

# Bawburgh Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

## Contents

SN0002SL .....	3
SN0015 .....	11
SN3032 .....	19
SN4053 .....	28
SN4071 .....	36

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0002SL
<b>Site address</b>	Land to the east of the Brambles, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	No relevant planning history
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.2ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension</b>	Settlement Limit Extension  (The site has been submitted single dwelling)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	1 dwelling would equate to 1dph  22 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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 to the site is via Stocks Hill  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Ok, subject to satisfactory access visibility.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School – 280m from the site. The school playing field backs on to the site  Some local employment opportunities, including Bawburgh golf club.  Other services available within neighbouring settlements.	
		Public House – The Kings Head – approximately 300m from the site  Village hall and recreation ground – approximately 50 from the site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber

Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity available to 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	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>SNC ENV PROTECTION</b> – Green. 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.  Amenity: - No significant issues noted.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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/Tiffany Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Grade 3 agricultural land  Site forms part of the rear garden to the Brambles. The site is screened from the wider landscape by existing boundary features.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Development would be located to the rear of the existing property and represent backland development. This would not reflect the form and character of development within the area.	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There are no known biodiversity or geodiversity concerns.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	The site is located within the conservation area and development has the potential to impact upon this. This may be mitigated through appropriate design.  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Development of the site is not considered to impact the functioning of the local road network.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green. Ok, subject to satisfactory access visibility.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Site is in the conservation area and would be backland development	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access is available via Stock Hills	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Residential garden – backland development	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential to the north, agricultural to the south, primary school playing field to the east	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Generally flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerows	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Hedgerows surround site	
<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>	No	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into and out of the site are limited by virtue of the existing site boundaries	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> <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>	Site is located to the rear of existing property. Development of the site would introduce backland development which would not reflect the form and character of the area.	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)
Conservation Area		
Development Boundary	Western half of site including existing property	
Norwich Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone		
Norwich Policy Area		
River Valley		
Open Countryside	Eastern half of site	
<b>Conclusion</b>	There are a number of landscape designations which affect this site	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 – proposal seeks a self build plot for the existing owners of The Brambles.	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	x
	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>	Promoter has confirmed that the 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?	The site is being promoted for a single dwelling only and affordable housing is not applicable	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site has been promoted for a single dwelling only and has therefore been considered as a settlement limit extension. The site lies adjacent to the existing settlement limit boundary but would be backland development. No highways issues have been identified at this time. The site is within a number of landscape designations.

**Site Visit Observations** The site is located to the rear of The Brambles. Development of the site would represent backland development which would not reflect the form and character of the area.

**Local Plan Designations** The site is partially located within the existing Settlement Limits, is within the Conservation Area and the Landscape Bypass Protection Zone. The site is also within the River Valley designation.

**Availability** Site is available for development

**Achievability** Site is considered to be achievable.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option as an extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is located to the rear of The Brambles and any development in this location would constitute uncharacteristic backland development. The site also lies within a number of landscape designations, including the Conservation Area.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN0015
<b>Site address</b>	Land at New Road, Bawburgh
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	2018/2368 – Erection of 1 self build dwellings – dismissed on appeal 2015/0140 – Erection of bungalow and garage – dismissed on appeal
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.7ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Allocation
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	17 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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 site is available from New Road</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> Sub-standard highway network, frontage too narrow to form a safe access and no footway to village facilities.</p>	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School – approximately 850 m from the school, however there are no footpaths</p> <p>Some local employment opportunities, including Bawburgh golf club.</p> <p>Other services available within neighbouring settlements.</p>	

<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – The Kings Head – approximately 700m.  Village hall and recreation ground – approximately 870m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water and electricity available to the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Broadband upgrades under consideration	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Site is unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known ground stability or contamination issues  <b>SNC ENV PROTECTION</b> – Green. 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. Amenity: The site in question is close to land used for pig and poultry rearing. Possible amenity issues arising.  <b>NCC M&amp;W</b> – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses confirmation that development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green

