

Rockland St Mary, Hellington & Holverston Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

New, Revised & Amended Sites

December 2022

Contents

SN2064REV.....	3
SN5013.....	13
SN5039.....	25

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2064REV
Site address	Land south of The Street, Rockland St Mary (rear of surgery)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocation – 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 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	Access through surgery grounds NCC Highways meeting - solution proposed by FW Properties has the same issues for NCC as access via The Surgery site would - concern about the need for third party land, including ponds to both the east and west, to create pedestrian footpaths, particularly to connect with existing provision to the east (the land appears to be in the ownership of multiple landowners). Visibility splays would need to be appropriate to the prevailing traffic speeds. SM to update FW Properties.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 530 metres Distance to peak time bus service 380 metres to bus stops Village shop and surgery in close proximity	
<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 		Village hall 550 metres away Distance to New Inn public house 1.5km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No surface water flood risk LLFA score – Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrudes into open landscape to south away from linear pattern of development, although mitigated by School Lane to west. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Does not relate to existing linear pattern of development, although mitigated by School Lane to the east Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. There are two established clusters to the east end and west end of the village – with this central area still very linear in its grain of development without backland development. Consequently there are not that many accesses in the centre of the village, and with gaps in housing it retain a rural scale. Introduction of a third central clustered area would create more of precedent for other backland areas to be developed in the same vain, fundamentally changing character of the village. I therefore have townscape concerns.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ potential for protected species/ habitats and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to priority habitat.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green. HES Score – Amber	
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	The Street has capacity and adequate footways Highways score – Green	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would not relate to linear pattern of development along The Street heading east from the site. However to the west The Street bends to the south with development along School Lane protruding to the south	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access adjacent to surgery which would be tight – seek clarification with Highway Authority as to whether there is sufficient room for an acceptable access arrangement	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and surgery to north along The Street, agricultural to south. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and tress on boundaries other than southern which ins undefined as part of larger field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in hedges and trees	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 contamination issues likely	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden in views from The Street due to position behind existing development	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>Could be acceptable given existing development along The Street further to the south as the road curves to the west and development protruding to the south along School Lane to the west. However, clarification that access is achievable required</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)
		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Under option to a developer/ promoter	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	With 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)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Site to the rear of existing linear pattern of development, however pattern of development to west could mitigate for this to some extent. As a consequence there are some townscape concerns. Access by the side of the surgery looks tight and needs clarifying if achievable.

Local Plan Designations

Adjacent to but outside the development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Whilst the site extends into open space beyond the linear pattern of existing development there is existing development to the south of The Street, as the road curves to the west with development protruding to the south along School Lane to the west of the proposed site. It would need to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Highways Officer that an appropriate access into the site, with adequate visibility, can be achieved.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

Officer: Kate Fisher

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5013
Site address	Land north of New Inn Hill, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1989/1788/O for 4 dwellings refused, appeal dismissed 19/09/1990. 1989/0916/O for 16 dwellings refused 21/06/1989.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.83
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15-19 21 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>Access should be achievable from New Inn Hill, there is an existing unused gated access to west of frontage. Await Highway Authority consultation.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Satisfactory access likely to require significant removal of mature hedge and affect substantial trees. Site remote from local facilities with poor standard footway, little if no scope for improvement to satisfactory standard.</p>	Amber
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	Green	<p>Distance to Rockland St Mary school 1,700m</p> <p>Peak time bus service passes site along New Inn Hill with bus stop 200metres away</p> <p>Distance to village shop and surgery 1,400m</p> <p>All connected by a footpath</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
transport			
<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 1,400m Playground 1,100m Distance to New Inn public house 100 metres, possible access to rear.	Green
Utilities Capacity		Promoter states: Mains water has previously been connected to the site, electrical supply available adjacent to highway, an extension to the water sewer beneath New Inn Hill is likely to be necessary, air source heating will be the default obviating any need for gas supply.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known issues.	Amber
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	No known issues. NCC Minerals & Waste - site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site were to go forward as an allocation then	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>information that - future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Surface Water Flood Risk: 1:1,000 across the north (rear) of site due to dyke on adjacent allotment site and area to north-west boundary 1: 30 & 1:100 through the lowest part of the site.</p> <p>LLFA – Green. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Site is adjacent to the Broads IDB. The site is affected by minor ponding in the 3.33% and 1.0% AEP events, concentrated to the site boundary. The site is affected by a minor flow path in the 0.1% AEP event, cutting the site northwest-east. Flow lines indicate this flood water flows east off the site.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Green</p>	Amber

