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Surface water risk would not prevent development. Standard information required at planning stage. The site is adjacent to major surface water flooding and in proximity of two major flow paths. This must be considered in the site assessment.</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> )	N/A	A5 Waveney Rural River Valley Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Site is in identified river valley landscape area. This edge of Wortwell is sparsely developed and the site provides a gap before the built-up area; development would have an impact on the landscape.</p> <p>The road frontage is now open following the recent felling of a substantial conifer hedge that gave</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>a significant green appearance. There are some native trees on the adjacent site and additional planting proposed. If this site was to be considered it may require new tree planting between it and the listed building to compensate for the removal of its green setting.</p> <p><b>SNC Landscape Officer</b> – Trees along site frontage removed earlier this year; no particular landscape issue identified.</p>	
Townscape	Amber	<p>Development of site could be within the pattern of development along High Road although typically it is more sporadic and less dense as it moves out of the village.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage Officer</b> – Chapel set back from frontage; new development would not necessarily need to be set along the same building line as chapel would have been set back.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>RNR off to rear (north-west) along A143. Also possible habitat within site and across High Road where water is present. Would require investigation.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. No PROW nearby. No priority habitat onsite but should avoid habitat loss. Residential development of 10 units or more, or any residential developments outside of existing settlements/ urban areas with a total net gain in residential units would require consultation with Natural England as site in SSSI IRZ. Amber risk zone for great crested newts.</p> <p><b>Norfolk Wildlife Trust:</b> This site is adjacent to Roadside Nature Reserve (RNR) 14, Wortwell. RNRs are designated for their nature</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		conservation value, and we recommend that any site allocation policy here includes reference to the RNR and the need to preserve it, should highway works such as visibility splays that may impact on the RNR be needed.	
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>United Reformed Church Listed Building to south with open aspect to site, would impact on its setting.</p> <p>Site of Archaeological Interest runs off-site, along the A143 to north-west.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage Officer</b> - The existing car park and access already provide a good physical separation between the site and the listed church, and the church is orientated mainly to be viewed from the front. No real issues, but require any buildings to be designed sympathetically to the setting of the chapel as still quite close proximity in terms of context.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Road is of a reasonable standard with footway.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to satisfactory access, may require tree removal. Footway widening required for full site frontage.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Church and graveyard to south, large new tarmaced car-park, sporadic residential to north. Roads either side.	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments 11/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Adjacent to a listed church, and completely within its setting/view, and it is an undeveloped gap which makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. Therefore, it will have townscape and landscape impact of development in this location.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears that it can be achieved, it would mean removing some of the frontage hedge.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Unused grassland, former garden to property to north.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Church to south, residential to north with garden between the site and the road (A143). Car-park to south at an elevated position would need addressing to prevent lights and noise disturbing nay residential properties.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	There is a slope west-east towards the High Road, with the property to the north being at a higher level and the car-park to the south also at a higher level on a bank overlooking the site. The frontage is at road level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Conifer hedge has been removed from the road frontage and deposited on site, hedging to rear. Open to north and south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some hedges, conifers were good habitat for nesting birds, this should be mitigated.	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)	Telegraph poles along path at frontage.	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	Views into the site are open. The site is still a green gap in the road frontage. There are public views from the church into the site from the south. There are now long views from the site over the river valley to the east.	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)	Site is in the River Valley landscape area and it is sparsely developed so a group of dwellings here would have some impact on the landscape. The road frontage creates a green gap looking towards the river valley. There would be a visual impact on the setting of the listed church.	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		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
<b>Conclusion</b>		Amber

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – 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 states site is deliverable but no evidence to support this.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Standard access improvements and also significant native landscaping, not just within dwelling plots.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it will be provided but 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 forms a gap in the built development fronting High Road, between the listed United Reform Chapel to the southwest and a small group of dwellings to the northeast. Recent removal of a substantial conifer hedge on the road frontage, and the implementation of the approved car park for the chapel have changed the immediate vicinity of the site. Whilst any scheme will need to be sensitive to the listed building, this would not prevent development of the site. A Roadside Nature Reserve immediately is close by, and the site is rated amber for the possible presence of Great Crested Newts, consequently ecology will also be an important consideration.

### Site Visit Observations

The site is in the River Valley landscape area, and it is sparsely developed, so a group of dwellings here would have some impact on the landscape however the addition of a car park (associated with the Chapel) adjacent to the site has altered the context of the site to a degree, as has the recent removal of the frontage trees from the site.

The road frontage creates a green gap looking towards the river valley. There would be a visual impact on the setting of the listed church.

### Local Plan Designations River Valley

**Availability** The site is considered to be available

**Achievability** The site is considered to be achievable.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** SN5045SL is considered to be a REASONABLE addition to the existing settlement limit which lies adjacent to the south of the promoted site. Potential impacts on the landscape and the adjacent listed building have been identified but it is considered that this could be appropriately addressed within any subsequent planning application. Similarly ecological surveys and mitigation measures would be required to support any development on the site.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 17 May 2022