Flood Risk	Amber	Fluvial and surface water flood risk located at the southern boundary of the site, incorporating the access.	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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)		A2: Yare/Tiffany Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Grade 3 agricultural land  The site is relatively well screened however development of the site would extend the built form into an undeveloped part of Bawburgh which would result in harm to the landscape which could not easily be mitigated.	Red
Townscape	Green	Site is separate from the main built form of the village	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	There are no known biodiversity or geodiversity issues	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Development of the site is not considered to impact the historic environment  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Existing road network is narrow and there are no public footpaths  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Sub-standard highway network, frontage too narrow to form a safe access and no footway to village facilities.	Red

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential	Green
------------------------	-------	-------------	-------

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	The site is separate from the main areas of the settlement and would have an adverse impact on the existing pattern of development.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access is available from New Road. New Road does not have public footpaths.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Residential garden	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential and agricultural	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Land rises to the north	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerows at the front of the site screen it from the road and at the rear.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Hedgerows at the site boundaries There are also a number of trees at the front of the site	
<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>	Oil pipeline crosses the site to the rear. Development of the site could avoid this area.	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into and out of the site are limited by virtue of the existing boundary treatments	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is detached from the village with poor connectivity to services and facilities. There are no public footpaths connecting the site to 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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> )	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
High pressure pipeline	East Carlton - Bowthorpe	
Oil Pipeline		
Norwich Southern Bypass Protection Zone		
Norwich Policy Area		
River Valley		
Open Countryside		
Flood Zone 2	Southern section of site covering access	
Flood zone 3	Small area at access road	
<b>Conclusion</b>	A number of landscape designations apply to this site	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>	Promoted has confirmed that the 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>	Improvements would be required to the local road network including footpath provision	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed the site is viable	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is of a suitable size for allocation but is remote from the existing settlement limits and main areas of development within the village. Highways constraints have been identified, including poor connectivity. A pipeline has been identified as crossing the site to the north and a number the site also lies within a number of landscape protection designations.

**Site Visit Observations** The site is disconnected from the village and is not considered a suitable location for development in this regard

**Local Plan Designations** The site is located within the River Valley. An oil pipeline crosses the site boundary to the north.

**Availability** Site promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

**Achievability** No additional constraints identified

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for allocation. The site is located outside of the main built form of the village and has poor connectivity to the services and facilities within the village. A number of highways constraints have been identified and the site lies within a number of landscape protection designations. The separation of the site from the main areas of the settlement would increase the detrimental landscape impact of development in this location.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2020

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

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN3032
<b>Site address</b>	Land to the west of Harts Lane, Bawburgh
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	2018/0114 – Erection of two dwellings - Refused
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	2.9ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension</b>	Both  (The site has been assessed as an allocation due to its overall size however it has been promoted for 4 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	4 dwellings equates to 1.3dph  72 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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	Yes – approx. 50% of the site. This is the western section of the site. The eastern section of the site is not within flood zone 3b.
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 Harts Lane  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Suitable access can be formed with complete removal of frontage hedge to provide adequate visibility splays, 5.5m wide road and footway. However, a continuous footway from the site to school is not possible.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Primary School  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  Village hall and recreation ground	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water, sewerage and electricity available to 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	No known contamination or ground stability issues  <b>SNC M&amp;W</b> – The site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber/Red	The western part of the site is within flood zone 3b so has a red score. The eastern section of the site is predominantly flood zone 2 and 3a. [Consultee comments required should the site progress further]	Amber/Red
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	x
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
		A2: Yare/Tiffey Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	Grade 3 agricultural land  A frontage area of the site only has been suggested by the site promoter as being suitable for development. This would significantly reduce the landscape impact of development in this location.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is currently screened from the wider settlement by the existing hedgerow. This forms part of the verdant rural character of this section of Bawburgh. Development would have an impact upon the townscape however it may be possible to mitigate this in part through an appropriate linear/frontage pattern of development only .	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development will require the removal of a section of hedgerow, which has previously been assessed as important under the hedgerow regulations.  The site borders the County Wildlife Site (currently not publicly accessible)	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	The site is located adjacent to the conservation area. Development of the site may impact upon views into the conservation area.  <b>HES</b> – Amber	Amber

