



Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Consultation on Alternative Sites & Focused Changes

December 2023 – February 2024

Updated Site Assessments for Consultation Sites

Contents

SN0433 - Land at Wheel Road, Alpington	3
SN0552REVC - Land at Watton Road, Barford	14
SN6000 - Land north of Chapel Street, Barford	24
SN0055 - Land east of Spur Road and south of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom	37
SN4053 - Land to the east of Stocks Hill, Bawburgh	46
SN4020 - Land west of Old Yarmouth Road, Broome	55
SN0373 / VC DIT1 - Land between Thwaite Road and Tunneys Lane, Ditchingham	65
SN0218 - Land west of Earsham	76
SN4078 – Land south of GIL1, Gillingham	87
SN0444 / VC SPO1 - Land west of Bunwell Road, Spooner Row	96
SN1057 / VC TAC1 - Land to the west of Norwich Road, Tacolneston	107
SN0577REVA / VCWIC1 - Land to the south of Wicklewood Primary School	118

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0433
Site address	Land at Wheel Road, Alington NR14 7NL
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	None
Planning History	No planning applications post-2000 Reasonable alternative in the last Local Plan
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.0
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site. (Promoted for approximately 10 dwellings as a SL extension)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Minimum of 12/ha. (Promoted for 10/ha)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Long frontage to Wheel Road, with existing field access. NCC Highways Meeting - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public 	Amber	Primary School - 450m Aldis & Son Farm Shop - 1,175m Various small-scale employment opportunities in the vicinity.	

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 		Pub - less than 50m Village Hall with Recreation Ground - 775m Yelverton Football Club & Pavilion - 950m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No specific known constraints, but Anglian Water response needed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	33Kv overhead lines at the eastern end of the site, may require diversion/effect the layout of development.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available for NR14 7NL area.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Greenfield site with no known issues. SNC Env Services: Green Land Quality: - No potentially contaminated sites are located within 500m of the site in question on the PCLR or Landmark databases other than a former agricultural repair workshop (about 120m from the site in question) and a graveyard. Neither of these are	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		<p>considered significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nothing of concern with regard to land quality noted on the historic OS maps. - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application. 	
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Small area in the east of the site subject to surface water flooding up to 1 in 100 years.</p> <p>LLFA - Few or no constraints.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Chet Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>No designated landscapes.</p> <p>Substantial hedge to the road frontage, with mature tree at the Wheel Rd/Reeder's Lane junction. However, hedging likely to be lost to create a suitable access. Aspect to the south is more open and visible from south on Reeder's Lane.</p> <p>Grade 3 agricultural land.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Meeting - Significant boundary/roadside hedgerow and vegetation. Does not appear to be compatible with LCA.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Green	<p>Postwar housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, and Wheel of Fortune pub immediately to the east. However this site would extend the settlement into more open countryside south of the village. Potential to screen/integrate the site.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design – Amber</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No designated sites within close proximity. However some mature hedgerow/tress on the boundary, which are likely to require protection.</p> <p>NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Potential impact on listed building to the south, Stacey Cottage, which currently has no screening between it and the site.</p> <p>SNC Heritage & Design – Amber, a suitably designed linear development would be fine, if developed to the north along the same line as the FW properties site to the east, this would leave a suitably sized rectangular agricultural field to the south. There is also the Wheel of Fortune to consider as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Not within an identified open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Assuming a suitable access can be achieved the site links to the current network serving the village, which links to the A146 and Poringland.</p> <p>NCC Highways Meeting - From a Highways perspective the entire frontage needs improvement; could widen Wheel Road, however this would require substantial hedge</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		removal. Wheel Road narrows outside the Wheel of Fortune, but this relatively short pinch point should be OK. Reeders Lane junction is substandard – could potentially be widened for improved visibility.	
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Pub to the east, road frontage to the north and west, with residential development beyond. Agricultural land to the south.</p> <p>SNC Env Services: Green</p> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site in question is adjacent to the Wheel of Fortune PH, Wheel Road, Alington, Norfolk, NR14 7NL. Consideration should be given to the potential impact of the Public House on future residents along with the impact on the future viability of the Public House of introducing noise sensitive receptors close to it. 	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Potential impact on the listed Stacey Cottage to the south.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Current field entrance to the site, close to the existing junction with Fortune Green. Substantial hedge, at least part of which may need to be removed. On a bend in Wheel Road and extends to the junction with Reeder's Lane.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, with no obvious concerns.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Pub, residential and open countryside. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level site.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Road frontage to Wheel Road and Reeder's Lane, only immediately adjoining development is the pub. Currently no boundary to the south, as the site subdivides a larger field.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Substantial hedgerow, with a ditch, to the Wheel Road frontage, includes tree(s) at the Reeder's Lane junction.	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)	Two sets of overhead powerlines across the site, which may require diversion or accommodating in any development layout.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of the site from the village are limited by the existing hedge, although any removal to create an access would make the site significantly more open. The site is more open from the south and can	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
	be seen through the field entrance on Reeder's Lane.	
<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>Whilst the site is effectively in gap between the Wheel of Fortune pub and housing on Burgate Lane, with additional housing on the opposite side of Wheel Road, the site has a rural feel, with a substantial hedge and ditch to the Wheel Road frontage and a more open aspect to the south.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be given to any access, with the bend in Wheel Road and junctions with Reeder's Lane and Fortune Green, plus the potential need to remove at least part of the frontage hedge.</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)
Open Countryside		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion		Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently being marketed, but is promoted by a house builder.	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	
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)	Site promoted by an established house builder who also completed the nearby 2015 allocation on Wheel Road. No known constraints to delivery.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Landowner also controls and to the south, should open space/landscaping etc be required. It is not envisaged that further off-site improvements will be required.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes, at the time of submission in 2016	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

Site is an unconstrained greenfield site, relatively well located in terms of access to local services/facilities. Keeping the development to the northern part of the field would limit the impact on the rural setting of Stace Cottage to the south. However, Wheel Road at the site frontage is narrow and has restricted forward visibility and the carriageway narrows in vicinity of the Wheel of Fortune PH. Whilst this 'pinch point' at the pub might be acceptable, the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (containing some larger trees) would significantly change the character of the area. Need to establish whether the 33Kv power lines are a constraint.

Site Visit Observations

Site quite rural in character, and currently well screened from surrounding development. However that screening is likely to need to be removed to access the site.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but on the opposite side of Wheel Road to the existing Development Boundary.

Availability

Promoter is a local house builder who states that the site is available and viable.

