

Bressingham Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

SN2054REVA	3
SN3019SL	14
SN4036	25
SN4037	35
SN5009	45
SN5021	55
SN5022	65
SN5024	74

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2054REVA
Site address	Land east of School Road and south of Pine Tree Cottage, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.44
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	35 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site has roadside frontage but site access would cross a green verge and require the removal of a mature hedge. Site access would also need to consider the mature oak tree.</p> <p>There is an existing footpath on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Visibility not achievable due limited frontage and presence of significant oak tree. Network a concern due to limited road width.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities	Green	Primary School; 140m Bus Service; 280m Shop; 530m	N/A

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	N/A	Village hall, playing field; 530m Public House; 580m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints Environment Agency - Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown but appears likely to be available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known contamination and ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 Surface water flowpath along road frontage to west but not within the site. LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency - Green (flood risk)	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary Farmland – majority of the site to the south-west Plateau Farmland – north-east	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland E2 Great Moulton Plateau Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	The landscape and visual impact would depend on whether the site to the north and west are allocated and developed as it would be unacceptable if they were not. If they were then there would be a significant impact on the landscape as development would be read with these other sites as a large extension to the village. Development of the site would require the removal of a hedge which is continuous on the east side of the road for some distance. There is no hedgerow buffer to the south as the site forms part of a wider field.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The impact would depend on whether the site to the north and west are allocated and developed. If they are this would be the next site sequentially and would relate well to them and the new townscape, if not it would be separate from the existing development and would not be acceptable.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations. Hedgerow to frontage and mature oak tree, otherwise it is an agricultural field with relatively low habitat value.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ - residential and water discharge not a trigger for NE consultation. Not in GI Corridor and on edge of amber risk zone for great crested newts. No PROW.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>LB (Pine Tree Cottage) immediately adjacent to the north and east of the site. The cottage looks towards this site, if both sites (SN4036 and SN2054REVA) were allocated the LB would then be surrounded by development and the impact on its setting would be significant. Previous comments received from the Council's Senior Heritage & Design Officer for adjacent promoted site SN4036 noted that the cottage is currently isolated but that its character and setting did not depend on its isolation. It was noted however that the north side of the cottage would be least affected by development although mitigation for SN4036 would still required. Development to the south of Pine Tree Cottage would have a greater impact on the significance of the setting of this listed building.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Red
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>The is site connected to the A1066 and Diss via School Road. School Road narrows towards the southern end.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Visibility not achievable due limited frontage and presence of significant oak tree.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Network a concern due to limited road width.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>Impact on the LB to the north to be assessed by the heritage officer if the site progresses further.</p> <p>The site is separate from the existing built form of the settlement and would depend on the promoted sites to the north and west being brought forward. This would create an issue with timings if all were allocated – as development would need to be sequential.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site is possible from School Road but would need to break through a hedge. There is an existing footpath opposite the site along the school frontage. The footpath also extends further to the south.	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)	One dwelling to the north. Fields surrounding.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Fence to the dwelling to the north, then hedge continuing. Hedge to road frontage and open boundary to the south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow along the site frontage which would likely be removed for access and visibility.	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 visible.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 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	Currently limited views in from road as there is a bank and a hedge. Would be views above the hedge as travel along School Road in a northerly direction.	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>The site is well connected to the centre of the village and its services. There is a footpath connection to services in the village on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>The site is currently separate from the existing built form and would only be connected if the two fields being considered as preferred sites are allocated – sequential development would therefore need to be a consideration. Development of SN2054REVA would have an impact on the local landscape and require removal of a hedge. The impact on the listed building would need to be assessed as would the noted surface water flooding issue along the road if the site progresses.</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)
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	Green
Comments:	The site is considered to be available	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, although partners are in agreement.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability SN2054REVA a greenfield site. The site has been promoted at a larger scale than required but could be reduced in size to meet the VCHAP objectives. A number of constraints have been identified including the presence of a listed building adjacent to the site, a roadside hedgerow and an established oak tree. The impact of the identified surface water flowpath may need further consideration. Consideration would also need to be given to the sequential development (phasing) of sites in this location to avoid a disconnect between this site and the existing built form.

Site Visit Observations The site relates well to the existing facilities and services within Bressingham. Development of this site would only be considered acceptable in townscape terms if undertaken sequentially with the other sites currently preferred for development along School Road. There would be both a landscape and heritage impact arising from the development of this site – both on its own merits but also in combination with the current preferred allocation site SN2054REVA.

Local Plan Designations None

Availability The site is considered to be available for development however consideration would need to be given the phasing of development along School Road.

