

# Kirby Cane & Ellingham Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

## Contents

|                  |    |
|------------------|----|
| SN0305REVA ..... | 3  |
| SN0348 .....     | 16 |
| SN5019SL .....   | 28 |

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail   | Comments  |
|--|---|
| Site Reference   | SN0305REVA  |
| Site address   | Land South of Mill Road, Ellingham  |
| Current planning status<br>(including previous planning policy status) | Outside development boundary  |
| Planning History   | Site adjacent 2010/2220 - Erection of 7 units of affordable housing. Approved |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 1.2ha   |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(a) Allocated site<br>(b) SL extension | Allocated site  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 25  |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield   | Greenfield  |

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### HELAA Score:

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

#### Site Score:

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

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

#### SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

| Constraint         | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Access to the site | Amber                 | <p>Access from frontage direct on to Mill Road.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Red. The site frontage is narrow with limited opportunity to form visibility splays and this would be compounded if carriageway widening is required, setting the site frontage further back. Opportunity to provide acceptable visibility might be improved by moving the access slightly west. The promoter would need to demonstrate acceptable visibility can be achieved with any necessary carriageway widening.</p> <p>Previous:<br/><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, access to be provide to satisfaction of Highway Authority. Requires 2.0m f/w at site frontage to tie in with existing facility and including crossing points. Visibility improvement at Mill Rd junction with Church Rd may be required. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.</p> | Amber                |

| Constraint  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
|   |                       | <i>NCC Highways meeting - this is the best site in this cluster in highways terms.</i>  |                      |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Amber                 | Village Shop within 600m<br><br>Bus stop within 550m and is on the bus route for 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.<br><br>Primary School within 200m   | N/A                  |
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>   | N/A                   | Kirby Cane Memorial Hall 700m<br><br>Recreational ground/play area adjacent to west, within 100m.<br><br>Olive Tree Restaurant 750m   | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity  | Green                 | Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed<br><br><b>EA</b> - The WRC according to our datasets is at 70% capacity and there is treatment capacity for this proposed development. No issues.                                | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure  | Green                 | High pressure gas main with an easement restricting development. Promoter has confirmed with Cadent that development is achievable avoiding the easement.<br><br>Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site | Green                |

| Constraint                       | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Better Broadband for Norfolk     | N/A                   | The site is within an area already served by fibre technology  | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route    | N/A                   | Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location   | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability | Green                 | <p>The site is unlikely to be contaminated as an agricultural field and no known ground stability issues.</p> <p><b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - site over 1ha which is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p> | Green                |
| Flood Risk                       | Green                 | <p>Flood zone 1.<br/>No surface water flooding identified on the site. There is on the road and to the south-west corner of the site.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage. "The site is adjacent to a major flowpath in the 0.1% AEP event leading away from the site.</p> <p>Access to the site could be limited due to off-site flood risk. This should be considered in the flood risk review."</p>   | Amber                |

| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments           | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br>(Land Use Consultants 2001) | N/A                   | Rural River Valley | N/A                  |

| Impact   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) | N/A                   | A5 Waveney Rural River Valley   | N/A                  |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Amber                 | <p>Extending the site to the west up to the easement of the gas pipeline would be a logical extension between the existing housing and the play area although it would reduce the views from Mill Road towards the Church to the rear. A small extension to the south, as indicated, would be seen against the backdrop of the existing development when seen from the south. This could be mitigated with a sympathetic layout and substantial, sensitive landscaping to the south, visually linking back to the hedge line around the play area.</p> <p><b>Broads Authority</b> - The site has some potential to adversely affect the local landscape character and the setting of the Broads. I suggest that we ask for the allocation policy to include a reference to the proximity and sensitivity of the Broads, and a requirement for Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment, with BA consulted on the selection of viewpoints. It would also help to mitigate visual impact if tree planting belts could be provided around the southern and western boundaries of the site.</p> <p><b>SNC Landscape Officer</b> - Policy wording re. landscape boundary will be key due to PROW and proximity to the Broads; design of the scheme will be important - transition from rural to village context; relates to existing development and adjacent to</p> | Amber                |