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	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland Immediately adjacent to Broads Area, runs along the eastern boundary. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site would be particularly visible travelling westwards past the staithe and, whilst part of it may be seen in the context of the existing buildings, as a whole it would change the character of the area. It would have a significant impact on the landscape and a negative impact on the setting of Rockland Broad and Staithe. Broads Authority: Valley slope location on BA boundary. Small site but has Wheryman's Way passing by. Also on approach to Broads visitor attractions. Site has some potential to adversely affect the local landscape character and the setting of the Broads. I suggest we ask that the allocation policy includes a requirement for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment and that we are consulted on the selection of viewpoints. Also seems somewhat distant from the main part of the	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		settlement.	
Townscape	Amber	This is an edge of settlement position where development has evolved in a sporadic nature around the staithe. It may be possible to accommodate individual dwellings within this form however a larger area of housing would be out of character with this incremental growth and would have an adverse impact away from the main part of the village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations on the site but adjacent to Broads Area and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve around Rockland Broad. Rockland Dyke lies close to the east. There are other drains and hedges connecting the site to this wider area and species surveys will be required as it is land which has been dormant for some time.</p> <p>Would also need to assess the impact of additional development on the Broads Area in terms of increased recreational impact.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. Any discharge of water or liquid waste that is discharged to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream will require Natural England (NE) consultation. Residential development of 50 units or more or any residential developments outside of existing settlements/ urban areas with a total net gain in residential units will also require NE consultation. No priority habitats onsite (MAGIC). Edge of amber risk zone for great crested newts</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	HES – Amber. Significant cropmarks within site.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No Adjacent Open Space: Rockland Allotments, along eastern boundary & Green Lane provision for young people to north-west	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Rural road network, Highway Authority to assess the impact. Public footpath opposite and to east and west, wider accessibility for recreation. NCC Highways – Red. Satisfactory access likely to require significant removal of mature hedge and affect substantial trees. Site remote from local facilities with poor standard footway, little if no scope for improvement to satisfactory standard.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Allotments to east. Residential to west. Grass/wood to north, field to south.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site is away from the main part of the village but is within a smaller cluster of development around the staithe. However, the dwellings in this location are more sporadic and a concentration of development here would have a significant impact.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Old, gated access existing with other residential access nearby to west and south, will need Highway consultation.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Unused grassland.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to west and south-east, allotments to east, agriculture to north and south-west. Entrance to the staithe carpark to east.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site is relatively level along the road side but with a severe slope from the road down to the south and north. The lowest point is the north-eastern corner adjacent to the allotments.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges and trees along all boundaries. Strong hedge along frontage with mature trees will need to be considered if requires any removal for access. It is scrappy in places but the overall impact is of a very rural frontage which adds to the character of the area.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Woodland area to north-west and north, hedges on perimeters. Rockland Broad is nearby and connected to the staithe by Rockland Dyke. This is an internationally protected area and there are dykes and hedges running nearby which create routes for species to use. This would need to	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments <i>Site Visit 07/02/22</i>	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	be carefully considered and the Ecology officer consulted.	
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 utilities or contamination. Contamination unlikely but would need some investigation, to determine past uses.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	<p>Currently limited views in because of hedge on road and the slope away. However, there would be some hedge removal to achieve an adequate access which would open the site up. There are also views from public allotments and staithe car-park to east. If developed it would be visible along the road frontage, particularly form the east given the slope.</p> <p>Views out are limited to the south however from within the site the wider views are extensive to the north and east. From the highest point at the south-west corner you can see across Rockland Broad.</p>	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 village by footpath, and distances are acceptable to walk. However, it is separate from the main part of the village and it would have a significant impact on the landscape and as a wider setting for the Broads Area.</p> <p>Would need to Ecologist’s advice on the impact of hedge removal and impact/presence of species/habitat in close proximity to Broads and internationally protected sites.</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
Adjacent Broads Area		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Need to consider the impact on the Broads Area	Amber

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	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	Amber
Are on-site/off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible mitigation/GI for increased pressure on Broads Area.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated that it would be provided, no evidence submitted.	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 unsuitable for development. The site is subject to several constraints; highways, heritage, flood risk and landscape impact. The culminative impact of these issues will result in an unacceptable form of development in this location.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well connected to the village by footpath, and distances are acceptable to walk. However, it is separate from the main part of the village, and it would have a significant impact on the landscape and as a wider setting for the Broads Area.

Local Plan Designations

Defined as Countryside. Located adjacent to the Broads Area

Availability

The landowner/developer has advised that the site is available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is **UNREASONABLE** for development. The Highway Authority have provided their comments on the site and have advised that in order to achieve a satisfactory access a significant number of mature trees and hedging will need to be removed. It has also been noted that whilst there is a footpath connecting the site to the main part of the village, this footpath is substandard where there is little or no scope for improvement to a satisfactory standard. In addition, the site contains significant crop marks which would need to be considered and could potentially limited the developable area. There is also an area of flood risk located to the north of the site which would also limit the developable area on site. The site would also be particularly visible travelling westwards past the staithe and, whilst part of it may be seen in the context of the existing buildings, it would change the character of the area. It would have a significant impact on the landscape and a negative impact on the setting of Rockland Broad and Staithe.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27/04/22