Achievability Delivery of SN2054REVA is considered to be achievable however both on- and off-site mitigation measures would need to be confirmed.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: SN2054REVA is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site and is not considered to be an appropriate option for allocation. Development of this site would have a detrimental impact on the significance of the setting of Pine Tree Cottage by virtue of wrapping around the property. In-combination effects with SN4036 would intensify this impact on the heritage asset. Further constraints include the loss of the frontage hedgerow and the potential impact on the oak tree to create a suitable access into the site. The site would have a poor relationship to the existing built form if not developed sequentially with SN4036 which could also impact on the delivery of this site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN3019SL
Site address	Land west of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.49 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	SL extension (<i>but could the site be extended by 0.1ha to allow for it to be considered as an allocation?</i>)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 5-10 dwellings (Site could accommodate 12 dwellings at 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	Green	On site check required re. footpath provision; road frontage Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school.	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 	Green	Access to school, public house, village hall Primary School – approximately 125m Bus Service – approximately 945m Shop – approximately 530m	

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 		<p>Village hall and play area – approximately 530m</p> <p>Public House – approximately 650m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints – the site promoter has confirmed availability of most services (excluding gas) to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Fibre technology is already available in this area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding – this forms the site frontage</p> <p>LLFA comments at Regulation 18 consultation – Red. Significant mitigation required for severe constraints; recommend a review of the site and potential removal from the plan; The on-site flood risk is a major flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. It affects the majority of the site. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows south off of the site. We advise this must be considered in the site assessment. Access to the site appears to be heavily affected by the on-site flood risk. A small area of the site is unaffected by flood risk</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		(west). We would advise that inclusion of this site in the plan is reassessed.	

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 with Parkland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALV – Grade 3 The site extends the settlement in a linear pattern further into the open countryside, outside of the existing built form	Green
Townscape	Green	Continuation of existing built form along School Road - a linear pattern that is in keeping with the settlement; does not appear to extend the settlement to a detrimental degree Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. This would continue the development on this side of the road with linear development which is very characteristic of Bressingham. There is no existing hedgerow, but being peripheral and an entry to the village, re-establishment of hedgerow and setting building back from road with access drive may be beneficial to the more rural character of the settlement. Plot boundary line does appear to be drawn to allow scope for this. Don't want it to be too urban. Setting building back would also benefit setting of LB opposite	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No anticipated impact however any impact could be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>LB opposite site and to south (Pine Tree Cottage and The Spinney)</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. The Setting of Pine Tree Cottage would be affected but agree that suitable development would not result in significant harm if well designed/good materials. The house faces away from the road and has quite an immediate setting. Setting should be mentioned in allocation to ensure better design and materials.</p> <p>HES – Amber score</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Views of Highways required – GNLP HELAA noted an amber score in this category</p> <p>Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to north; open fields to south and west	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>LB opposite the site but do not consider that it would have a significant impact on its setting – check with LB Officer</p> <p>Development of this site could be read as an extension of the recent development at Pascoe Place with a suitable site layout</p>	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Yes – access directly from School Road and an existing footpath already extends along the site frontage	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is undulating and rises to the north and west- consideration would need to be given to the building heights to address this (e.g., the western-most dwelling at Pascoe Place is single storey)	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No significant boundaries around the site to the west – no natural site delineation. An access track to a water pump installation forms the southern boundary	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	There is a water pump to the south west of the site (adjacent to the site)	

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site currently forms part of the gateway into the village on the approach from School Road and has a pleasant open aspect however it is immediately adjacent to the existing boundary of the village	
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)	The site is well connected and relates well to the settlement. Development of this site would not have a significant impact on the nearby listed buildings although due to the topography of the land it would be prominent within the landscape. With an appropriate design and layout, the development of this site would continue the existing built form along School Road without significantly encroaching further into the surrounding landscape.	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations identified	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)	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – not requested or submitted	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?	As promoted the site size would fall below the required size for affordable housing delivery. The site promoter would need to confirm that a larger number is viable and would deliver the required affordable housing contribution on this site.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

If the site is extended by 0.1ha or is shown to accommodate 12 dwellings then it would be suitable for a site allocation however the site is not considered appropriate as a settlement limit extension as it would encroach further southwards along School Road.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well related and connected to the centre of the settlement and there is an existing footpath provision. Access is achievable from School Road. The site would be read in the context of the existing development at Pascoe Place which would reduce its visual intrusion into the landscape. The topography of the site, however, means that it may be appropriate to include single or 1.5 storey dwellings to the west of the site.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting Local Plan designations identified

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

The promoter has not confirmed whether affordable housing could be delivered on the site as it has been promoted for a smaller number of dwellings at this time. For this reason, the site has scored a red rating in this category.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site was initially promoted as a settlement limit extension, however as it is of a scale that is only just below the nominal 0.5ha allocation threshold it has been identified suitable as an allocation. The site is well related and connected to the centre of the settlement where there is an existing footpath provision. Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding, however this forms the site frontage.