Achievability

Achievable, subject to any outcomes of technical consultation.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is reasonably located in terms of local services and facilities and has few on-site constraints. The main concerns with the site relate to the removal of the substantial frontage hedge (with trees) to facilitate the necessary highways improvements, across the whole site frontage from the Reeders Lane/Burgate Lane junction (which itself would require improvement) to the Wheel of Fortune. This would significantly change the character of the area and raise concerns in terms of wider landscape character.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:

Development on this site would reflect the existing build form seen along Wheel Road. Hedgerow removal has been identified as being necessary for an acceptable highways scheme to come forward, which could expose the site to the landscape. However, replacement planting would assist in reducing the overall impact on the landscape. Planting along the southern border of the site would also reduce the impact on the landscape. Considering the mitigation measures that have been identified, the Council considers the site appropriate for allocation for approximately 12 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0552REVC
Site address	Land at Watton Road, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.73ha (residential element)
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dwellings and 6ha of open space
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

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

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

Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>The site has two road frontages where the residential development is proposed. An indicative plan shows a site access off the B1108 Watton Road or off Back Lane.</p> <p>Back Lane is a single carriageway road and currently unsuitable.</p> <p>Highways meeting (from discussion of the wider SN0552 site) – site would need to demonstrate adequate visibility within the 40mph area. Development (of a larger site) could help enforce speed reduction through 'side friction'.</p>	Amber
<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 	Amber	<p>Barford Primary School; 400 metres from site</p> <p>Bus service runs past site along B1108 (bus stops approx. 275m)</p> <p>Local employment on B1108 (approx. 350m)</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport			
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Distance to Barford village hall and recreation area; 520 metres (Cock public house, close to the site is closed)	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known capacity issues.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Within village on east side. No gas – oil only?	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Unlikely as agricultural field.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1 Low risk if surface water flooding to south along the B1108.	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>	N/A	B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Outside of the river valley designation but this field is open and prominent on the approach from the west. Development would break out into the countryside and be highly visible.	Red
Townscape	Red	Doesn't relate well to the existing village. This site is away from the village core, in an area where houses are only sporadic. Back Lane currently provides a clearly defined the edge of the settlement and this site breaches that line.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Unlikely to be any habitat as it is an arable field with open boundaries on all sides.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed farmhouse opposite the rural setting of which would be affected.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Direct access onto B1108 and onward to the A47 and Norwich. However, there is a lack of footway access back to the village, and no indication that one could be provided.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agriculture and sparse detached dwellings.	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site has services within walking distance and is well connected to Norwich. But it is detached from the main part of the settlement and would negatively impact on the landscape. The affect on the listed building will need to be considered.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Two possible accesses are suggested. Back Lane is a very minor, single track road although it could be widened to a site access. It is likely that an access could be achieved from the B1108.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Arable field.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agriculture with scattered houses opposite and one set well back on Back Lane.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Slope down towards the village.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	None – open with a small bank along each roadside.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles along B1108. Unlikely to be contaminated given agricultural use.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Long views into and out of the site when approaching from north and west.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated August 2021)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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)	Development would have a significant impact on the landscape and would not respect the existing character of the village.	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)
Adjacent River Valley		N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No. Would need to demonstrate how open space would be provided, managed etc in addition to residential.	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	6ha open space	N/A

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is on the western periphery of Barford, where Back Lane currently forms an edge to the settlement. Whilst within a reasonable distance of local services and bus stops on the main Norwich/Watton route, there is a lack of footway connections along the busy B1108 (which is subject to a 40mph limit); the site would need to demonstrate adequate visibility in both directions onto the B1108. Barford is currently visually well contained in the landscape; however, this site would be visible for some considerable distance when approaching from the west, changing the character of the area. There would also be impacts on the rural outlook of the listed Sayers Farm.

Site Visit Observations

Development would have a significant impact on the landscape and would not respect the existing character of the village.

Local Plan Designations

Open countryside, but otherwise no conflicts.

Availability

The site promoter has indicated the site would be available within the first five years of the plan.

Achievability

The site promoter has indicated the site is deliverable. However, no supporting evidence has been provided to support deliverability, in particular the extensive areas of open space offered as part of the scheme.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

Whilst the site is relatively well located in terms of distance to services and has few on-site constraints there are two main concerns with development in this location (1) the visual intrusion which would make the settlement of Barford more prominent, as opposed to presently being visually well contained, significantly altering the character of the area and impacting on the rural setting of the listed Sayers Farm; and (2) the lack of safe pedestrian (and cycle) links back to the main part of the village. On balance, as a relatively small extension to the settlement, a proposal with adequate landscaping/screening, a sensitive layout/design, a suitable access on to the B1108 and good quality pedestrian links into the main part of the village could be acceptable.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:

The site would be contingent on the delivery of the site east of Back Lane (SN0552REVB) in order for highway access to be achievable. As the site opposite is already considered to be a preferred site and was included in the Regulation 19 version of the VCHAP, it is considered that it would be possible to deliver this site either alongside or after the development of SN0552REVB (Policy VC BAR1).

The site is exposed to the open countryside and contributes towards the setting of the Sayers Farmhouse Listed Building. Significant consideration will need to be given to these factors during the design phase to ensure the impacts are mitigated as much as possible whilst also balancing the need

to deliver new homes in the area. The site is considered for development of up to 20 dwellings, which would allow for the delivery of appropriate landscaping and screening to mitigate the impacts on the landscape and townscape. Landscaping and screening will also be needed to mitigate the impacts on the setting of Sayers Farmhouse.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN6000
Site address	Land north of Chapel Street, Barford
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Borders development boundary but outside of area.
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2ha of developable land 1.3ha of new/replacement playing field land
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site for housing and replacement community centre and playing fields
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted at 13dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield (north) Brownfield (south – existing community hall)

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:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Existing access via Chapel Street. Footpath located on opposite side of the road NCC Highways Comments – Amber: Subject to achieving acceptable visibility, localised f/w improvement and 20mph zone.	Green

<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 	<p>Amber</p>	<p>Distance to Barford Primary School 180m</p> <p>Bus stop located at access and opposite side of road</p> <p>Distance to Barford Industrial Estate 300m</p> <p>NCC Education comments – Amber: The school would have capacity based on current numbers taken Jan23 but there is some concern relating to the play space, which this appears to consume. Assumed the school have use of this as part of its curriculum requirement, and the impact losing this would have of the community.</p> <p>Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (NHS) ‘RAG’ rating – Red: Further than 1200m walking distance to nearest GP practice (Humbleyard, Hethersett)</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Village Hall and Play Spaces currently provided on site but will be demolished and replaced with development</p> <p>Distance to Golden Triangle Brewery Public House 320m</p>	<p>Green</p>
<p>Utilities Capacity</p>	<p>Green</p>	<p>No known specific constraints.</p> <p>Anglian Water comments – Green: Current capacity at Barford Chapel Street WRC for small scale growth - dependent on cumulative growth across Colton and Barford within the WRC catchment. Would be deliverable with existing proposed allocations.</p>	<p>Green</p>
<p>Utilities Infrastructure</p>	<p>Green</p>	<p>Utilities provided for existing village hall</p>	<p>Green</p>

Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available in NR9 4AB area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Investigation will be needed for land of existing community hall and potentially equipped play areas. Rest of site is greenfield, therefore unlikely to have any issues Community Protection and Environment Comments - No known contamination issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Located within flood zone 1 – low risk of surface water flooding. NCC LLFA comments – Green : Not at risk of surface runoff. No on-site internal or anecdotal flooding but some within 500m. no watercourse on or close to site. No surface water sewage systems on site but some within 100m. Source Protection Zone 3. Site has superficial deposits of diamicton. Geotechnical survey needed for infiltration, which should be used where possible.	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	Yes
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

<p>SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)</p>		<p>Tas and Yare River Valleys</p> <p>Tas: Some long views within the valley but restricted external views. Sparsely settled character with buildings of a rural vernacular appearance clustered around fording points or linear development at the upper or lower areas of the valley sides. Characteristic vernacular buildings including distinctive weather-boarded mill houses and Dutch gable ends. Presence of a small number of distinctive halls and parkland.</p> <p>Yare: Presence of attractive historic bridges over the river, mostly constructed of brick, some of which are Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Important buildings present including Wymondham Abbey and churches and mills forming landmark features. Distinct small attractive villages with strong vernacular qualities clustered around river crossings on the valley floor. Sparse farmsteads and isolated buildings, scattered across the valley sides. Important views including the view to Wymondham Abbey across the river valley. Villages contain a core of attractive buildings with a distinctive vernacular character including brick and flint buildings, stepped gable ends, round towered churches and weatherboarded watermills.</p> <p>Agricultural land value 3</p>	
---	--	--	--

Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Place making guide recommends maintaining sparse settlement and nucleated/linear patterns of development in both landscape areas. This site would likely contradict this recommendation due to particularly linear layout of Barford on the northern side of Church Lane/Chapel Street. Development of the site would also extend the settlement further into the open countryside. Proposed dwelling footprints appear to be similar to those of existing dwellings.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	As above, Barford is a predominantly linear settlement on the northern side of Church Lane/Chapel Street. The site would expand beyond the existing boundaries of development on the northern side. Park Avenue and Park close do extend beyond the linear settlement on the southern side.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No designations. Site is borders by established trees and an area of woodland sits to the east of the site. Possibility that these could be frequented by birds and other animals which will need to be investigated.	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	<p>School Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building) located to the southeast. Site of Archaeological Interest borders site in the northwest corner.</p> <p>NCC Historic Environment comments – Amber: close to finds of Roman and mid-Saxon pottery.</p> <p>Historic England Comments - This is a large site. Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed School Farmhouse lies to the south east of the site. The grade II* St Botolph’s Church and grade II listed war memorial lie at some distance to the west of the site.</p> <p>A heritage impact assessment of the site should be undertaken to assess the impact of the proposed development, if allocation of this site is appropriate, and if it is what mitigation may be required. The findings of the HIA should inform if the site is suitable for allocation and the policy criterion including any mitigation and enhancement.</p>	Amber
----------------------	-------	---	-------

Open Space	Amber	Site is made up of the existing village hall, children’s play area and playing fields. Developing on this site would obviously lead to the loss of these, however replacements have been proposed to the north of the development. The new facilities will therefore be located further away from the exiting development, which could reduce its accessibility.	Amber
Transport and Roads	Green	Site leads directly onto Church Lane/Chapel Street, which links to local services. Footpaths are located on the opposite side of the road and new footpaths may not be possible along the entirety of Church Lane/Chapel Street, meaning new residents would need to cross the road. Bus stops are located at the entrance to the site. NCC Highways comments – Amber: Subject to improvements required for access.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential uses border the site to the east, south and west. Fields to the north appear to not be in use and bordered by established trees. All appear to be compatible, however it should be noted that the residential development to the east only stretches around halfway up border towards the open countryside.	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	No obvious issues relating to the historic environment. The site is well contained by vegetation and existing development. The site is well related to the townscape with existing development on most sides.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Yes, access already exists on the site. Discussions with Highways would be needed to determine what else would need to be done to accommodate development.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Currently used for a village hall, equipped play area and playing fields. Village hall and play equipment would need to be demolished.	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Neighbouring land use is primarily residential, however this is screened by existing vegetation. To the north the site face open countryside, however this is again screened. No issues with compatibility.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	The site slightly slopes towards the north away from the access. The slope is minor but noticeable.	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	The site boundaries are made up of well-established trees and hedgerows which screen the site from the neighbouring uses almost entirely. The only exception is the access on the south boundary.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Within the site there are no obvious habitats to be protected. The site is maintained as playing fields for the majority and therefore habitat likelihood is low. Habitats and species may be present in the established vegetation along the boundaries.	

<p><i>Utilities and Contaminated Land</i>– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</p>	<p>Utilities already present due to location of village hall. In the north east corner there currently resides a small garage and shipping container of unknown use.</p>	
<p><i>Description of the views</i> (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</p>	<p>Views from the site are limited by the established boundaries and the site being mostly contained by development. Some views to the open countryside can be seen from the northern boundary but these are still heavily screened. Views into the site show mostly the maintained playing fields as well as some views of the village hall and play area.</p>	
<p>Initial site visit conclusion <i>(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)</i></p>	<p>Site has no issues in terms of historic and natural environment and relationship with the townscape. Only issues may be potential contamination in the north east corner and moving of community services.</p>	<p>Green</p>

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Development Boundary		
River Valley		
Open Space		
Conclusion	Development of the site would involve developing a designated area of open space	Amber/Red

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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	X	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments: Information provided by promoter		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No further evidence provided. Self-completed site assessment states that site is viable and deliverable.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. Site would involve replacement and moving of existing village hall, equipped play area and playing fields. Self-completed site assessment also references new pedestrian road crossing to footpath on opposite side of Church Street.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Stated in self-completed site assessment as yes.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Site includes provision of a new village hall, equipped play space and playing fields.	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is well located to existing services and public transport and has existing access. The site is well related to the existing townscape and would not conflict with any neighbouring uses. The site is unlikely to have a negative impact on the natural and historic environment. Development on this site would require the replacement of the village hall, equipped play area and playing fields.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well contained by both existing development and the established vegetation on the boundaries. The site slopes slightly towards the north however this would not be a barrier to development. The site is in a good location for access to local services and public transport. There could be some contamination issues related to the garage and shipping container that reside in the northwest corner.

Local Plan Designations

The site borders the existing Development Limit for Barford but exists outside of it, and therefore is within the countryside. The River Valley designation covers the entire site. Development on this site would result in development on a designated area of open space.

Availability

The site promoter has stated that the site would be available within 5 years.

Achievability

In their self-completed site assessment the promoter has stated that the site is achievable, however no supporting evidence has been provided. There would be costs related to the decommissioning of the existing uses on the site.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is well related to Barford and its existing services and does not present any serious issues relating to the natural or historic environment. The site is well contained within the landscape and access already exists off Chapel Street. There are potential issues with contamination relating to a garage and shipping container in the northwest corner, as well as the decommissioning of the existing village hall. The proposed location of the new village hall and other services would make them less accessible to the existing village, however this may be mitigated through development. The site is recommended as a preferred site for approximately 25 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0055
Site address	Land east of Spur Road and south of Norwich Road, Barnham Broom
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.95 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation – numbers not specified
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Assumed 25/ha
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
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 options constrained by existing hedgerows</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber - Vehicular access at Norwich Road & pedestrian access at Spur Road. Footway to be provided at Norwich Rd frontage & to tie in with ex facility to west of site. New f/w to be provided at Spur Road between site and Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting – sites at the eastern end of the village are well connected by footways and have potential, SN0055 would appear to perform the best in highways terms.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Distance to Barnham Broom Primary School 400 metres along Norwich Road (footway for almost entire length) Distance to bus stop 400 metres Distance to shop / post office 970 metres	
		Distance to Barnham Broom sports pavilion and recreation area 200 metres Distance to The Bell Inn public house 980 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues SNC Env Services Land Quality - Having regard to the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some identified surface water risk in north of site and on highway	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Rural River Valley	

SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Tributary Farmland	x	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
		Settled Plateau Farmland		
		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		B6 Yare Tributary Farmland		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	<p>Would result in intrusion into open countryside.</p> <p>Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land</p> <p>Landscape meeting – significant hedgerows that would need to be assessed in terms of the hedgerow regulations. Significant oak tree on site.</p>		Amber
Townscape	Red	Would introduce estate development into area of village which is not characteristic		Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity		Green
Historic Environment	Red	<p>Non designated heritage assets to east</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>		Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of public open space		Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local road network is rural in character and constrained</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber - Vehicular access at Norwich Road & pedestrian access at Spur Road. Footway to be provided at Norwich Rd frontage & to tie in with ex facility to west of site. New f/w to be provided at Spur Road between site and Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways meeting – sites at the eastern end of the village are well connected by footways and have potential, SN0055 would appear to perform the best in highways terms.</p>		Amber

