

Alburgh & Denton Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

SN5034	3
SN5055SL	15
SN5054SL	25

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5034
Site address	Land south of Beech Farm, Tunbeck Road, Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2016/6096 new dwelling refused. 2019/1690/O for 4 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed: outside development boundary, access to services and impact on landscape. 2019/0030/CUQ for COU to 2 dwellings refused; did not comply with part Q as a conversion.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12-13 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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing access; Highway Authority to advise - are visibility splays adequate for residential? NCC Highways – Amber. Access achievable with significant tree removal. Site remote, no walking/ cycling to catchment school. Substandard highway network.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Primary school and nursery; 900m. Bus stops to north of site; 200m. Also bus service in Wortwell but need to cross A143; 1.3km (Anglian 84 and 581). No shop. Microbrewery opposite with beer shop. No footpaths.	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p><i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Village hall and sports facilities; 1.2km. Pub/restaurant on A143; 1.3km.	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known constraints. Environment Agency: Green re foul water capacity.	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints.	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	Existing use is poultry sheds, may require some remediation. No known stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Low surface water flood risk to south and medium surface water flood risk to east. Environment Agency: Green LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. At risk of surface water flooding but would not prevent development.	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 Good to Moderate (Green)	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Some rural development nearby originally associated with agriculture. Development loose and spread out. Proposed scale of residential would significantly alter this rural character. Site is flat, visible when approaching from south and will have some detrimental impact.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Outside development boundary and separate from main built-up area of village. Would be out of keeping with low key incremental rural development surrounding.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Low biodiversity potential due to intensive poultry units. Environment Agency: Green NCC Ecologist: Amber zone for great crested newts. Pond nearby. No priority habitats. Not in Green Infrastructure Corridor	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Grade II listed building to north. Impressive detached, thatched farmhouse with large separate barn. Set in large grounds within the rural area. Intense residential development adjacent would detract from its wider setting. HES - Amber	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Narrow rural road, 40mph. No footpaths and no safe walking route to school.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Access achievable with significant tree removal. Site remote, no walking / cycling to catchment school. Substandard highway network.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Paddock and detached house to north. Recent barn conversion to south-east.</p> <p>Agricultural use to east and south. Previous agricultural use to west now a microbrewery with associated shop and business uses (Iceni Kitchens).</p>	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Listed building to north, there is good separation and screening which will lessen any detrimental impact. Outside development boundary where there is only sporadic rural development and consolidating it with more intense residential development would have an impact within the river valley and on the rural character.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Is an existing access need to check with HA if visibility could be achieved.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural. Poultry sheds would need to be demolished.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, agricultural and commercial. Likely to be compatible.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat, no significant issues.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedges.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature trees and hedges to be considered around boundaries. Otherwise, it is in intense poultry use with grass and of low ecological value.	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.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated April 2021)	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	Limited views into site from roadside because of hedgerow. Views as approach from south. No views from Station Road to north due to intervening hedging and trees.	N/A
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	<p>No existing development boundary and the site is detached from the main part of the village. There are services in the surrounding area, but all involve walking along narrow rural roads which are unlit and have no paths and there is no safe walking route to the school. Some are located across the A143 which is busy and not easy to cross.</p> <p>The character of the area is of mixed development (small scale industry, agriculture and residential), but very much dispersed in pattern. The site is at the edge of the designated River Valley and residential development in this location would erode the character of the area.</p>	Red

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Rural River Valley		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Some negative impact	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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	Owner states agricultural use could cease immediately.	Amber
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible road widening needed – Highway Authority to advise.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated affordable housing will be provided in line with Policy.	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 relatively unconstrained, although may require remediation work due to the current poultry units on site. However, the site is poorly related to the existing settlement and in townscape and landscape terms would mark a breakout in the open countryside, out of keeping with the low-key rural development in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the highways access is likely to require significant tree removal, making the site more prominent, and there are no safe foot and cycle connections to local facilities, particularly the catchment primary school, and the immediate network is substandard in terms of supporting new development.