POST REGULATION 18 UPDATE:

Technical consultee comments submitted by the Lead Local Flood Authority in response to the Regulation 18 consultation highlighted the severe flood constraints on this site. Further discussions with the LLFA have clarified that this on-site flood risk could not be reasonably mitigated on-site and as a result this site has been reassessed and is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site for development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

Date Updated: 28 April 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4036
Site address	Land to the east of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.09ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site with POS, landscaping and infrastructure
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 14 dph 12-30 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access available from site frontage; site located immediately opposite the primary school; footpath on opposite side of the road</p> <p>Highways score – Green. Suitable for limited frontage development only and subject to c/w widening to min of 5.5m and provision of 2.0m frontage footway.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - SN4036 - Road widening and footpath along the site frontage required; likely to lose the mature tree along the site frontage; "frontage development" does not mean frontage only, but development should face onto the road along the site frontage - an estate road into the site could be supported; provision of passing places on School Road (route to the A1066) should be investigated.</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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Access to services including: school, village hall, public house</p> <p>Primary School – approximately 20m</p> <p>Bus stop – c. 50m</p> <p>Village shop – approximately 440m</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village hall, playing field – c. 440m</p> <p>Public House – approximately 800m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No anticipated issues as the site is adjacent to the existing development within the settlement	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Provision already available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination and ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Small area of surface water flooding in southern corner of site adjacent to Pine Tree Cottage</p> <p>LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)</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	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC – Grade 3 The site is well related to existing development and its development would have limited additional impact on the landscape	Green
Townscape	Green	Frontage development along School Road would continue the existing linear form of the settlement Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Bressingham is predominantly linear development, and this would result in some clustering. However, at some point linear development becomes detrimental and inefficient, and perhaps the time has come for clustering. There is no particular significance attached to the area in the village character, and the field is quite well enclosed in landscape views, however there do appear to be some good trees around it. This site would allow a more efficient layout and provision of safer public space away from the School Lane. It would be good to set building back with establishment of a frontage boundary rather than creating too much of an urban character. There would probably need to be a need for landscape buffer strip for housing to the north.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	LB (Pine Tree Cottage) immediately adjacent to the south of the site. Heritage Officer views to be sought. Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Development would impact upon cottage which is to a degree isolated but it’s character and setting does not depend on it being isolated. The north side is a plain pantiled roof with no windows facing north. I would however suggest mitigation at south end. HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Highways to advise on the impact on the local road network Highways score – Amber	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on the LB to the south to be assessed by the heritage officer The site is well related to the existing built form of the settlement	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site is possible from School Road. There is an existing footpath opposite the site along the school frontage. The footpath also extends further to the south.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Scrub land	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site appeared to be level but access onto the site was not possible	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Small tree and hedgerow. Existing vegetation provides screening between site and properties to the north. No significant boundaries between the site and the LB.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow along the site frontage which would likely be removed in its entirety for access and visibility	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 the site frontage	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is enclosed within the streetscene due to the existing built form in the environs	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 connected and related to the centre of the village. It also relates well to the existing built form and would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape. The impact on the LB would need to be assessed however the location of the proposed school car park closest to the LB could address both the noted SW flooding issue and mitigate the impact of development on the setting of the LB.</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)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations identified	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 – multiple ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Enquiries received but not actively marketed	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – evidence not requested/ provided	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unlikely to be required	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but supporting evidence not submitted at this stage	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Part of the site is promoted for off-site parking for the primary school located opposite the site	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is well related to the centre of the settlement and subject to the comments of the heritage officer regarding the adjacent LB, as well as an appropriate design to address the area of surface water flooding, the site is considered to be suitable for development.

Site Visit Observations

The site would form a clearly defined addition to the existing settlement. It has a good relationship with surrounding properties (subject to LB comments above) and is well connected. Access is achievable and/or already in place. The development would not have an adverse impact on either the local landscape or townscape.