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential SNC Env Services Amenity - - No issues observed.	Green
------------------------	-------	--	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Impact on setting of non-designated heritage assets by removing their rural setting. Would introduce estate development into part of the village where this is not characteristic	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access should be achievable from either Norwich Road or Spur Road but in either case is likely to require removal of sections hedgerow. Works to extend footway to site are also likely to be required	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential to west, agricultural land to north and south. No compatibility issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is level	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedges on boundaries with both Norwich Road and Spur Road, with some significant trees. Some hedging and trees along southern boundary	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Habitat in trees and hedges on boundaries, ponds on land to east.	
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</i>	Overheard power line crosses site	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Some views across site from public highway, particularly Norwich Road where field access is but generally limited by hedgerow.	
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)	Not considered suitable for allocation due to adverse impact on form and character of settlement and on setting of non-designated heritage assets.	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 (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
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?	Site is in single private ownership	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Not currently marketed.	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes
	Within 5 years	Yes
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	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? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway provision to link to footway along Norwich Road likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site could be of a suitable size to be allocated if reduced. The site is well located in terms of access to services and facilities, although some enhancements to footway provision would probably be necessary. The eastern end of the village has some small cul-de-sacs (Lincoln's Field and Chapel Close), but no larger estate scale development; as such, a smaller allocation (12-15 units) may be more in keeping.

Site Visit Observations

On eastern fringe of village in a part of the settlement where there is no estate development. Also adjacent to non-designated heritage assets whose rural, open setting would be lost by development of the site.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to 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: Reasonable - The site is well located in terms of access to services and facilities in Barnham Broom, although improvements to footways may be necessary. The site is rural in character, with frontage hedges, providing the setting to non-designated heritage assets; consequently, estate scale development is unlikely to be appropriate. However, the site could be considered suitable for a small-scale allocation of up to 25 units, potentially with some units fronting both Norwich Road and Spur Road.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION: The site is located close to the main services within Barnham Broom. Highways access is considered to be achievable. A small site opposite is considered for inclusion within the Settlement Limit and this site could be developed in a sympathetic manner relating to the nearby non-designated heritage assets. The site is recommended for allocation of approximately 15 dwellings broadly consistent with the previous conclusion.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4053
Site address	Land to the east of Stocks Hill, Bawburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation (The site has been promoted for 25 dwellings, plus a potential additional area of land to the east for public open space)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access is available from Stocks Hill NCC HIGHWAYS – Green. NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING COMMENTS – Preferred site - next to the school, existing footpath, suitable width carriageway, within the 20mph limit zone.	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	Primary School located approximately 200m from the site Some local employment opportunities, including Bawburgh golf club. Other services available within neighbouring settlements.	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – The Kings Head approximately 370m from the site Village hall and recreation ground located opposite the site on Stocks Hill	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No anticipated issues	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the 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	No known contamination or ground stability issues SNC ENV PROTECTION - Land Quality: Having regard to the history of the site along with the size of the site and sensitivity of the proposed development it is recommended that a Phase One Report (Desk Study) should be required as part of any planning application. Amenity: The site in question is close to the Village Hall, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh, Norfolk, NR9 3LL. Consideration should be given to the potential impact of the Village Hall on the amenity future residents along with the impact on the future viability of the Village Hall of introducing noise sensitive receptors close to it.	Green

Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1 LLFA – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required. The site is adjacent to a significant flowpath.	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	x
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		A2 – Yare/Tiffey River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land The site forms part of the river valley and offers open views to the west. SNC LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT – The site would require a landscape assessment as it is an open landscape and visible from the SLBPZ. No significant vegetation on the site.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would impact on the existing verdant characteristics of this part of Stocks Hill. This impact may be mitigated through an appropriate design solution	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There are no known impacts upon biodiversity or geodiversity NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Close to Yare Valley CWS. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green

Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Site is located adjacent to the conservation area and may impact views into the conservation area. It is considered that this could be mitigated through appropriate design solutions.</p> <p>HES – Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Development of the site is not considered to impact the functioning of the local road network.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Green.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING COMMENTS – Preferred site - next to the school, existing footpath, suitable width carriageway, within the 20mph limit zone.</p>	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Site offers open views across the River Valley. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access from Stocks Hill. A new access would need to be formed.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agricultural and residential	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Generally flat. The site is in an elevated position at the top of Stocks Hill.	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerows to the north and south. Limited screening on the western edge of the site.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Hedgerows at site boundaries	
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</i>	Electricity lines run along the front of the site and cross the site to the north	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	There are open views across the site looking over the River Valley	
Initial site visit conclusion <i>(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)</i>	Development of the site will impact upon the landscape character of the area. The site is in a prominent position and offers open views across the river valley towards Norwich	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 (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Norwich Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone		
River Valley		
Conclusion	Potential landscape constraints	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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Site is owned by a developer/promoter		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	x	Green
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Site promoter has confirmed that site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Site promoter has confirmed that the site is viable	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	An area of public open space associated with the site has been suggested by the site promoter	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is of a suitable size for allocation. The site relates well to the main settlement and existing services. Development of the site would not significantly encroach into the open countryside however development in this location would be visible in long views towards the site, including from the SBLPZ and River Valley. No highways, heritage or flood constraints have been identified.

Site Visit Observations The site offers open views across the River Valley. The site relates well to the settlement and existing services.

Local Plan Designations River Valley.

Availability Promoter has confirmed the site is available.

Achievability No identified issues.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for development. The site has a strong relationship with the existing built form of the settlement and would benefit from good connectivity. A landscape assessment would be required to determine the landscape impact of development in this location. There would not be a significant impact on existing vegetation on the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION: Following the conclusion of the Regulation 19 Consultation, the site area has been proposed to be increased to 1.9ha in order to reduce the building density on the site. This would minimise the visual impact of the site on the landscape and Conservation Area and be more in keeping with the village location. The site would still be allocated for up to 35 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4020 (Note: The western part of this site overlaps with SN0410REV)
Site address	Land west of Old Yarmouth Road, Broome
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No planning history Site is directly to the east of 2018/0852 which has planning permission for 9 dwellings. Allocation BRO1,
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.67
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocated Site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 – 17 dwellings (approximately 11 dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access would be via Yarmouth Road. There are existing footways at the front of the site. Highways score – Green. No suitable walking route to school. Subject to footway widening at site frontage and south to Broome village.	Green
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	Primary School within Ditchingham is approximately 1.9km from site Village shop Limited employment opportunities Regular bus services operate between Diss and Beccles.	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		2 public houses – 340m to the Artichoke Village Hall – 570m 2 pre-school facilities – Ditchingham and Broome Pre-school within development boundary and Ditchingham Day Nursery outside of the development boundary in Belsey Bridge Road. Recreation ground within Ditchingham	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste water infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, electricity and foul drainage available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within 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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues. Minerals & Waste – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then 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, it should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1 LLFA score – Green	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	x
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Waveney river valley Site is grade 3 agricultural land	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is located within the Waveney River Valley	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Proposal would extend the existing settlement to the east. Linear development would reflect the surrounding built form. Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Concerns about the continued linear expansion of the settlement. Development getting ever closer to Ellingham and will be visible from countryside and footpath to NE/possibly south. At some point in terms of settlement growth it may be considered preferable in urban design and access terms to start to cluster	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development could be mitigated NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ Close to Broome Heath Pit SSSI, LNR, CWS. Potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not impact upon any designated heritage assets Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green HES score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	No known impacts within the local transport network which would affect delivery CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Green

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential located to the west. Agricultural to the north and south.	Green
------------------------	-------	--	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development is not considered to impact the historic environment. Development on the site would extend the linear development pattern along Yarmouth Road.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Site is accessible from Yarmouth Road. Site is outside of the 30mph limit, which would need to be extended. There are also traffic calming measures in this vicinity. There is an existing footpath along the site frontage.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Site is in an agricultural use.	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Land to the west is under construction for residential development. Site is part of a larger agricultural field.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site slopes upwards to the north from the road.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	No hedgerows or trees within the site.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Site is adjacent residential development which is under construction, so it is presumed that there is utilities connection within the vicinity. Overhead power line crosses the site.	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views across the agricultural field from the east . Provides the gateway into the village from the east.	