Site Visit Observations

No existing development boundary and the site is detached from the main part of the village. There are services in the surrounding area, but all involve walking along narrow rural roads which are unlit and have no paths and there is no safe walking route to the school. Some are located across the A143 which is busy and not easy to cross.

The character of the area is of mixed development (small scale industry, agriculture and residential), but very much dispersed in pattern. The site is at the edge of the designated River Valley and residential development in this location would erode the character of the area.

Local Plan Designations

Some potential negative impact on the Rural River Valley (DM4.5)

Availability

Site owners indicate the agricultural use could cease with immediate effect; however, the site could require remediation work due to the current poultry units on site.

Achievability

The site itself appears achievable, although no supporting evidence has been submitted to demonstrate deliverability, including any potential off-site improvements (e.g. highways)

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is relatively unconstrained, although may require remediation work due to the current poultry units on site. Distance to services is acceptable, however some of these are separated from the site by the A143. The site is poorly related to the existing settlement and in townscape and landscape terms would mark a breakout in the open countryside, out of keeping with the low-key rural development in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the highways access is likely to require significant tree removal, making the site more prominent, and there are no safe foot and cycle connections to local facilities, particularly the catchment primary school, and the immediate network is substandard in terms of supporting new development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/22

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5055SL
Site address	Site opposite village hall, Low Road, Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside Development Boundary
Planning History	1986/2106/O for three dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 25/8/87
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.37Ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Not stated. 9 @ 25dph
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	There is a road frontage onto Low Road and visibility is good in both directions. NCC Highways – Green. Wide verges and length of frontage would allow visibility splays, albeit all frontage vegetation would need to be removed.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	No village Shop Bus stop adjacent and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School is 290m No footpaths	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Village Hall opposite Recreational ground/play area next to village hall opposite Public House 2.20km (A143) Pre-school at the primary school	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site.	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability		The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1. Low surface water risk from pond adjacent to west. LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. The on-site minor flooding in the 0.1% AEP event is minor ponding concentrated to the site boundary and associated with a pond feature bordering the site.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a significant detrimental impact on the undeveloped landscape in this location which cannot be reasonably mitigated.	Red
Townscape	Amber	A concentrated development of houses on this site would be out of character with this verdant part of Low Road which adds significantly to the character of the village. There is a break in the development boundary to the north and so this site would not be a continuation of that boundary.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. Mature trees and pond adjacent, also buildings to rear with potential habitat – would require investigation. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but residential and water discharge do not need NE consultation. Amber risk zone for GCN and pond adjacent and within 250m of the site. No priority habitats onsite and not in GI corridor. No PROW.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Two Listed Buildings to south-west with access along south boundary of the site also, Tudor House to the north-west means the site would impact on the wider setting of all three. These have all been omitted from the development boundary to protect this. HES - Amber	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	The road network is inadequate with no footpath or lit routes; however the site is relatively close to services. NCC Highways – Red. The site is located on bus route, but there is no walking route to catchment primary school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Garden/grassland to south and west with large residential properties. Opposite village hall. Compatible.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	This side of the road is characterised by large, detached properties set well back from the road with significant green frontages. Three of the properties are listed, including those directly behind the site which have been excluded from the development boundary. A concentration of dwellings here would be out of character and have a negative impact on the setting of the listed buildings.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Appears that this is achievable, would need Highway Authority advice.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grassland, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential, compatible.	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)	Mature hedges and trees	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	As above, with a pond to the rear, all providing habitats which would require investigation.	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)	Electricity poles crossing the site to the village hall. No evidence of contamination.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Currently limited because of vegetation. No long views into or out of the site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>The site is well located in terms of services, but development of this site would have a significant impact on the verdant landscape along the west side of Low Road. It would also impact on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.</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)
None		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	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	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Site is under threshold for these requirements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter is suggesting affordable housing, the site is under threshold to require this.	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 relatively well located in terms of distance to local services; however, the local network is narrow, unlit with no footways. The site itself is opposite the village hall, however the west of Low Road is characterised by large, detached dwellings, generally set back from the frontage; as such development of this site would be out of keeping. There are also a number of listed buildings in the vicinity.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well located in terms of services, but development of this site would have a significant impact on the verdant landscape along the west side of Low Road. It would also impact on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The site promoter indicates the site is available.