Local Plan Designations

No constraints identified

Availability

The land is considered to be available

Achievability

The land is considered to be achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well related and connected to existing services and facilities, it relates well to the settlement and has limited on-site/ off-site constraints identified. A larger site area is proposed to be retained as site includes proposed parking for the school, and also needs to protect the setting of the adjoining listed building, which is expected to require the provision of a large area of open space.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4037
Site address	Land to the south of Fersfield Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.29ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated site for up to 20 dwellings with POS, landscaping and infrastructure
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12-20 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Site frontage adjoins Fersfield Road a single track road; drainage ditch along site frontage; no existing footpath provision Highway score – Green	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 	Green	Access to services including primary school, public house, village hall Primary School – approximately 300m Bus stop – approximately 265m Village Shop – approximately 495m	

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 		<p>Village Hall, Playground – approximately 495m</p> <p>Public House – approximately 1000m</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The site promoter has advised 'unknown' however the site is adjacent to existing development and it is anticipated that infrastructure would be available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Provision already available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No identified contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Small area of surface water flooding identified in south west corner of the site</p> <p>LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)</p> <p>Updated LLFA comments post Regulation-18 consultation (meeting 20/10/21) - Flow path begins on site – flood limitations on site could be accommodated by a good sustainable drainage design. A good drainage scheme on this site could have the effect of improving the situation off-site to the south. Development on site does not seem to be problematic however development on both SN4036 and SN4037 could not be</p>	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		supported.	

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
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC - Grade 3 Development of the site appears to have limited impact on the landscape when viewed from the east or west. The landscape impact from the north and south may be an issue.	Amber
Townscape	Green	PROW adjacent to the western boundary of the site; infill plot between existing residential properties; adjacent development is linear in form however it also extends along onto School Road; Poplar Farm has a number of agricultural buildings on the site. Senior Heritage & Design Officer - Bressingham is predominantly linear development, and this would result in some clustering. However, at some point linear development becomes detrimental and inefficient, and perhaps the time has come for clustering. farm complex is to west so rear plot line already created. This site will have less impact on existing residents in terms of views/relationship to open countryside – although views are quite expansive compared to SN3019. Restablishing a hedgerow	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		to the lane would be good.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	LB Poplar Farm adjacent to the western boundary of the site Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. The LB is in a relatively big plot and existing thick landscaping will separate it from the development. Landscaping and appropriate materials/building design can mitigate harm, particularly along the frontage. HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	HA to advise on local road network Highway concerns about the local road network.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, educational and agricultural land use	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	<p>LB to the north-west of the site is currently well screened behind trees.</p> <p>The site sits between existing residential properties although it is at the edge of the settlement. It can also be seen on the approach north along School Road.</p>	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The site has a road frontage but the road width is narrow (single car) and there is no existing pedestrian access along the site boundary (although the existing pathway could potentially be extended within the site boundary)	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Scrub land	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 education (school playing field)	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site appears to be level although there was dense vegetation across the site so unable to confirm this on the site visit	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	At the time of the site visit the site was bounded by an overgrown PROW and tall trees to the west and vegetation to the east	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is densely covered with vegetation – a mix of large shrubs and small trees. There is an existing tree along the site frontage which would likely need to be removed to allow for safe access and/or visibility. Whilst the tree may not be significant it would be a loss in the landscape. The vegetation covered the ditches but there appeared to be ditches along the northern and western boundaries.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is between two residential properties and due to the surrounding trees the visual impact of development when viewed from Fersfield Road would be minimised. Due to the local topography, development of the site would be visible on the approach north along School Road but this would be viewed within the context of the existing development at Pascoe Place. Loss of the existing vegetation across the site would be necessary in order to develop this site.	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)	The site is well connected to the main areas of the settlement and there is potential to join the existing footpath provision. Whilst development would be visible in the landscape from different approaches this would be read in the context of the existing built form and would not be detrimental to the local landscape. Existing vegetation currently provides screening between the site at the adjacent LB.	Green

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP 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 – multiple site owners	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Enquiries received but the site is not being actively marketed	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Subject to the comments of the technical consultees, the site is considered to be suitable for development. In particular the comments of the highways department and the heritage officer will be key to determining the overall suitability of this site.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well related to the main centre of Bressingham and existing footpath provision could potentially be extended to allow for safe pedestrian access. A small development in this location could relate well to the existing built form and from School Road would be viewed in the context of existing development at Pascoe Place. The loss of the tree along the site frontage would likely be necessary for safe vehicular access and this would be regrettable in terms of the local landscape.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations identified

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site relates well to the existing settlement and would not have a detrimental impact on the landscape or townscape. It is anticipated that other constraints identified could be subject to suitable mitigation measures.