| Impact                      | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
|                             |                       | <p>recreation ground and school; improvements to frontage hedgerow should be included in policy text if possible.</p> <p><i>Landscape meeting - Although there is a hedgerow along the site frontage this is not complete and development in this location would have a less harmful impact on both the landscape character and the setting of the settlement.</i></p>  |                      |
| Townscape                   | Green                 | <p>The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. There is linear development predominately in the immediate vicinity, with two dwellings set back to the rear of existing properties in larger plots. This does give a notional east-west line which could be the southern extent of the site and would be much better if it was not a straight line but swept across, softened by planting.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage Officer</b> – Green. No significant townscape issues.</p> | Green                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green                 | <p>CWS located to the west on the other side of Station Road.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>   | Amber                |
| Historic Environment        | Amber                 | <p>Development could have detrimental impact on views of St Mary’s Church to the south. Although the view is relatively distant and there would still be a good separation.</p> <p><b>HES</b> – Amber.<br/>Possible ploughed-out Bronze Age burial mound adjacent.</p> <p><b>SNC Heritage Officer</b> – Green. No significant heritage issues.</p>  | Amber                |



| Impact                 | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Open Space             | Green                 | Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space   | Green                |
| Transport and Roads    | Amber                 | <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to confirmation of carriageway width at site frontage, widening may be required to facilitate safe access. Footway required for full extent of site frontage extending east to link with existing and west to provide safe access to the existing recreation/play area. The 30mph speed limit will also need to be extended.</p> <p>Previous:<br/> <i>NCC advised that the local network currently is considered unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures.</i></p> <p><b>NCC Highways meeting</b> - this is the best site in this cluster in highways terms.</p> | Amber                |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                 | Agricultural/residential and children’s play area  | Green                |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments<br><b>Site Visit 27/02/22 &amp; previous</b>   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | <p>Technical officer to assess impact on setting of listed church to south in the long views.</p> <p>This part of the village is characterised by a linear development form. However, there is development along Mill Lane to the east with a small cul-de-sac which extends development to the south. The density would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village. There would still be a good separation.</p> | N/A                     |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                    | Access is shown direct onto Mill Road, Highway Authority to be consulted.   | N/A                     |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Agricultural – Land classification Grade 3/4  | N/A                     |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Agricultural and residential  | N/A                     |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Flat.<br>Agricultural land outside site to south rises slightly along Church Road over the old railway bridge.  | N/A                     |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Hedging/tree to the north, residential boundary to the east, open to the south and vegetation to the west with the hedged boundary of the play area beyond the gas easement.  | N/A                     |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | As an agricultural field significance of the hedgerows should be assessed under hedgerow regulations? Monoculture field with low habitat likelihood. Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.  | N/A                     |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments<br><b>Site Visit 27/02/22 &amp; previous</b>   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
|  | Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).  |                         |
| Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)                            | High pressure gas main preventing development within the easement along the west boundary.  | N/A                     |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Prominent in views from Mill Road and particularly from the south and from open land to west. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.   | N/A                     |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | <p>Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would be a breakout to the west of the village. There are views of the site from both surrounding footpaths and roads around the site and from the higher vantage point at the railway bridge to the south. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley. There is linear development predominately in the immediate vicinity, with two dwellings set back to the rear of existing properties in larger plots. This does give a notional east-west line which could be landscaped as the southern extent of the site.</p> <p>The high-pressure gas main and its buffer makes a small area to the west of the site undevelopable.</p> | Amber                   |

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Designated River Valley           |   | N/A                  |
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

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

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is adjacent to the existing development boundary (adjoining a development of 7 affordable units, completed within the last 10 years) and is well located in terms of access to the local services and facilities in the village. The site is constrained by a high-pressure pipeline running along the western boundary, which has an easement, development is possible outside of this area. The extent of the easement has been confirmed between the site promoter and Cadent.

Moving the Preferred site boundary to the west would increase the potential to create suitable visibility splay and the total extent of the promoted site allows for any localised carriageway widening/footways to be achieved. Consideration will need to be given to the off-site flood risk within the carriageway.

The site closes a gap between existing housing and the play park; whilst there are some distant views of the Ellingham church and the Broads Authority area, these are not prominent. However, consideration will need to be given to the landscape impacts as part of a sensitively designed scheme.

### Site Visit Observations

The site would be a breakout to the west of the village. The site has few features, but equally is open, and there are views of the site from both surrounding footpaths and highways. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley.

### Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and the River Valley, which surrounds the settlement

### Availability

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

### Achievability

Site promoter has indicated that the site is deliverable, however no supporting evidence has been supplied in terms of the issues such as highways works, flood risk mitigation and overall viability.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** Preferred – the site is well located for access to local services and facilities in the settlement. The high-pressure pipeline running along the western boundary reduces the development area, but the extent has been confirmed between the site promoter and Cadent.

The site would be a breakout to the west of the village and any landscape harm will need to be mitigated, particularly as this is within the River Valley. There is linear development in the immediate vicinity, with two dwellings set back to the rear of existing properties in larger plots. This does give a notional east-west line which could be landscaped as the southern extent of the site in order to not completely obscure views of the church to the south or impact too greatly on the River Valley Landscape.

The site will also need to address the highways requirements and the implications of any off-site requirements re existing flood-risk within the carriageway.

There is a preference in terms of extending the site to go further west, within the constraints of the pipeline easement, rather south.

**Preferred Site:** Yes

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:**

Date Completed: 02/05/2022

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail   | Comments   |
|--|--|
| Site Reference   | SN0348   |
| Site address   | Land to the South of Old Yarmouth Road, Kirby Row, Kirby Cane                  |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)    | Unallocated  |
| Planning History   | No recent planning history (historic refusals for residential development)     |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 0.65ha   |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(c) Allocated site<br>(d) SL extension | Allocation<br><br>(The site has been promoted for approximately 20 dwellings)  |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | Approximately 20 dwellings which equates to 31dph<br><br>16 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>No existing access from highway to the site. Initial highway comments indicate that there may be potential constraints on the site but these could be overcome. Off-site highway improvements would be required including provision of footpath.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber.</b><br/>           May be feasible to form access subject to adequate visibility being available, provision of frontage 2.0m wide footway and modification to existing speed limit. Visibility north from Old Yarmouth Rd to Church Rd constrained, little scope for improvement.</p> <p><i>(Highways meeting: would appear broadly acceptable in highways terms, main concern would be visibility re the speed of traffic exiting the bypass from the north, but there appears to be scope to realign the carriageways within the existing highways)</i></p> | Amber                |

| Constraint   | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> | Green                 | <p>Village Shop within 500m</p> <p>Nearest bus stop is 255m is 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.</p> <p>Primary School is within 1800m</p> <p>No footpath on Mill Lane but from Mill Road there is a footpath all the way to the school.</p>                 |                      |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>   |                       | <p>Village Hall</p> <p>Recreational ground</p> <p>Public House</p> <p>All with 1800m</p>  | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity   | Amber                 | Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed  | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure   | Green                 | Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site  | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk   |                       | The site is within an area already served by fibre technology   | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route  |                       | Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location  | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability   | Green                 | <p>Desktop investigations in relation to contamination have been undertaken and no issues found. No known ground stability issues</p> <p><b>NCC M&amp;W</b> – the site is less than 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If the site</p> | Green                |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
|            |                       | progresses as an allocation then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.   |                      |
| Flood Risk | Green                 | <p>Flood zone 1. Surface water flooding 1-100 in the top northwest corner and 1-1000 across the site from west to south and east covers about 50%.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Significant mitigation measures required for heavy constraints. A flow path present in the 1:1000 year rainfall events as identified on the Environment Agency’s Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps, runs from North West to South East crossing the site. Watercourse is not apparent on DRN mapping (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Safe dry, emergency access and egress across the site should also be considered. Not served by AW connection. In SPZ2 for groundwater protection so will need to be considered when designing SUDS.</p> | Amber                |

| Impact  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| SN Landscape Type<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>           | N/A                   | Rural River Valley  | N/A                  |
| SN Landscape Character Area<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> |                       | <p>A5 Waveney Rural River Valley</p> <p>ALC – Grade 3</p> |                      |