Achievability

The site promoter indicates the site is deliverable, however no supporting evidence has been submitted to support this.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well located in relation to the local services, however the creating of an access would significantly change the verdant character of the west side of Low Road and the local network is narrow, unlit and has no footways. West of Low Road is characterised by large, detached dwellings, generally set back from the frontage; as such development of this site would be out of keeping. There are also a number of listed buildings in the vicinity.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5054SL
Site address	Land off Church Road, Alburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside Development Boundary
Planning History	2006/0407/O for a dwelling refused, appeal dismissed 19/12/2006.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.14Ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	None given. 4 dwellings @ 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Existing gated access from Church Road would need to be up-graded. NCC Highways – Green. Wide verges and length of frontage would allow provision of visibility splays, albeit all frontage vegetation would need to be removed.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	No village Shop Bus stop 600m and is on the bus route for Anglian 84 Primary School 290m No footpaths	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	N/A	Village Hall 600m Recreational ground/play area next to village hall 600m Public House 2.30km (A143) Pre-school at the primary school	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known constraints	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, sewage and electricity available to site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Low surface water risk in south of site. LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a significant detrimental impact on the undeveloped landscape in this location which cannot be reasonably mitigated.	Red
Townscape	Red	The site is not adjacent to the development boundary and not related to any group of dwellings or buildings. It would be completely out of character with the built form of the village.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No designations. Mature trees and hedges, potential for habitat. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ but residential and water discharge do not need NE consultation. Amber risk zone for GCN and ponds within 250m of the site. No priority habitats onsite and not in GI corridor. No PROW.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby listed All Saints Church Grade I and War memorial Grade II, located to the north. Views of the church tower. Site of Archaeological Interest opposite – this site would also need investigation. HES – Amber. Close to possible deserted village	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of Church Road/road network may not be reasonably mitigated. Narrow	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>carriage way and no footway. NCC Highways – Red. Whilst the site is within reasonable walking distance from the primary school, A safe off-carriageway walking route is not available, it is also remote from other local services. The surrounding highway network substandard e.g. narrow and no footways.</p>	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural – compatible.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of listed church which is prominent.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by open space and mature trees and it would be out of character with the townscape.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing small field access which would need to be upgraded. The road is narrow with no footpaths.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield, no buildings.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Grassland	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	No significant change in level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and hedges.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in and around the site as is undeveloped with mature vegetation and hedgerow links.	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)	None evident and unlikely to be contaminated.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views limited into and out of the site, medium views but no longer views in the landscape.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>The site is not adjacent to the development boundary and would be separate from existing development. It would significantly alter the character of Church Road to the detriment of the setting of the attractive listed church. The road network is poor with no footpaths or lit routes to services although services are relatively close.</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)
None		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	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	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		N/A

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	None supplied	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Site is under threshold for these.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter is suggesting affordable housing, the site is under threshold to require this.	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 not well related to the existing built form of the village and would represent an isolated dwelling in the countryside, with consequent negative townscape and landscape impacts. The site also has heritage concerns regarding nearby listed buildings and potential archaeological interest. Whilst site access should be achievable, this would result in the loss of hedgerow, and the local road network is narrow carriageways with no footway provision.

Site Visit Observations

The site is not adjacent to the development boundary and would be separate from existing development. It would significantly alter the character of Church Road to the detriment of the setting of the attractive listed church. The road network is poor with no footpaths or lit routes to services although services are relatively close.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability.

The site promoter indicates the site is available.

Achievability

The site promoter indicates the site is achievable, but no supporting evidence has been submitted to support this e.g. in terms of delivering a suitable access, potential archaeological investigation etc.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site would represent an isolated dwelling (small group of dwellings) in the countryside, with consequent landscape and townscape issues. The site would impact on the setting of the nearby listed church, and also potentially on a site of archaeological interest. Whilst the site is relatively close to local facilities, creating an access would impact on the rural character of Church Road, and the local network is narrow, unlit with no footways.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/22