POST REGULATION 18 UPDATE:

Following a review of the comments received during the Regulation-18 consultation, as well as ongoing discussions with the LLFA have confirmed that the site lies at the head of a surface water flowpath and, if developed in addition to the preferred allocation site SN4036, would have an adverse impact on the flood risk south of the site along School Road. For this reason the LLFA have advised that they are unable to support the allocation of both of these sites and as such SN4036 remains the preferred site for allocation. However, the site remains as a REASONABLE option as it may be a reasonable alternative should the preferred site not progress within the VCHAP.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

Date Updated: 28 April 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5009
Site address	Land between 105 and 117 Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside settlement boundary
Planning History	2020/0453/PIP for 2 self-build homes, refused 03/04/2020.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	4.1
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 12-18 dwellings (102 dwellings at 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	<p>Frontage to road. No existing pedestrian footpaths or street lighting.</p> <p>Bressingham Footpath 7 and 9 both cross the site north-south and east-west which would reduce the developable area.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Not feasible to provide safe access remote from local facilities, no footpath to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Red
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>Primary school; 1,900m</p> <p>Access to village shop - approximately 1, 460m from the site</p> <p>Limited bus service to Diss</p>	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 and playing field – approximately 1,400m from the site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known infrastructure constraints Environment Agency: (Foul Water Capacity) Green	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown but likely to be available due to proximity to existing development	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No evidence of contamination of ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 High risk of surface water flooding along road frontage and within site close to road because of pond adjacent to south. Also small area to north within the site and an area just	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>outside the entire western boundary where there is a pond.</p> <p>LLFA: Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Flood risk is minor, localised ponding to the site boundary. The site is within proximity of anecdotal external flooding records held by the LLFA.</p> <p>Environment Agency: (Flood Risk) Green</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p> <p>Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland</p>	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
<p>SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p>	N/A	<p>B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is large but well contained, more so along the frontage. It would mean the loss of a valuable piece of open green space within this part of the settlement which would be to the detriment of its setting.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is separated from the main settlement and is located in a gap between existing dwellings. There is a more concentrated group opposite however development is	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>generally linear and is sporadic, particularly on this side of Common Road.</p> <p>The size of the proposed site would be out of scale and character with this looser and more rural part of Bressingham. A reduced site area would be possible but would still result in a significant townscape impact.</p>	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Habitat present in hedges and trees. Also several ponds and drains around the site which are likely to provide a valuable network for wildlife to move between which would be reduced if the site was developed.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ - housing and water discharge not listed as triggers requiring Natural England consultation. Pond adjacent to boundary - site in amber great crested newt risk zone. Not in GI corridor.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No close heritage assets.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Common Road is restricted.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Not feasible to provide safe access remote from local facilities, no footpath to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Red
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?	No impact on historic environment but the site is located some distance from the centre of the settlement and whilst there is some linear development along Common Rd, development in this location and of this size would be out of character with the wider setting. A reduced scale of development would be possible on this site but would have also a detrimental townscape impact.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Vehicular access into the site would be achievable –the hedgerow is not continuous. The road is narrow, between 1.5-2 car widths. There is no existing pedestrian footpath and limited footpath provision into the main village. Two footpaths crossing the site.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Pasture land, undeveloped.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential on frontage and agricultural to west. Livestock buildings to northern boundary, would need to check compatibility.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Broken and immature hedge to frontage, with trees to north which are prominent in the street scene. Significant hedge and tree boundaries on all other sides.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Boundary hedges/trees. No significant trees/hedges within the site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views into the site from the roadside are limited apart from at frontage where the hedge is not continuous. Public views both in and out of the site from the footpaths crossing the site therefore there would be a landscape and visual impact arising from this development.	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)	Site too large for area but could be reduced in area. However, development of this site is not considered acceptable (even at a reduced scale) due to the impact of the development on both the townscape and the wider landscape setting. Isolated from services by poor walking environment. Issues relating to highways, also concerns about surface water flooding and possible habitat fragmentation.	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)
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	Immediately	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)	Highway improvements (to be confirmed if the site progresses)	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	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 excessive in size and would not meet the objectives of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in scale to meet the identified criteria and reduce the visual impact of development in this location. The site is separated from the main areas of the settlement and is poorly connected to the existing services and facilities. The existing highway network and lack of connectivity is considered to be a constraint of this site. Two footpaths have been identified as crossing the site.

Site Visit Observations The site is separate from the main areas of settlement and is poorly connected to the main areas of development in Bressingham. Development of the site at the scale proposed would not be appropriate in this location and would have a significant townscape and landscape impact. A smaller scale development would also have a significant impact due to the rural context. The road network is narrow. Footpaths cross the site and there would be a visual impact arising from development of the site.