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5039
Site address	Land south of The Street, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Largely outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.16
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	50 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>Existing access from the Street but it is constrained between existing dwellings. It is also close to the junction with School Lane which is narrow with limited visibility. The promoter also owns No 4 The Street to the east and states that the site access could be extended across the front to create the necessary visibility splay.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient frontage to provide acceptable visibility. Acceptable footway does not appear feasible.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting - access very close to the junction of School Lane with The Street. Does not appear possible to get adequate visibility splays in.</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 	Green	<p>Bus stop opposite, peak time bus service</p> <p>Distance to Rockland St Mary school 190 metres</p> <p>Village shop 290 metres, doctor's surgery in close proximity on The Street</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	<p>Village hall/parish room in close proximity</p> <p>Distance to New Inn public house 1.7km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity		Promoter states that it is immediately adjacent to The Street with ready access to all utility supplies.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	None identified.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No evidence and promoter states no issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 Small area of low risk of surface water flooding around access to site.	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints, on-site flood risk is minor ponding. Standard information required at planning stage.</p> <p>Environment Agency: 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>B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 2</p>	N/A
<p>Overall Landscape Assessment</p>	Green	<p>The site cannot be seen from the road frontage and is contained to the north and west by existing development. It encroaches to the south into the open countryside however, the land slopes away to the south and this site would be seen against the dwellings to the north and west and the shortlisted site is adjacent to the east.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - Similar in landscape terms to SN2064REV; need to consider boundary with open land to east and south - to be secured in specific allocation policy text.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	<p>The site is behind existing development. The existing village is largely linear but at this western end there is an example of a nearby cul-de-sac to the east of School Lane which this site could mirror. Also adjacent to a Preferred site SN2064REV.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design: No issues - perhaps preferable to extending the village with linear development</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Site is an arable field with a few trees around perimeter so there is limited habitat potential on site.</p> <p>NCC Ecologist: Amber. No PROW nearby. Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 5m³/day to ground (ie to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream, or residential development over 50 units, and residential over 50 units outside existing settlement area will require Natural England consultation. No priority habitats onsite. Amber risk zone for great crested newts.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No designations on site. There is a Grade II listed building to the west on School Road. This is attached to the adjacent dwellings and with an established rear boundary development would not adversely affect it.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design – No issues - intervening development between the site and St Mary's Church to the west; listed building immediately to</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>west of site - benefits from long rear garden, therefore unlikely to have significant impact.</p> <p>HES – Amber. Close to cropmarks of Bronze Age burial mounds.</p>	
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>The Street has capacity and adequate footways. No continuous footpath to the school but it is very close along School Lane which is the only pedestrian route currently used.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red. Insufficient frontage to provide acceptable visibility. Acceptable footway does not appear feasible.</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impact on heritage assets. Could be assimilated into the village in a similar form to the development on the west of School Road. Although the site is large for the village and could be reduced in size.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	The access to The Street is between dwellings and close to the junction with School Road. There is additional land, two adjacent accesses, which appears to give sufficient width for a road. Can a footpath be achieved? Require Highway Authority advice on suitability.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agriculture with a brick built barn and walls some near the entrance. These would need to be removed for access, unless the barn can be retained, no major concerns.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agriculture – compatible uses. Would need to consider the rear of the dwellings to the west as they have no buffer and have windows on the boundary line.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level with a gentle slope south.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Various residential properties, with an unfarmed area adjacent to residential boundaries to north and east which is laid to grass and neatly maintained - included in the site.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature group of trees to north. Small pond at access. Barn with possibility of bats. Close to the Broads Area and designated sites.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit 07/02/22	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)	None evident. Barn indicates previous use on site, long ceased.	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 behind dwellings and there are no views from the road. There would be views from the rear of existing properties. Long views out over fields to south.	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)	This is a large site which is behind existing dwellings. If an adequate access can be achieved a smaller area could relate to the existing built-up part of the village as there are no significant constraints.	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)
None		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate) Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Within 5 years Land is rented to a tenant farmer on 3 year contract which ends October 2022.	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)	Yes, standard access improvements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has indicated it will 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 suitable for allocation, subject to achieving a suitable access with sufficient visibility.

Site Visit Observations

This is a large site which is behind existing dwellings. If an adequate access can be achieved a smaller area could relate to the existing built-up part of the village as there are no significant constraints.

Local Plan Designations

The site is located adjacent to the settlement limit defined for Rockland. There are no other conflicting designations.

Availability

The promoter has advised that the site would be available within 5 years; land is currently rented to a tenant farmer on 3 year contract which ends October 2022

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered REASONABLE for allocation, subject to achieving a satisfactory access with sufficient visibility. The Highway Authority have highlighted concerns with the insufficient site frontage to provide visibility. However, the promoter has advised that the applicant owns neighbouring land where access could be achieved. Prior to allocation, the ownership of this land and measures to ensure visibility will need to be agreed with highways. No other major issues have been raised at this stage and therefore it is considered that subject to highways approval, a carefully designed scheme could be implemented on site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: 28/04/2022