| Impact                       | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Overall Landscape Assessment | Amber                 | Development could have a detrimental impact on landscape. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity to the Broads.<br><br><b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> - Potentially acceptable in landscape terms as it could retain the setting of the settlement.  | Amber                |
| Townscape                    | Green                 | Development could have a detrimental impact on townscape but it is considered that this could be mitigated. Density considerations?<br><br><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Green   | Green                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity  | Amber                 | Development may impact on protected species, but impact could be reasonably mitigated. SSSI Leeth Hill to the east of the site 700m. With 3000m of the Ramsar site located southeast - south of Gillingham Road, Geldeston.  | Amber                |
| Historic Environment         | Amber                 | Listed building to the southwest of the site but is separated by existing development<br><br><b>SNC SENIOR HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN OFFICER</b> – Green<br><br><b>HES</b> – Amber   | Green                |
| Open Space                   | Green                 | Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space   | Green                |
| Transport and Roads          | Amber                 | Potential impact on functioning of local road network, that may not be reasonably mitigated. NCC to confirm.<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red.<br>May be feasible to form access subject to adequate visibility being available, provision of frontage 2.0m wide footway and modification to existing speed limit. Visibility north from Old Yarmouth Rd to Church Rd constrained, little scope for improvement. | Red                  |

| Impact                 | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
|                        |                          | <i>(Highways meeting: would appear broadly acceptable in highways terms, main concern would be visibility re the speed of traffic exiting the bypass from the north, but there appears to be scope to realign the carriageways within the existing highways)</i> |                         |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                    | Agricultural/residential   | Green                   |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?  | <p>The listed building to the south is separated by intervening land uses.</p> <p>Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated. The site is adjacent to the development boundary. This part of the village is characterised by a linear form either side of Church Road. The density proposed is high given the character/context of the site. Noted that the Broads Authority is located to the south of this part of village.</p> | N/A                  |
| Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?                                       | Potential access constraints. NCC should confirm feasibility of new access/es and impact on road network.   | N/A                  |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Agricultural  | N/A                  |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)    | Agricultural/residential  | 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)  | Residential boundaries to the west mixture of fencing and hedges, open to the north and south   | N/A                  |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site? | <p>Potential impacts on Bats, Owls etc. which could be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>Within 3,000m buffer to Ramsar site to south east (Ramsar Site to south of Gillingham Road – Geldeston).</p>  | 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)                            | Overhead lines 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   | Prominent in views from Old Yarmouth Road when viewed from the north and east. Sensitive landscape as it is in the River Valley.  | N/A                  |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the northeast of the village. The site is open and visible in long views across the landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm could be difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley. | Amber                |

## Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

| Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Designated River Valley           |   | N/A                  |
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
|                                   |   | N/A                  |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green                |



**Part 6 - Availability and Achievability**

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

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

## **Part 7 - Conclusion**

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and relates reasonably well to the existing settlement. The site is well connected to local services and could be enhanced to create a gateway to the village. Development of the site would be constrained by identified areas of surface water flooding and access arrangements for the site would also require careful consideration. Updated highways comments suggest that there may be scope for addressing the earlier highway safety concerns identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Adjacent to existing development boundary and well related to services. It would represent a breakout to the northeast of the village. The site is open and visible in long views across the landscape. Therefore, the landscape harm may be more difficult to mitigate, particularly as this is a site within the River Valley, however it could also be a gateway site.

### **Local Plan Designations**

River valley setting.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

### **Achievability**

Surface water flooding across the site may affect both the viability and/ or quantum of development that is achievable on the site.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for allocation at this stage, subject to further discussions with the LLFA about the identified flood risk across the site and the mitigation measures that would be required to address this. Updated highways comments identify possible solutions to earlier highway safety concerns and whilst there would be a landscape impact to development in this location it could also provide an opportunity to enhance a gateway approach to the settlement.

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

Following the Regulation 18 consultation, and in response to the comments of the LLFA, this site has been reviewed for inclusion in the VCHAP and is now considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. Significant surface water and drainage constraints have been identified on the site and whilst the Council has made efforts to engage with the promoter of the site to seek a possible solution to these issues this has not been met with a response. For these reasons the site is no longer considered to be an available or achievable site for allocation.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 11 August 2020