Local Plan Designations None

Availability The site is considered to be available

Achievability The site is considered to be achievable but would require both on-site and off-site highways mitigation measures to make it acceptable which could impact on the viability of the site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. The site has been considered both at the larger scale it was originally promoted for and a smaller scale development that would meet the objectives of the VCHAP. However, the site is not considered appropriate in either form due to the landscape and townscape impact that would result and it's poor connectivity to the existing facilities and services within Bressingham. The site would be reliant on a narrow road network that does not benefit from pedestrian footpaths.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5021
Site address	Land north of High Road and east of Folly Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 20 dwellings (25 dwellings at 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	The site is accessed via Folly Lane which is a national speed limit road. Folly Lane is single track with no passing places nearby. The site is in close proximity to High Road. NCC Highways – Amber. Access subject to demonstrating satisfactory visibility. Network subject to demonstrating land adjacent to Folly Lane available for highway improvement including widening & footway and demonstrating acceptable visibility at Folly La / High Road junction.	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 	Green	Primary School – 400m Shop – 595m Bus stop – c. 50m	N/A

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	N/A	Village Hall, Playground – 595m Public House – 1,100m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed Environment Agency: Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Adjacent to existing development therefore utilities infrastructure likely to be available however this would need to be confirmed.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site is within an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Undeveloped agricultural land with no known contamination or ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1. Surface water flooding along Folly Lane. No issues on site. LLFA: Green. At risk of surface water	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>flooding. Flood risk is very minor, localised flooding to the site boundary. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green (Flood Risk)</p>	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p> <p>Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland</p>	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
<p>SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p>	N/A	<p>E2 Great Moulton Plateau Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate</p>	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	The site is next to existing development but it encroaches into the undeveloped landscape to the north. It would have a significant detrimental impact.	Red
Townscape	Red	It does not respect the linear form of development of the village and is out of character. It would have an adverse impact on the village.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designations. Limited habitat as agricultural field with limited hedge boundaries.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Green. SSSI IRZ - housing and water discharge not listed as triggers</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		requiring Natural England consultation. Pond adjacent to boundary - site in green great crested newt risk zone. Ponds within 250m of boundary - site arable field. Not in Green Infrastructure corridor.	
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Restricted width of Folly Lane with no passing places but close to junction. No foot path but close to village facilities. NCC Highways – Amber. Access subject to demonstrating satisfactory visibility. Network subject to demonstrating land adjacent to Folly Lane is available for highway improvements including widening & footway and demonstrating acceptable visibility at Folly La / High Road junction.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture and residential.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact on any heritage assets but a significant impact on the townscape as it is completely out of character with the existing form of linear development along High Road. Land also gently rises to the north meaning development would be more visible.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	No existing access but has road frontage and no hedge would be lost.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture – monoculture.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture on all sides except to the south where there is a row of bungalows fronting High Road.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Slope south to north.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Open to fields with mainly fenced rear boundaries to dwellings on south.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited as it is an arable field with few if any natural features.	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
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Wide views from all sides as it is currently open. Would be some private views from dwellings to south.	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>Do not consider development in this location would be in keeping with the surrounding pattern of development and it would have a severe impact in the landscape.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the adequacy of Folly Road.</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	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	Immediately	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)	Likely highway improvements including road widening, footpath.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated that it would be provided.	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 considered to be suitable for residential development. The site is adjacent to the existing development along High Road but would result in a breakout to the north of the existing dwellings. The site is well related to existing services and facilities. The site is in close proximity to High Road but access would be required off Folly Road which is constrained.

Site Visit Observations Development on this site would be prominent in the landscape due to the open views to the north and west of the site. Development of this site would also represent a significant departure from the linear development currently in evidence along High Road and would impact on the gateway to the village when approaching from both Folly Road to the north and Fersfield Road to the west. Folly Road is narrow and access may be problematic. Dwellings closest to the promoted site are single storey in height.