<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>Site would be suitable for road frontage development which reflects the existing approval which is under construction. It would however represent further linear development away from the centre of the village.</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 (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valleys		
Internal Drainage Board Area		
Conclusion	Site within river valley	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	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	x
	Within 5 years	
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Statement from promoter confirming deliverability	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	No	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Site owner has confirmed that there are non-known abnormal costs which would affect viability	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability Site is considered to be suitable for residential development along the road frontage.

Site Visit Observations Site forms the gateway to Broome from the east. Residential development in this location would extend the built form away from the village centre. There is a footpath along the site frontage.

Local Plan Designations Site is located within the open countryside, however it is adjacent to the development boundary. Site is located within the river valley.

Availability Site promoter has advised that the site is available.

Achievability No additional constraints have been identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE

The site is considered a reasonable option for additional road frontage development. Consideration should however be given in regard to the continues linear spread of the village to the east away from the main services and facilities.

Note: The western part of this site overlaps with SN4049

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION: Development on this site would extend development into the open countryside, however, it would reflect the existing built form seen on Old Yarmouth Road and could contribute to the area becoming a gateway for the village. The footpath along the site frontage will provide access to local services and facilities, however this will require widening. The Council considers the site suitable for allocation for approximately 15 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0373 / VC DIT1
Site address	Land between Thwaite Road and Tunneys Lane, Ditchingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated. Land directly to the south was allocated as DIT1.
Planning History	Land to the south of this site - 2019/1925 – Residential development for 27 houses
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	5.58ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph = up to 140 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>Access could be achieved from Thwaites Road or Hamilton Way. Tunneys Lane is not considered to be suitable for access.</p> <p>Highways score - Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision. The site is considered to be remote from services so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. Albeit that the network is not considered suitable, accesses could be formed but would require removal of frontage hedges.</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"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	<p>Primary School within Ditchingham is approximately 100metres from the site</p> <p>Village shop</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities</p> <p>Regular bus services operate between Diss and Beccles.</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>2 public houses</p> <p>Village Hall</p> <p>2 pre-school facilities – Ditchingham and Broome Pre-school within development boundary and Ditchingham Day Nursery outside of the development boundary in Belsey Bridge Road.</p> <p>Recreation ground within Ditchingham</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	<p>Waste water infrastructure capacity should be confirmed.</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed mains water, foul drainage and electricity is available at the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the 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>The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues.</p> <p>Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded</p>	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes 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.	
Flood Risk	Amber	Part of the site (to the north east) is located within flood zone 2. This area could be avoided however this would result in a reduction in the size of the site. LLFA to provide technical comment if the site is considered appropriate to progress as a Reasonable Alternative	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>)		Waveney River Valley Site is grade 3 agricultural land	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site forms part of the river valley, however the designation covers all areas outside of Ditchingham and Broome outside of the development boundary.	Amber
Townscape	Green	There is existing residential development to the south and west, however the site would extend further north than the existing built form Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer - Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Any impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is not considered to impact upon the historic environment Senior Heritage & Conservation Officer - Green HES score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	The site would not result in the loss of open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Site is accessible by Hamilton Way, Thwaite Road or Tunneys Lane. Improvements to the local road network may be required.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential development	Green.

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No impact upon the historic environment. The site is surrounded by residential development to the south and west.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be achieved from Hamilton Way. The planning layout for the adjacent development off this lane includes the retention of an access to this site. Tunneys Lane would be unsuitable for access.	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)	Residential to the south and west. The residential development to the south is predominantly single storey bungalows.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site slopes downwards from the north to the south	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	There are existing trees which screen the site from Tunneys Lane. There are also trees to the north of the site, which screen it from the junction of Tunneys Lane and Thwaites Road,	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Trees at boundaries.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Residential properties to the south and west, therefore considered that there is likely to be utilities connections.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are wide views into and across the site	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>Subject to being able to achieve satisfactory access through the proposed development (2019/1925) site is considered to be suitable for development.</p>	<p>Green</p>

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valley		N/A
Housing Allocation DIT1	Located to south of site	N/A
Flood zone 2	Small area of land within flood zone 2 to the north east of the site.	N/A
Conclusion		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 Ownership. Site is in multiple ownership, however the site promoter has confirmed that all site owners support the development.	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?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

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

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered to represent a suitable option for development. It is adjacent existing residential development, and subject to suitable access being provided through Hamilton Way, it is considered a reasonable option for development. Whilst there is a small area of the site which is located within flood zone 2, due to the size of the site it is considered that this could be avoided.

Site Visit Observations

Site is surrounded by existing residential development to the south and to the west. Access can be achieved through Hamilton Way with secondary access available from Thwaites Road.

Local Plan Designations

The site is located within the defined river valley, however this is the same for all land outside the development boundary within Ditchingham.

Availability

The landowner has confirmed that the site is available

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

REASONABLE - The site is significantly larger and could potentially accommodate 35 dwellings, or more if necessary. The site is well related to the existing services and facilities within Ditchingham. No additional constraints have been identified which would affect its delivery. Although, the development of the site is subject to suitable access via the current DIT1 allocation (which has yet to be started) and Waveney Road, and this may limit the total capacity for the site to expand. The preferred site at approx. 1.4ha reflects the aspirations for the plan and would be located to the south of the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

Liaison with the LLFA and the production of a Stage 2 SFRA have confirmed that up to 35 dwellings will be appropriate on this site, but on a slightly larger area (1.56ha) to the south west of the overall site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:

As identified in previous assessments, this site is considered to be able to accommodate more development than initially proposed. Development will need to avoid the areas of flood risk identified in the north eastern part of the wide promoted site. NCC Highways have also confirmed that suitable access can be achieved via Waveney Road/Rider Haggard Way with an increase in the number of dwellings proposed. The Council therefore considers the site appropriate for allocation of approximately 45 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0218
Site address	Land west of Earsham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.46 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation of 80 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified
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:	
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 to the south via The Street (good visibility)</p> <p>Potential constraints on access from hedgerow. Lack of footway immediately adjoining site.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS -Amber</p> <p>Subject to access at south eastern boundary and frontage development. Will require speed limit to be extended and review of speed reducing feature/entry treatment, including existing feature. Footway required at frontage and north eastwards within highway to connect with existing facilities, including crossing facility to connect with ex facility to south east side of The Street. Improve footway at south east side of The Street for its full length south of Milestone Lane to School Road, may need to use some of existing carriageway. Particular pinch between 22 The Street and Old Ale House needs to be resolved.</p> <p>Highways meeting –</p> <p>Long site frontage, so providing a suitable vehicular access should not be a problem (good visibility/ability to set development back to provide a footway). However limited verge to provide a footway from the site to the village. This is the old A143 pre-bypass, and measures to reinforce the 30mph limit may be needed.</p>	Amber
--------------------	-------	---	-------