Date Updated: 10 May 2022

Officer: Kate Fisher

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

### Part 1 - Site Details

| Detail   | Comments   |
|--|--|
| Site Reference   | SN5019SL   |
| Site address   | Land adj Old 113 Yarmouth Road, Ellingham  |
| Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)    | Outside development boundary   |
| Planning History   | 2011/1598/CU into caravan storage area refused 24/11/2011.<br>1988/3102/O for 3 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 23/08/1989.<br>1981/0591/O for 4 dwellings refused 18/03/1981. |
| Site size, hectares (as promoted)                                      | 0.25   |
| Promoted Site Use, including<br>(e) Allocated site<br>(f) SL extension | SL extension   |
| Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)    | 6 (4 detached, 2 semi-detached)  |
| 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>Small existing access to the site on frontage.</p> <p>Site now reduced to frontage development only so will need Highway Authority consult to assess suitability for either six separate accesses, three shared or vehicle access to rear, and whether adequate visibility can be achieved.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to demonstrating acceptable visibility can be provided. Footway improvement required at Yarmouth Road.</p> | Amber                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br>○ Primary School<br>○ Secondary school<br>○ Local healthcare services<br>○ Retail services | Amber                 | <p>Primary School is within 750m. It is on the other side of the A143 (although there is a crossing point with pedestrian island), there are some footpaths at either end with around 250m along Station road with no path.</p> <p>Village Shop/PO 1,400m</p> <p>Bus stop within 50m and is on the</p>  | N/A                  |

| Constraint  | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments  | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>  |                       | bus route for 580 Beccles to Diss route which stops in Bungay and Harleston.  |                      |
| <p><i>Part 2:</i><br/>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul> | N/A                   | <p>Kirby Cane:<br/>Village Hall; 1,300m<br/>Recreational ground; 750m<br/>Restaurant; 1,300m<br/>Pre-school</p> <p>Broome, connected by footpath;<br/>Public House; 1,100m<br/>Village Hall</p>   | Green                |
| Utilities Capacity  | Amber                 | No known constraints  | Amber                |
| Utilities Infrastructure  | Amber                 | <p>Promoter advises mains services exist on site.</p> <p>Another promoter has confirmed that this part of the village does have mains drainage.</p>   | Green                |
| Better Broadband for Norfolk  | N/A                   | Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.  | Green                |
| Identified ORSTED Cable Route   | N/A                   | Not within identified cable route or substation location.   | Green                |
| Contamination & ground stability  | Amber                 | <p>Unknown, contamination would require some investigation given has been previous use but unlikely to be an issue.</p> <p><b>NCC Minerals &amp; Waste</b> - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the</p> | Amber                |

| Constraint | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
|            |                       | site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.  |                      |
| Flood Risk | Amber                 | <p>South-east corner: Flood Zone 2</p> <p>Surface Water Flooding depth 1:1000 to the bottom southeast corner and eastern boundary due to a drain.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Amber. Flood Zone 2. In terms of any future residential proposals coming forward for this site, it would be covered by our FRSA.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. On-site flood risk is very minor flooding on the site boundary. Standard information required at planning application stage.</p> <p>There is a major flow path immediately adjacent to the east and south of the site. This must be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>Access to the site could be severely affected by off-site 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                   | Rural River Valley  | N/A                  |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) | N/A                   | A5 Waveney Rural River Valley   | N/A                  |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                 | It is within the rural river valley but is located adjacent to existing development along the original main road, prior to the bypass. It is therefore closely related to established development and it will | Green                |

| Impact                      | HELAA Score (R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
|                             |                       | not have a negative impact on the landscape.   |                      |
| Townscape                   | Green                 | This part of the village is characterised by a liner form of development with a variety of dwelling types mainly set in reasonable sized plots. The site has been significantly reduced to allow for only frontage development. It will relate well to the townscape.  | Green                |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green                 | <p>No designations on site. Trees and hedges surrounding provided habitat; require ecology survey.</p> <p>CWS located to south separated by A143, unlikely to be affected.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber.<br/>SSSI IRZ - Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m<sup>3</sup>/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream requires NE consultation. GI corridor and amber risk zone for great crested newts and ponds within 250m. Adjacent to priority habitat. No PROW onsite.</p> | Amber                |
| Historic Environment        | Green                 | <p>Listed Icehouse and locally designated Historic Parkland located to the north separated by Old Yarmouth Road and intervening uses, therefore no direct visual impact on these.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>  | Amber                |
| Open Space                  | Green                 | No   | Green                |
| Transport and Roads         | Amber                 | Given that the site area has been reduced it is considered that the potential impact on functioning of Old Yarmouth Road Lane will be minimal.   | Amber                |



| Impact                 | HELAA Score<br>(R/ A/ G) | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
|                        |                          | <p>Relatively easy access to local facilities.</p> <p><i>Previous</i></p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber, subject to demonstrating acceptable visibility can be provided. Footway improvement required at Yarmouth Road.</p> |                         |
| Neighbouring Land Uses | Green                    | Residential and small agricultural area.   | Green                   |