Local Plan Designations None

Availability The site is available for development

Achievability The site is considered to be achievable but would require highways mitigation measures which may impact on the viability of the site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. Development on this site would be very prominent within an open landscape, and this would be exacerbated by the land rising to the north along Folly Lane. Development of the site would also have a detrimental impact on the existing townscape, being in conflict with the existing linear pattern of development along High Road. Although the site is close to the High Road/ Fersfield Road junction the site would be accessed via Folly Lane which as a single width carriageway poses a significant constraint to the development of this site. The site is therefore not considered to be suitable for allocation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5022
Site address	Land east of Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Several applications for retention of a caravan, polytunnels and netting, most recently 2007/1620.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.03
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated site – 1 occupational dwelling for small holding owner (Due to its size this site could only be considered as a settlement limit extension)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1
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	Green	<p>Current access to the small holding is along a lane to the north of 46 Common Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. See SN4033 - no independent access.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Local healthcare services <input type="checkbox"/> Retail services <input type="checkbox"/> Local employment opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Peak-time public transport	Amber	<p>1,400m walk to primary school. No continuous footpath</p> <p>Limited retail services within 1,900m</p> <p>Limited bus service to Diss</p>	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	Sports/rec facilities within 1,900m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Not known; would need to be confirmed. Environment Agency: Green (Foul Water Capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises that mains water is already connected to site. Connection to the electrical grid, mains foul sewer appear achievable as these services are located close by however this would need to be confirmed.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW flood risk LLFA: Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage. Environment Agency: Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Tributary farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B4: Waveney tributary farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Land is flat, currently in cultivation with tree belt to west. Only one dwelling proposed which would be screened within existing small holding, therefore limited impact.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Would not be in keeping with the linear pattern of development along Common Road. Site would be separated from the existing settlement limit by intervening land (rejected site SN4033) and is not a logical extension to an existing settlement limit.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations Land is farmed as a small holding, there will be some habitat but unlikely to have a significant affect. NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ - housing and water discharge not listed as triggers requiring Natural England consultation. Ponds within 250m of boundary and site in amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not in Green Infrastructure corridor. Environment Agency: Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets affected HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	One dwelling would have a minimal impact on local network. NCC Highways – Red. See SN4033 - no independent access.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit **Site not considered suitable as a settlement limit extension based on desktop assessment therefore site visit not undertaken **

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?		N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?		N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)		N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)		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)		N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?		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)		N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape		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)		

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		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	Immediately	Green
Comments:	Site not being put forward as open market housing, it is with the intention of providing a dwelling for the owner to manage the small holding.	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	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown – unlikely given small size of site	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No – site area does not trigger requirement	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability The site has been promoted as an allocation but as a small site for one self-build dwelling. As such the site is not considered suitable for allocation. Whilst the site lies within proximity of an existing settlement limit it is separated by an intervening parcel of land which has been assessed as being unsuitable for allocation within the VCHAP – as a result the site is disconnected from the existing settlement limit. Access to the site appears to be constrained.

Site Visit Observations A site visit was not undertaken for this site as it was considered to be an unreasonable extension to the settlement limit based on a desktop assessment of the site in Part 3 of the assessment.

Local Plan Designations None

Availability The site is considered to be available for development

Achievability Overall it is considered unlikely that the site could be achieved due to the access constraints that have been identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is too small to allocate and is not adjacent to an existing settlement limit to be reasonably be considered as an extension to the existing settlement limit. In addition an intervening parcel of land that was also promoted has been rejected and the site would therefore be an isolated single dwelling located in the open countryside. Access to the site also appears to be a constraint to its development.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5024
Site address	Land west of Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	2006/1721/F for 9 dwellings refused 01/08/2006. 2002/1721/F for 36 dwellings refused 29/12/2003.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.79 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	20 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site has a road frontage but this has a mature hedge along it as well as two TPOs. The site promoter is proposing two accesses, but these will have a significant impact on the hedge. No continuous footpath connecting the site to the existing services and facilities within the village.</p> <p>Footpath 7 along rear boundary and Footpath 8 across the road to east.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Not feasible to provide safe access remote from local facilities, no footpath to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Red