<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 <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 	Amber	<p>Distance to Earsham Primary School 600 metres along roads with footways (other than immediately adjoining site). Slightly shorter route available through footpath link to Queensway</p> <p>Village 2 buses per day either going to Great Yarmouth or to Diss Nearest bus stop located 150metres from the site, along The Street</p>	
		<p>Distance to village hall 220 metres</p> <p>Distance to playing field 630 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Queens Head public house 200 metres</p> <p>Local employment: care home, small retail businesses</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Capacity tbc AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Access to all key services, except for gas supply. Electricity lines cross the site	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	Amber	Flood Zone 1. Small section to the southern boundary is considered a 'low risk' to surface flooding.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Some identified surface water flood risk on site</p> <p>F & W - Few or no Constraints. Small area of ponding in the 1:1000 year rainfall events as shown in the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. Watercourse not apparent (in relation to SuDS hierarchy if infiltration is not possible). Not served by AW connection.</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley ALC: Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER Acceptable in landscape character terms however the importance of the hedgerow along the site frontage would need to be confirmed	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is well related to existing development in the village	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in close proximity NCC HES – Amber SNC HERITAGE OFFICER – seems fine in Townscape and Heritage terms. A143 is quite well landscaped on south side. There are some views towards the church spire – however these are less important than views from the Waveney Valley to the east	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	No footway along this section of road. Road is of reasonable capacity and offers relatively direct access to A143 NCC HIGHWAYS -Amber	Amber

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green
------------------------	-------	------------------------------	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site could relate well to the existing settlement and is contained in the wider landscape by the A143	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable, but footway link will need to be provided along road into village to connect to existing footway. This appears to be achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Boundary with A143 could require noise mitigation measures. Otherwise residential properties or agricultural land with no compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow along boundary with The Street / Harleston Road. Belt of trees planted on most of A143 boundary. Otherwise largely open	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging on boundaries.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Two overhead power lines bisect site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from A143 as approach site from west and also from Harleston Road	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Part of site adjacent to village could be suitable for allocation for 25 dwellings subject to footway being able to be provided.	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 (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation.	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?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments: The land is currently subject to an Agricultural Tenancy, but possession can be obtained.		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	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? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Will require speed limit to be extended and review of speed reducing feature/entry treatment, including existing feature. Footway required at frontage and north eastwards within highway to connect with existing facilities, including crossing facility to connect with existing facility to south east side of The Street and improvements to footway within village	Amber

<p>Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?</p>	<p>Landowner has acknowledged that there are likely to be policy requirements such as affordable housing provision. Confirmed site to still be viable for proposed use taking into account the policy requirements and CIL.</p>	<p>Amber</p>
<p>Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?</p>	<p>Affordable housing provision and open space</p>	<p style="background-color: #cccccc;"></p>

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site as promoted is too large for an allocation of 12 to 25 dwellings. However, it could be reduced in size. The site is well related to the existing settlement of Earsham and is well linked as it is bounded by the A143 to the north.

Site Visit Observations

Large field adjacent to built up area of village that is severed from the wider landscape by the A143. There is an existing passing place to the south of the site which restricts the speed into the village from the east. There is a 3-wire power cable line which runs across the site. The site appears open within the countryside as views in and out of the site are currently unscreened.

Local Plan Designations

The site is well related to the existing settlement of Earsham and is well linked as it is bounded by the A143 to the north. Outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Earsham.

Availability

The site is promoted by Agent on behalf of Landowner and appears available based on the information provided.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: This site was preferred for allocation on the basis that the site is well related to Earsham village and facilities. Development of the site is subject to achieving a satisfactory access to the south eastern boundary, off The Street. The site benefits from a long site frontage where providing a suitable vehicular access should be sufficient (good visibility/ability to set development back to provide a footway). Whilst development of the site may have impacts upon the landscape and townscape, it has been identified that these could be mitigated. The site is within Flood Zone 1 where a small section to the southern boundary is considered a 'low risk' to surface flooding, given the size of the site it is considered that development is still achievable.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION: Whilst development on the site may have an impact on the landscape and townscape, the impacts could be mitigated through the reduction in size from the original proposal and careful consideration of landscaping and the scale and layout of development. The site relates well to the existing development. The site also benefits from good public transport links to Bungay and its services. Whilst technical consultees have raised some areas for consideration, these have not raised issues that could prevent development from occurring on the site; subject to a suitable pedestrian connection back to the amin village being achievable. For these reasons the site is now considered a preferred site for approximately 25 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4078
Site address	Land south of GIL 1, Gillingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	To the north - Allocated GIL 1 under existing local plan 2019/1013 - Residential development of 22 dwellings, together with associated public open space, access roads, garaging and car parking.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated for residential dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25/1ha
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:	
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 via The Street to the south</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Green Subject to access via GIL1</p> <p>Highways meeting – Hopkins development (currently under construction) appears to offer a suitable access. Hopkins development includes improvement across the site frontage, and clearing back of existing paths to the highways boundary should also improve the situation</p>	Green

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Primary School – immediately north of the site. Service station – 650 meters from site Morrisons – 2000 metres from site (Blyburgate) Within close proximity to Blyburgate	Amber
		Pre-School – 600 meters from site Village hall – 650 meters from site	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No Known constraints	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site is within an area already served by faster available broadband technology.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	Amber	The site is not within an area affected by the ORSTED cable route.	Amber
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk		Flood Zone 2	
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Amber	Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC: Grade 3	Amber
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Detrimental impact on landscape could be mitigated through design and landscape treatment.</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - Landscape caution. Previous issues experienced with the existing allocation GIL1 and significant work was undertaken to agree a suitable landscape scheme given the landscape sensitivities of the site. The site is in close proximity to the Broads (King's Dam) and footpaths run parallel to the south and west of the site. A landscape assessment would need to be undertaken to ensure that neither the Broads or the public routes were adversely impacted. GIL1 has a landscape scheme to the south to ensure the impact of views from these areas are mitigated – this would need to be carried forward if this site did progress.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Potential impact of the character could be mitigated through careful design.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Potential impact on the presence of any protected species, however these could be reasonably mitigated.	
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>No LB within close proximity.</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC HERITAGE OFFICER- No heritage or townscape concerns. It would be further developing a cluster away from the main part of the settlement to the east – however it is around the school so makes sense.</p>	Amber

Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on local network and concerns regarding provision of a suitable and safe access. NCC HIGHWAYS – Green	
Neighbouring Land Uses		Residential to the north – GIL 1	

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Limited. Site is set back behind existing residential development to the north east.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be via the existing residential site GIL 1.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	School located to the north	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively flat.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)		
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?		
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles cross the site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	School to the north View are open to the south – looking southwards to residential dwellings.	

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)		
--	--	--

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
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. Promotor is owner.		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	X	Yes
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	The promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable.	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highways improvement likely to be required – NCC Highways to advise	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No viability information submitted to date.	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified.	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is considered suitable for allocation, subject to access via GIL1 to the north. The site would appear as an extension to the existing allocation which is currently being constructed.

Site Visit Observations

The site is adjacent to the existing GIL 1 allocation which is visible to the east as land is this directly is relatively flat and open.

Local Plan Designations

Countryside

Availability

Land available.