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

| Site Visit Observations   | Comments<br>11/02/22  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?   | <p>It will not adversely impact on the setting of the listed building and historic parkland to the north given that it is separated by trees, Old Yarmouth Road and intervening land uses.</p> <p>Frontage development would continue the existing linear development along Old Yarmouth Road. Whilst access would require the removal of the hedge it is largely residential along this part of the road and it would not look out of place nor have a significant effect.</p>   | N/A                     |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?                                 | <p>It is a 30mph limit with existing dwellings and traffic must slow when approaching bend to A143. On-coming traffic will be slower coming around the bend.</p> <p>Would require new accesses for dwellings but these would be similar to those already along the road. Need HA consult to determine if visibility is achievable, particularly to the east.</p> <p>Need clarification on remaining access to rest of land to rear; presumably between 121 &amp; 125 to west?</p> | N/A                     |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Storage of caravans.<br>No demolition.  | N/A                     |
| What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site) | Residential to north and west.<br>Caravan site to south.<br>Smallholding to east.   | N/A                     |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)                                      | Relatively flat, land falls slightly from the road.   | N/A                     |

| Site Visit Observations  | Comments<br>11/02/22  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| What are the site boundaries?<br>(e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)   | Trees and hedge, hedge to frontage.   | N/A                     |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | Hedge to frontage, trees within the site. Would need ecology input, possibility of bats.  | 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 pole on frontage. Unknown if contamination, would need more details given there has been a previous use for storage of vehicles. Likely mitigation would be minor if necessary.   | N/A                     |
| Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape   | Very limited views into and out of site. Main views would be along frontage, these would fit in with existing development.<br>No views from A143 to south as there is a substantial tree belt outside the site which would remain.  | N/A                     |
| <b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development) | There are services and facilities relatively close by, with a choice between Broom or Kirby Cane. All day-to-day services are available near-by in Bungay. Although across the A143, the school does have a safe route to it which takes 15mins.<br><br>Frontage development would continue the existing pattern of development with little significant wider impact.<br><br>Acknowledge that frontage hedge would need to be removed however, it is not the best quality and in this location the gain could outweigh this loss. Also, could require plots to have hedge planted along frontage to mitigate this loss. | 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) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| River Valley                      |  | N/A                  |
|                                   |  | N/A                  |
|                                   |  | N/A                  |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                 | Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations. | Green                |

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

| <b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b> |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No)<br>(Additional information to be included as appropriate) | Indicated it is deliverable but no evidence to support this. | Amber                     |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)     | Unlikely.  | Amber                     |
| Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?           | Indicated affordable housing could 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 proposes a Settlement Limit extension at a location where no Limit exists and there are currently no plans to designate one. In terms of distance to services, the site lies between those located in Ellingham/Kirby Cane and those in Broome, and is within a reasonable distance of a suitable range. The site is separated from the Ellingham/Kirby Cane by the A143 bypass, although there is a crossing point with pedestrian island. Although the site has been reduced in scale from the previous proposal (SN4054), there is still an element of flood risk across the south-east corner of the site and the site is a well vegetated plot within a wider GI corridor

### **Site Visit Observations**

There are services and facilities relatively close by, with a choice between Broom or Kirby Cane. All day-to-day services are available near-by in Bungay. Although across the A143, the school does have a safe route to it which takes 15mins.

Frontage development would continue the existing pattern of development with little significant wider impact.

Acknowledge that frontage hedge would need to be removed however, it is not the best quality and in this location the gain could outweigh this loss. Also, could require plots to have hedge planted along frontage to mitigate this loss.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Open Countryside and River Valley.

### **Availability**

Promoter has advised availability immediately.

### **Achievability**

Site promoter has indicated the site is deliverable, although no supporting evidence has been submitted.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site proposes a Settlement Limit extension at a location where no Limit exists and there are currently no plans to designate one. The site is well located in terms of distance to services, albeit that some require crossing the A143 bypass, at a designated crossing point. Although reduced in scale, the site still has an element of flood risk across the south-east corner and is a vegetated site with an GI corridor.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 02/05/2022