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	<p>1,550m walk to primary school. No continuous footpath and no lighting.</p> <p>Village shop 1,200m</p> <p>Limited bus service to Diss</p>	N/A
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>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	Sports/rec facilities 1,200m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Utilities capacity to be confirmed</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green (Foul water capacity)</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises these are available nearby however this would need to be confirmed	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Promoter states there is no evidence to suggest contamination issues, there have been no historical works undertaken on the site that would have resulted in any known ground stability issues. The site has not been previously developed.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood zone 1</p> <p>Surface Water Flood risk to north area of the site.</p> <p>LLFA: Green. At risk of surface water flooding. Few or no constraints. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>The on-site flood risk is a minor flow path in the 0.1% AEP event cutting the site northwest-east in the north of the site. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows east off the site contributing to a larger flow path east of the site. The site marks the beginning of this minor flow path, we advise this must be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk and has the potential to be developed.</p> <p>Development of the site has the potential to reduce flood risk off-site.</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>Environment Agency: Green (Flood Risk)</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	Tributary farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B4: Waveney tributary farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would be contained so wider impact minimal but would have some detrimental impact on landscape given the need for a new access. Would need to be able to achieve access with no impact on the protected trees.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would continue the adjacent developed area, however the site is large and the depth is out of character so should be restricted to frontage to reflect the existing linear pattern. It would have some impact on townscape which it may not be possible to mitigate.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Two trees on frontage have TPOs and it is unlikely that a satisfactory access can be achieved to this site without detriment to these trees . Also, a hedge along the frontage and north boundary and ponds within immediate area. Would need to retain the trees with no impact and ensure no impact on species. Further information would be required should this site progress further.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. SSSI IRZ - housing and water discharge not listed as triggers requiring Natural England consultation. Ponds within 250m of boundary and site in amber risk zone for great crested newts. Not on Green Infrastructure corridor.</p> <p>Adjacent to Bressingham FP7 and opposite Bressingham FP8 (potential to link the two footpaths).</p> <p>Norfolk Wildlife Trust: Note that this site may be supporting species-rich grassland and this is possibly Priority Habitat. If site is to be taken forward this requires further investigation. Recommend ecological surveys for this site.</p>	
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Adjacent to Grade II listed building (Jubilee Farmhouse) but good separation – unlikely to have significant impact – but this should be confirmed with Heritage and Conservation Officer should this site progress further.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	<p>Common Lane is a minor rural road with no footpaths or lighting. There is no safe route to the primary school, shop or playing fields. The junction where it meets Bressingham Road/High Road currently appears unfavourable for pedestrians.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Not feasible to provide safe access remote from local facilities, no footpath to catchment school, network poor.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to east and south, farmhouse to west. No compatibility concerns.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Listed building – Jubilee Farmhouse to west and impact would need to be assessed.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Currently no access onto road frontage, access to farmhouse to south could possibly be used would need to clarify with Highway Authority. No continuous footpaths.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grassed paddock/small field.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Part of farm holding with listed farmhouse to west, residential to south and east. No significant concerns regarding compatibility.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedgerows, particularly to roadside boundary. TPO trees.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Impact on hedgerow could be significant, would need consideration. Also are two TPO trees on 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, would need clarification on what land has been used for in the past.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views in and out of site are currently limited because of mature hedge along the road frontage however note the existence of footpaths in proximity to the site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	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>Adjacent to development boundary and opposite existing development. School is less than 2k but is difficult to walk to due to the lack of a continuous footpath. Access to other services is also limited for the same reason.</p> <p>Development of the site would significantly change the road frontage, particularly if the hedgerow needed to be removed for access, and it would therefore have a negative impact on the street scene.</p> <p>If development were acceptable in this location the appropriate form would be linear development along the frontage, minimising the loss of the existing hedgerow and avoiding an impact on the TPO trees.</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)	Being promoted and enquiries have been received.	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

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)	The promoter has stated the site is viable including the provision of all known infrastructure.	Amber
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possibly depending on number of dwellings. Need to investigate acceptable access provision.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would comply 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 of a suitable scale for allocation and is adjacent to the existing settlement limit however a number of constraints have been identified. Two TPO trees are located along the site frontage and there is an existing established hedgerow also along the frontage. There is currently no vehicular access into the site. Limited (not continuous) footpaths connecting to the central areas of the settlement. A listed building (Jubilee Farmhouse) is adjacent to the site. Significant highway concerns have been identified, including the lack of footways.

Site Visit Observations The site is well contained in the landscape by the existing established vegetation along the road frontage. There is currently no obvious access into the site and it is likely the hedgerow would be significantly altered to create a suitable access and visibility. This would be detrimental to both the landscape and the streetscene. Poor connectivity back into the centre of the village with Common Road seen to be narrow in places. Linear form of development in evidence around the site with the promoted site potentially conflicting with this pattern of development. Reasonable separation between the listed building and the site.

Local Plan Designations None

Availability The site is available for development

Achievability The site is considered to be achievable however highway mitigation works would need to be confirmed and may impact on the viability of the site

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Although the site is adjacent to the existing settlement limit it is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for allocation due to both the substandard highway network (including poor pedestrian connectivity to the facilities and services in the village) and the detrimental landscape and townscape impact that would result. Furthermore, the established hedgerow along the site frontage would be impacted significantly by development of the site and this would alter the character of the area to an adverse degree. In depth development of the site would be out of character with the existing linear pattern of development in evidence around the site and would also result in a harmful townscape impact.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27 April 2022