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Development of the site would not impact the functioning of the local road network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> Suitable access can be formed with complete removal of frontage hedge to provide adequate visibility splays, 5.5m wide road and footway. However, a continuous footway from the site to school is not possible.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and Agricultural	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	The site is adjacent to the conservation area. Linear pattern of development adjacent to and opposite the site.	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access is available from Harts Lane	
<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>	Residential and agricultural	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site slopes down from the road towards the river valley	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Site is bounded by hedgerows	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Site is located within the river valley and slopes down towards the river. Development of the site could impact upon the landscape depending on the scale of development.	
<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>	No	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into and out of the site are limited by virtue of the existing site boundaries.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> <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 would have a detrimental impact upon the landscape due to the loss of the roadside hedgerow.	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		
Norwich Policy Area		
River Valley		
County Wildlife Site	Located forms the western boundary of the site	
Conservation Area	Located directly to the south of the site.	
Flood Zone 2	This covers the majority of the site	
Flood Zone 3	This covers a large proportion of the site	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site lies within a number of landscape protection designations, as well as being subject to other 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>	No		
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

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Promoter has confirmed the 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>	Off-site highway works would like be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	The site promoter has acknowledged viability of the site however affordable housing would depend on the scale of development	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The promoter has suggested that development of the site would enable access to a private CWS.	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is of significant size and has been considered as both an allocation and an extension to the existing settlement limits. The site is in close proximity to the existing settlement limits. The site promoter has indicated a low number of dwellings in a linear pattern of frontage development only. Development on the site would be heavily influenced by the identified constraints both on and adjacent to the site. A linear pattern of development would follow the existing form of development in evidence however the scale proposed would under-utilise the available land. A number of on-site constraints have been identified, including areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3, its River Valley setting and its position within the Landscape Bypass Protection Zone. There is also a County Wildlife Site to the east of the site. Highways concerns have also been noted.

**Site Visit Observations** The site forms a key part of the verdant rural character of the area. Development of the site would therefore impact upon both the townscape and landscape. Hart's Lane is relatively narrow. Linear development only in evidence around the site. Proposal for frontage development would echo the form of development but at a different scale to the existing built form.

**Local Plan Designations** Parts of the site are located within flood zones 2 and 3. The site is also within a River Valley, adjacent to a CWS and within the Landscape Bypass Protection Zone.

**Availability** Promoter has confirmed that the site is available.

**Achievability** No additional constraints identified.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for both allocation and as an extension to the existing settlement limit. Large portions of the site are within flood zones 2 and 3, restricting the developable area of the site. The site is located within the River Valley and forms a key part of the verdant rural character of the area. Development of the site would impact upon the townscape and landscape. Highways concerns have been raised and development of the site would also require the removal of a significant hedgerow along the front of the site which is a particular feature of the existing streetscene.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2021

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

### Part 1 Site Details

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

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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	<p>Access is available from Stocks Hill</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING COMMENTS</b> – Preferred site - next to the school, existing footpath, suitable width carriageway, within the 20mph limit zone.</p>	Green
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School located approximately 200m from the site</p> <p>Some local employment opportunities, including Bawburgh golf club.</p> <p>Other services available within neighbouring settlements.</p>	

<p><i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>oVillage/ community hall</li> <li>oPublic house/ cafe</li> <li>o Preschool facilities</li> <li>o Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		<p>Public House – The Kings Head approximately 370m from the site</p> <p>Village hall and recreation ground located opposite the site on Stocks Hill</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	<p>Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed</p> <p>AW advise sewers crossing the site</p>	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	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p><b>SNC ENV PROTECTION -</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Green

Flood Risk	Green	Site is in flood zone 1  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required. The site is adjacent to a significant flowpath.	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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/Tiffany 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.  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT</b> – 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  <b>NCC ECOLOGY</b> – 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><b>HES</b> – 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><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS MEETING COMMENTS</b> – 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	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> <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		
<b>Conclusion</b>	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:		

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? (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 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
<p><b>Suitability</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b> The site offers open views across the River Valley. The site relates well to the settlement and existing services.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b> River Valley.</p> <p><b>Availability</b> Promoter has confirmed the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b> No identified issues.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Preferred Site:</b> Yes  <b>Reasonable Alternative:</b>  <b>Rejected:</b></p>

Date Completed: 11 January 2021

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

### Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4071
Site address	Land to the east of Harts Lane and South of Long Lane, Bawburgh
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	The site has been promoted for 25 dwellings which equates to 12.5dph  25dph would equate to 50 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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	<p>Access is proposed via Harts Lane</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green. Does not appear to be feasible to provide continuous footway to village centre &amp; school.</p> <p><b>UPDATED HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> - Harts Lane has an intermittent footpath to the south of the site - however there are relatively wide verges with potential to extend the path (albeit on alternate sides of the road). However, this site is the opposite side of the bridge to the school and village hall, therefore not supported by highways.</p>	Green

Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Primary School – 800m. New footpath provision would be required to link with the existing</p> <p>Some local employment opportunities, including Bawburgh golf club.</p> <p>Other services available within neighbouring settlements.</p>	
		Green	<p>Public House – The Kings Head – 400m</p> <p>Village hall and recreation ground</p>
Utilities Capacity	Green	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there is mains water sewerage and electricity 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	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	<p>Site is in flood zone 1</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard information required.</p>	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
		Rural River Valley	x

SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Tributary Farmland		
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland		
		Settled Plateau Farmland		
		Plateau Farmland		
		Valley Urban Fringe		
		Fringe Farmland		
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		A2 – Yare/Tiffany River Valley		
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land</p> <p>Site forms the western half of a larger agricultural field. There are open views from the north towards the south, development would have an impact upon landscape character however this impact may be reduced through appropriate design solutions</p> <p><b>SNC LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT</b> - Not acceptable in landscape terms. The site is within a River Valley as well as the Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and is more prominent in the landscape due to the rising level of the land. Also likely to be hedgerow issues on this site.</p>	Red	
Townscape	Amber	<p>Existing development to the east of Harts Lane is linear with road frontage with large rear gardens. Development has the potential to impact upon the townscape, but this may be mitigated through appropriate design</p>	Amber	

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Development of the site would require the removal of a section of hedgerow adjacent to facilitate access and visibility splays. It is considered that the impact could be mitigated</p> <p><b>NCC ECOLOGY</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Close to Yare Valley CWS. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Development of the site is not considered to impact the historic environment.	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Development is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the local road network however the bridge could be a constraint</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green. Does not appear to be feasible to provide continuous footway to village centre &amp; school.</p> <p><b>UPDATED HIGHWAYS MEETING</b> - Harts Lane has an intermittent footpath to the south of the site - however there are relatively wide verges with potential to extend the path (albeit on alternate sides of the road). However, this site is the opposite side of the bridge to the school and village hall, therefore not supported by highways.</p>	Red
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 forms a gateway into the settlement. Linear development closest to the site. Impact on townscape due to changing land levels on the site?	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	There is an existing field access on Harts Lane. This would need to be widened.	
<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>	Residential to the south and west. Agricultural to the east.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Generally flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerows to the north and west. Site forms part if a larger agricultural field so there are no site boundaries to the east.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	There are hedgerows along the northern and western 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>	No	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	There are limited views into the site from Harts Lane or Ling Lane by virtue of the hedgerows. There are open views across the site to the east	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would impact upon the landscape and townscape.	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)
Archaeology		
Norwich Southern Bypass Land Protection Zone		
Norwich Policy Area		
River Valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Some conflicting landscape 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		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Site is not currently being marketed		
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>	Promoter has confirmed that the 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>	Footpath improvements would be required to link with existing provision to the south	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that there are no known viability issues	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is excessive in size but could be reduced in scale to meet the objectives of the VCHAP. A linear form of frontage development would reduce dwelling numbers and complement the existing built form. The site forms an entrance site to Bawburgh and is located within the River Valley and Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone. Creation of an adequate access into the site would result in the loss of hedgerow and significant highway concerns have been identified about the connectivity of the site, resulting from the narrow bridge in the village centre. It is not considered possible to overcome this issue at this time.

**Site Visit Observations** There are open views across the site to the east. This site forms a gateway into Bawburgh from the east. Development of the site would have a detrimental impact upon the landscape and townscape. Development would also require the removal of a section of hedgerow.

**Local Plan Designations** Site is located within the River Valley and the SBLPZ

**Availability** Site is available

**Achievability** No additional constraints identified

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for allocation. Development of the site would have a negative impact upon both the landscape and townscape, particularly having regard to the sites location at a gateway into Bawburgh from the east. Development of the site would also require the removal of a section of hedgerow to facilitate access and footpaths and significant highways concerns have been raised about the connectivity of the site to the facilities within the village due to the narrow form of the bridge in the village. It is not considered that the constraint could be reasonably addressed.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 7 January 2021