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered a **REASONABLE** option for development, subject to achieving access via GIL1 to the north. Development of the site would be accessed through the exiting GIL1 allocation, (Hopkins development) which is currently under construction, which appears to offer a suitable access. It is recognised that upgrades may be required/numbers restricted and that the highways constraints to be resolvable. It is noted that much of the surrounding area falls within flood zone 2/3, where land immediately to the south of the site falls within this zone. However, the promoter advised that the report produced by Evans Coastal and Rivers in connection with GIL1, identified the land to be in Zone 1 in relation to Flood. Further investigation (FRA) would be required to confirm this prior to allocation. It has also been noted that the boundaries of the site can be adjusted if required, due to same landowner owning surrounding fields. Landscape constraints have been identified, as previously experienced with the existing allocation GIL1, as site is in close proximity to the Broads (King's Dam) and footpaths run parallel to the south and west of the site. A landscape assessment would need to be undertaken to ensure that neither the Broads nor the public routes would be adversely impacted.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION: This site is now subject to a planning application (2022/1993). This application has been submitted for over 40 dwellings with open space being delivered outside of the original boundary of the allocation. Therefore, the Council proposes that the allocation is increased to approximately 40 dwellings to reflect this application.

Reasonable Alternative:

Preferred: Yes

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0444 / VC SPO1
Site address	Land west of Bunwell Road, Spooner Row
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.64 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation (The site promoter has suggested that the site could accommodate between 44 – 61 dwellings, as well as open space)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	At 25dph the site could accommodate up to 91 dwellings The site has been promoted with a density up to 16dph
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>Constraints from hedging, traffic calming features and inside of bend</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Site access likely subject to improvements to continuous frontage footway (2m wide) to connect with existing facilities, c/w widening to 5.5m, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. 2 points of access onto Bunwell Road. Removal of all / most of existing frontage hedge likely. Footway improvements likely around junction with Station Road.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities 	Amber	<p>Distance to Spooner Row Primary School 540 metres</p> <p>Distance to bus service or railway station 390 metres</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
○ Peak-time public transport			
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ café ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Spooner Row village hall 440 metres Distance to Three Boars public house 100 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Sewerage network is likely to require upgrades	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	Amber	North-eastern part in flood zones 2 and 3a, with surface water flood risk along entire length of highway past site.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		B2 Tiffey Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would relate to existing settlement in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land. SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - short length of hedgerow; relatively open site; could achieve something to complement dwellings on the opposite side of Bunwell Road.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Within existing mixed pattern of development. Mix of linear and (new) estate development. SNC SENIOR HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER - a large area and will make the settlement more clustered – however there is an argument that the village should perhaps be becoming more clustered rather continuing long stretches of linear development in terms of being in closer proximity to village services. It could also provide a useful sized public space to also serve existing housing.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed house to south of site HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber.	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		Site access likely subject to improvements to continuous frontage footway (2m wide) to connect with existing facilities, c/w widening to 5.5m, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. 2 points of access onto Bunwell Road. Removal of all / most of existing frontage hedge likely. Footway improvements likely around junction with Station Road.	
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?	Land at risk of flooding to north of site prevents development in part of site that would be most appropriate in townscape terms. Development to south of site would relate to new development in allocation on opposite side of road but would lead undeveloped gap to north and has potential issues in relation to setting of listed building.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Potential constraints on access, however NCC Highways have suggested site could be acceptable subject to footway and carriageway widening, extension of local speed limit and review of associated gateway features. May result in loss of hedging	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north and to east of opposite side of Bunwell Road. Single (listed) residential dwelling to south. Agricultural land to west. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level, slightly higher to south.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on part of highway boundary. Hedge and trees along western boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges and trees, and associated with watercourse to north.	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 existing infrastructure or contamination on site	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from Bunwell Road, particularly to the north where there is no hedge	N/A
<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>Constrained site with northern part not suitable due to flood risk. Southern part of site is therefore detached from existing development to the north, although it does still relate to new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road to the east. Development of this part of the site would involve the loss of part or all of the hedgerow along the highway boundary with the southern part of the site and has potential issues with the setting of the listed building to the south although there is some natural screening. Unlikely to be preferred site but could be a reasonable alternative, subject to views of Senior Heritage and Design Officer</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)
Norwich Policy Area		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?	Site is in single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	The site is under option to a developer/ site promoter	N/A
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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)	Footway improvements, carriageway widening, extension of speed limit and review of associated gateway features would be required by highway authority.	Amber
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 confirmation of viability for a smaller site than they are promoting would be required	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Various identified but as part of a much larger strategic development along with other sites in the village	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

As promoted the site is too large for allocation in accordance with the requirements of the VCHAP however it could be reduced in size. The northern section of the site is within flood zones 2 and 3a therefore development of the site would need to avoid these areas. An estate form development to the south of the site would complement new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road. Development of the site would result in the loss of some hedgerow.

Site Visit Observations

Relatively open field with hedgerow along southern part of highway boundary. Avoiding northern part of site due to flood risk leaves gap between any new development and existing development to the north on this side of Bunwell Road, however development would relate to new development on allocation on opposite side of Bunwell Road to east. Listed building to south does benefit from natural screening but the impact of development would need to be considered.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable subject to avoidance of areas of flood zone 2 and 3a.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for allocation subject to a reduction in the overall site area to meet to the objectives of the VCHAP and to avoid the identified areas of flood zones 2 and 3a within the site (subject to comments of the LLFA). Development would be to the south of the site and would complement the new development on the opposite side of Bunwell Road. Development to the south of the site would result in the loss of hedgerow along the road frontage in order to create a suitable access into the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGUALTION 18:

The site is recommended for allocation for approximately 15 dwellings, broadly consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:

During the Regulation 19 consultation, the site was promoted for a higher number/density than initially recommended by the Council. Whilst this number was considered to be quite high due to the relatively limited services available in the area, as well as potential landscape and townscape

concerns, the Council considers that a slightly higher numbers would be appropriate and would result in a more effective use of land on a relatively well contained site. Therefore, the site is being recommended for approximately 35 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN1057 / VC TAC1
Site address	Land to the west of Norwich Road, Tacolneston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2016/2635 – 3 self-build plots at front of site adjacent Norwich Road – Outline allowed at appeal - extant permission 10/05/21. Only small part of site.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (80 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Predominantly greenfield – part brownfield as the site includes a dwelling and buildings associated with Hill Top Farm

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 to the site is available from Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Subject to 2m wide frontage footway (linking to existing provision to the north) along with suitable crossing to existing facility at east side of Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Meeting: Considered difficult to provide a satisfactory access without losing trees and hedges, particularly if a footway is to be provided on the west side of Norwich Road. Would potentially need a crossing facility to the school – which would help provide a speed calming measure.</p>	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 	Amber	Primary school – 190m from the site Public transport provision with a service to Norwich	
<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 Recreation ground 2 public houses and a takeaway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Waste-water infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that mains water, sewerage and electricity are available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site already in an area served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or the substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1 LFFA – Green. Few or no constraints	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land Development would represent a breakout to the west of the village. This would have a negative impact on the landscape It is not considered that this could be mitigated. SDC Landscape Officer - Impact on townscape through eroding significant gap/green lung between two distinct parts of the settlement.	Red
Townscape	Amber	Development of the site would represent a break-out to the west of the village and not reflect the existing pattern of development. The proposal is considered to have a negative impact on the townscape which is not considered can be reasonably mitigated through design.	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Any impacts of development would be reasonably mitigated – note ponds on existing residential site NCC Ecology - SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. Need to maintain pond connectivity.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	The proposal is not considered to impact on the historic environment. HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of designated open space	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Access would be from the B1113. There are existing footpaths on the opposite side of Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access likely to require removal of frontage hedge. Subject to 2m wide frontage footway (linking to existing provision to the north) along with suitable crossing to existing facility at east side of Norwich Road.</p> <p>NCC Meeting: Considered difficult to provide a satisfactory access without losing trees and hedges, particularly if a footway is to be provided on the west side of Norwich Road. Would potentially need a crossing facility to the school – which would help provide a speed calming measure.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would result in the break-out of development to the west of Tacolneston which does not reflect the form and character of the area. Development of the site would erode a clear gap between the two sections of the settlement.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available from Norwich Road	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural. There are a number of existing farm buildings within the site.	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	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	The western boundary includes a hedgerow adjacent to the public footpath.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	The site is open with views across it. There are significant trees located within the centre of the site which are visible within the landscape. The proposal will result in a break-out of development which would negatively impact on the landscape.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Electricity and telephone wires cross part of the site connecting the existing buildings	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There are open views both within the site and across it to the west.	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>Development of the site would negatively impact on both the landscape and townscape.</p>	<p>Red</p>

Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
TPO	At front of site adjacent to Norwich Road.	N/A
		N/A
		N/A
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	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?	Immediately	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)	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Footway required on the west side of Norwich Road and would potentially need a crossing facility to the school	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that the site is viable but has not provided additional supporting evidence at this time.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	An area of public parkland is proposed to the south-east of the site	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

The site is considered to be excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. The site is located within a gap between two distinctly separate sections of the settlement and would result in the loss of a significant green gap in the townscape. Townscape, landscape and highways concerns have been raised and TPOs are noted along the site frontage.

Site Visit Observations

The site provides open views across the wider countryside. Development would result in a break-out to the west which would not reflect the form and character of the area and negatively impact on the landscape and townscape. It is not considered that this could be mitigated through design.

Local Plan Designations

There are no conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter has advised that the site is available within the plan period.

Achievability

No additional constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is excessive in scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. The site is within a sustainable location and relates well to existing development to the north of the settlement. Development of the site would be limited to the top section of the site only in order to reduce the landscape and townscape impact of new development in this location. Creation of an adequate access would require the removal of existing vegetation and trees along the site frontage and some additional highways safety works may be required to support the development of this site. The trees at the front of the site are subject to TPOs. Consideration would need to be given to the form of development on this site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

Through the Regulation 18 consultation both the areas north and south of the access drive were included for an allocation of up to 20 dwellings. This site included an area which already had permission for three dwellings, on the frontage of the southern part of the site, which needs to be removed from the allocation. The site promoter has provided a site layout which indicates that 25 dwellings can be accommodated, albeit with a mix of units that focuses on one and two bed properties. As such, the site is recommended for allocation of up to 25 units, depending on the mix of units proposed.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:

This site is now subject to a planning application (2023/2234). The application has been submitted for 29 affordable dwellings, which is higher than the proposed allocation, alongside open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure. The application site is larger than the proposed allocation, including land to the southeast facilitating access up to the B1113, making the site approximately 1ha. The Council proposes that the allocation is amended to reflect this application.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0577REVA / VC WIC1 (site also promoted as part of a wider site – SN0577REVB)
Site address	Land to the south of Wicklewood Primary School
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation of 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 off Hackford Road would be constrained due to proximity to junctions. The Green is a constrained country lane NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access would be required to the site via The Green <u>only</u> , widen carriageway to 5.5m to Hackford Road. Provide footway over whole site frontage including suitable pedestrian crossing to north side of road and footway to the school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public 	Amber	Adjacent to Wicklewood Primary School Distance to bus service 230 metres Local employment 1km	

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 		Distance to Wicklewood village hall and recreation area 550 metres Distance to The Cherry Tree public house 230 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Water supply and sewerage infrastructure, including the water recycling centre, may need to be upgraded	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some surface water flood risk on highway and to south of site but should not prohibit development LLFA – Green. Few or no	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		constraints. Standard information required.	

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>)		E3 Hingham – Mattishall Plateau Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Potential intrusion into open elevated landscape.</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER - This is a very exposed site; with careful design it could be a positive addition to the landscape providing a gateway to the village however a poorly designed site would be detrimental to the landscape setting. If this site is allocated it would benefit from specific policy text or a design brief – possibly to consider a lower number of units on the site or the submission of a sketch scheme. The landscape character refers to views towards the Church however whilst these would need to be checked they would not appear to be significant. Wicklewood has a history of substantial hedgerow loss and this could be an opportunity to reinstate lost hedgerow patterns. Tree planting would also be required on the site.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	Main area of existing development is to north of Hackford Road	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No protected sites in close proximity</p> <p>NCC ECOLOGY – Green.</p>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
		SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to priority habitat (buffer suggested). Potential for protected species/habitat, and Biodiversity Net Gain.	
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed building to south HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	The Green is a constrained narrow lane NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Access site via The Green, widen carriageway to 5.5m to Hackford Road. Provide footway over whole site frontage including suitable pedestrian crossing to north side of road and footway to the school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Adjacent to school	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would be slightly detached from main part of village which is to the north of Hackford Road, but would be adjacent to the school which is also to the south of Hackford Road. There is some further residential development to the south of Hackford Road along Milestone Lane to the west	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways advise that access should be from The Green.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Adjacent to school, with residential on opposite side of Hackford Road to north. Otherwise agricultural. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries with highway are open. Boundaries for REVA option would involve creating new boundaries within larger field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Little habitat. Some hedging on boundary with school.	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 existing infrastructure / contamination	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is open with views across site from The Green and Hackford Road. Potential views from Milestone Lane.	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>Although development would result in some intrusion into landscape, the site is well related to the school.</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?	Site is in private ownership	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?	Within 5 years	Green
Comments:		Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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)	NCC Highways require footway across whole site frontage and to the school and suitable pedestrian crossing	Amber
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	

Part 7 - Conclusion

Suitability

This site forms a smaller parcel within a larger site that is also being promoted (SN0577REVB). This site is of a suitable size for allocation and whilst the site promoter has provided a suggested location for this site, it has also been confirmed that there would be flexibility in terms of its location with the overall landholding. The site has been assessed on the basis of the information submitted at this time. The site is within a prominent location within the landscape but is well connected to the local services, including the local primary school. There are no heritage concerns and it is considered that the issues raised by highways could be successfully addressed.

Site Visit Observations

Site with open boundaries in large open landscape. Adjacent to school. Some precedent for development to south of Hackford Road, but would have some level of intrusion into open countryside.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

This site is considered to be a reasonable option for allocation. The site is in a prominent location within the local landscape however with careful design it could enhance the gateway to the village. A Design Brief may be required for this site to ensure appropriate design. The site is well connected to the settlement and highways matters could be reasonably addressed through the development of the site.

UPDATED CONCLUSION POST-REGULATION 18:

Due to the open aspect of this site and the need to create both a 'village green' to the front (northeast) and a more sensitive boundary with the wider countryside (to the south and west), a revised site layout has been prepared by the site promoter, on a larger footprint. Otherwise, the site remains recommended for allocation for up to 30 dwellings, consistent with the Regulation 18 consultation.

UPDATED CONCLUSION FOR FOCUSED REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION:

The Landscape Visual Assessment for the amended site boundary identified that the impact on the landscape will be broadly similar to that of the previous site and will in fact follow a more natural boundary to the south. The increase in the site area also means that a slight increase in the number of dwellings being proposed would not result in any material detrimental effects. Therefore, the Council proposes the site is appropriate for allocation of approximately 40 dwellings.

Preferred Site: Yes
Reasonable Alternative:
Rejected: