

Bressingham Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN2052	3
SN2053	10
SN2054	17
SN2056	25
SN2057	32
SN2079	39
SN3010	47
SN3019SL	54
SN3020	63
SN3023SL	71
SN3036	78
SN3037	85
SN3038	92
SN4026	100
SN4033	108
SN4036	115
SN4037	123

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2052
Site address	East of The Street, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.84 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 18 dph (site promoted for 10-15 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:	
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	Field access off The Street. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable. Access onto private drive on northern side. Confirm whether any access rights exist here. Highways score – Amber. 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. No safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	3km walk to primary school and shop in Bressingham. No continuous footpath No bus services near site	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		500m walk to church – no footpath No other core services within 1800m of site (all in Bressingham)	Red
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to 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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified SW flow path running across site	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	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>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC Grade unknown	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is visually contained so detrimental impacts could reasonably be mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site is small in scale so detrimental impacts could reasonably be mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Historic Environment	Green	Development could impact on setting of nearby LBs HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm suitability of network. Impact on local road network could be reasonably mitigated. CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS WITH THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Development likely to impact on open setting of LB to south. Seek comment from technical officer if the site is to be considered as a reasonable alternative	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Existing field access onto narrow lane. Visibility may not be achievable close to bend. NCC to confirm visibility and impact on network	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Paddock	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential/grazing	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerow to north and east. Fencing separates further paddock to south	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Intermittent trees along northern boundary. Wide ditch along northern boundary	
<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>	Pumping station adjacent to eastern boundary	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Visually contained site. Most prominent view into site is from road	
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>	Site is remote from core services. Narrow lanes, lack of continuous footpath or street lighting creates hostile walking environment. Significant SW flood risk identified. Development likely to harm setting of heritage assets. Not suitable for allocation	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?	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
	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 advising same	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site is remote from core services. Narrow lanes, lack of continuous footpath or street lighting creates hostile walking environment. Significant SW flood risk identified. Development likely to harm setting of heritage assets. Not suitable for allocation.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Within open countryside; no conflicting Local Plan designation</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE. The site has limited access to services and facilities. Site has significant surface water flood risk issues with flow path running across site. Potential harm to open setting of nearby listed buildings. Concerns over highway impacts.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2053
Site address	Adjoining Pond Farm, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.09 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	7 dph (promoted for 10-15 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:	
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	Field access off The Street. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable. Highways score – Amber. 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. No safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	3km walk to primary school and shop in Bressingham. No continuous footpath No bus services near site	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		500m walk to church – no footpath No other core services within 1800m of site (all in Bressingham)	Red
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to 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	The site is unlikely to be contaminated and has no known ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified SW flow path running across front of site	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	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>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC Grade unknown	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Historic Environment	Green	Development would cause harm to designated heritage asset to north. Query whether harm could be mitigated – views of the technical officer to be sought if the site is considered to be a reasonable alternative. HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm suitability of network. Impact on local road network could be reasonably mitigated. CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Development likely to harm open and rural setting of LB to north. Seek comment from technical officer if the site is a reasonable alternative	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Existing field access onto narrow lane. Likely to achieve adequate visibility. NCC to confirm	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agriculture	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agriculture and residential	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Ditch and intermittent trees along highway frontage. Hedge along northern boundary. Open to west – part of larger parcel.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along northern boundary	
<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>	Pumping station close to southern boundary	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Open in views from west and prominent in views along highway	
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>	Site is remote from core services. Narrow lanes, lack of continuous footpath or street lighting creates hostile walking environment. Significant SW flood risk identified. Development likely to harm setting of heritage assets and landscape. Not suitable for allocation	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?	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
	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 advising same	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Limited off-site highway improvements may be required. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site is remote from core services. Narrow lanes, lack of continuous footpath or street lighting creates hostile walking environment. Significant SW flood risk identified. Development likely to harm setting of heritage assets. Not suitable for allocation.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Within open countryside; no conflicting Local Plan designations/</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE. The site has limited access to services and facilities. Site has significant surface water flood risk issues with flow path running across site. Potential harm to open setting of nearby listed buildings. Concerns over highway impacts.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 17 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2054
Site address	Land east of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history on the site – refusal of pp for new dwelling adjacent to the north of the site 2019/0172
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.85ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation for an unspecified no. of residential units
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	88 dwellings (at 25 dwellings/ha) (NB. The site was promoted for an unspecified number of 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:	
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	GNLP HELAA previously scored as Amber due to need for highway improvements and footpath provision Highways score - Amber. The site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school. Although this would require the removal of all adjacent trees and hedges.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Local services include: school, public house, village hall Primary School – approximately 274m Shop – approximately 670m	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – approximately 500m Village Hall, Playground – approximately 670m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Fibre technology is already available in this area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination on site or ground stability issues identified	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Not on site NB: Public comments during earlier stages of the consultation refer to flooding of the site, as well as School Road. To be checked with technical consultee comments as appropriate if the site is to be considered 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>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	Y
		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 Tributary Farmland ALC value – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is prominent within the landscape	Amber

Townscape	Amber	The site is separated from the settlement by a parcel of undeveloped land (SN4036). The site is located on a key approach into Bressingham in the open landscape. If SN4036 is allocated the site would have an improved relationship with the rest of the settlement, although would extend the pattern of development significantly.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	LB to the north of the site (Pine Tree Cottage). Impact to be checked with technical consultee if the site is to be considered as a reasonable alternative. HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of recreation space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	GNLP HELAA previously scored the site as an amber rating Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school. Although this would require the removal of all adjacent trees and hedges.	Amber
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>	<p>LB (Pine Tree Cottage) is adjacent to the northern boundary of the site however there appears to be significant vegetation along this boundary which would reduce the impact of development on the setting of this LB</p> <p>As promoted the site is of a scale that would have a negative impact on the townscape setting as it would be out of keeping with the area. If the site size is reduced development to the north of the site would be preferable, subject to the impact on the LB.</p>	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access could be achieved from School Road; a partial footpath exists on the opposite side of the road so some provision would be required	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Access onto the land was not possible however it appears to be scrub land	
<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>	Access onto the site was not possible however, generally, the land rises to the north along School Road	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	There are hedges and trees along the site frontage and vegetation on the site – query whether the hedgerow should be classified as an ‘important hedgerow’?	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Access onto the site to check this was not possible	
<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	

<p><i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i></p>	<p>Views into the site are restricted by the existing vegetation along the boundary however, as with other sites promoted along School Road, this forms one of the keys approaches into Bressingham</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>The site is well connected and access should be achievable. However, development of this site would have a substantial landscape impact due to its proposed scale and separation from the existing built form. The loss of the existing boundary treatment would also have an adverse impact on the local landscape as this forms part of the rural setting of the village. Should a smaller scale site be promoted, development should be concentrated to the north and in a linear pattern.</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)
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>No conflicting constraints identified</p>	<p>Green</p>

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>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years		
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years	Y	Amber
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		Amber

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 site promoter has confirmed availability of the site. No additional evidence submitted at this stage.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Some highways works may be required – to be identified by NCC Highways	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

As promoted the scale of development exceeds the village cluster thresholds however the site would be suitable for development if a smaller site boundary was agreed, subject to the comments of technical consultees particularly the LB officer.

Site Visit Observations

The site is well connected but in its current form does not relate particularly well to the existing development. The promoted site is of significant size – a smaller boundary may be acceptable – however there would be a landscape impact as the site forms part of the gateway into the centre of the village. The loss of the existing frontage boundary would be regrettable as this forms part of the setting of the local landscape.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP constraints identified

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable however confirmation should be sought that the site remains viable with a smaller site boundary

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Has a good relationship to services and facilities, but due to its scale and relationship to the existing settlement, the development of the site would have a significant detrimental effect in terms of landscape and the form and character of the area (townscape).

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18th June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2056
Site address	Land at Fersfield Common, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.72ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for up to 10x dwellings (but subject to site constraints could accommodate a greater number)
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	Site has frontage; no local footpaths 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. No safe walking route to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	The site is poorly connected to any services and is approximately 3.5km from Bressingham	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		(See above)	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Infrastructure availability to the site to be confirmed	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Proposed delivery area	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Approximately half the site is in an area at risk of surface water flooding, including at 1 in 30 year risk	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	YES
		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 Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	ALC – Grade 3 The site is located in an open landscape with limited and sporadic built form in the immediate area only – development in this location would be prominent and have a harmful impact on the local landscape	Amber

Townscape	Amber	Minimal development in the surrounding area therefore the development would have an adverse impact on the townscape	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact upon protected species but the impact could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	LB to the west of the site HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Surrounding road network is limited CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL HIGHWAY NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site visit not undertaken as the site was ruled out at the HELAA stage of the site assessment process

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

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	None identified	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private		
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:		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>	No – additional evidence not requested/ submitted but the promoter has advised deliverability	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highways works likely	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site would not represent sustainable development due to its remote location and distance from the local services. It is likely that local improvements would be required to the road network to allow safe vehicular movements. Development in this location would have an adverse impact on the local landscape due to the relatively limited built form in the immediate area. A significant proportion of the site is also shown to be at risk of surface water flooding, and whilst a smaller area of the site could be developed the other constraints identified would outweigh this.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations The site was considered an unreasonable alternative at the desktop assessment stage therefore a site visit was not undertaken</p> <p>Local Plan Designations There are no conflicting LP designations</p> <p>Availability The land is considered to be available</p> <p>Achievability The land is considered to be achievable</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE due to its unsustainable location. The site has limited access to services and facilities. Site is subject to surface water flood risk issues. Development of the site would have an adverse effect on local landscape due to limited built form in the immediate area. Concerns over suitability of local highway network.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 12th June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2057
Site address	North of A1066, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.2 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25dph = 30 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)	
Is the site located in, or does the site include:	
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	Existing access to A1066, also serving adjacent barns. NCC to confirm acceptability of enlarged access onto main road and impact on network CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	900m walk to primary school Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall, public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to 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 ground stability issues but site is within hazardous installations consultation zone	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Small area of identified SW flood risk in south-west corner.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	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>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC Grade unknown	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Development would cause harm to designated heritage assets to east and south (church). Query whether harm could be mitigated HES – Amber score	Amber/red?
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber/red?
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Development likely to cause harm to setting of LB and curtilage-listed barns on eastern boundary and to St Johns Church to south. Seek comment from technical officer if the site is to be considered as a Reasonable Alternative	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Existing field access from main road. NCC to assess intensification of use of access onto A1066	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agriculture	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agriculture/residential	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat site but elevated from road	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerow (including trees) to south, west and east. Northern boundary open to larger parcel of land	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along southern and eastern boundaries.	

<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)	Site is within hazardous installations consultation zone. Consult HSE if the site is to be considered as a Reasonable Alternative.	
<i>Description of the views</i> (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site visually contained from views along main road. Open in views to and from site to north	
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>)	Relatively well connected to existing services. Development likely to be constrained by heritage issues, highways and river valley designation so unlikely to achieve sufficient level of development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley	Site frontage only. Policy DM4.5 relevant	
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	
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
	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>	Statement from promoter advising same. No further evidence requested at this time.	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm re. highways requirements.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

It is constrained by heritage issues, highways issues and the River Valley designation.

Site Visit Observations Relatively well connected to existing services. Development likely to be constrained by heritage issues , highways and river valley designation so unlikely to achieve sufficient level of development. Not suitable for allocation

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside. Partially within designated river valley

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is relatively well connected to existing services. However, development will be constrained by the need to protect the setting of nearby listed buildings, potential highways issues and the landscape concerns due to its position in a designated River Valley. Site is unlikely to achieve a level of development that would make it suitable for allocation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2079
Site address	Land at Fersfield Road/ Folly Lane, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land - unallocated
Planning History	2006/1396 – outline pp refused for 9x dwellings (limited information submitted to support the proposal but considered to be a sustainable location for development)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.94ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation (but promoted for 9 dwellings only and would therefore be considered as a SL extension if an increased number of dwellings is not suitable on the site)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 9 dwellings but could potentially accommodate a greater number subject to onsite constraints
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	<p>Site frontage to Fersfield Road, a single track road which widens along the frontage of the site; site is in close proximity to crossroads; existing footpath on opposite side of Fersfield Road ; footpath on opposite side of Fersfield Rd</p> <p>Highways score – Amber. Subject to highway conditions in planning application to widen carriageway and provide a footway to the school.</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	Amber	<p>Access to services including primary school, public house, village hall</p> <p>Primary School – approximately 300m</p> <p>Public House – approximately 1000m</p> <p>Shop – approximately 495m</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall, Playground – approximately 495m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Available – no known issues. The site promoter advises all available with the exception of a gas supply to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	The site has no identified contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small area of surface water flooding to west of site NB. Earlier public consultation comments refer to surface water run off passing over the site from the land to the north	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	Yes
		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 Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC – Grade 3 The site is next to and opposite existing development which would mitigate its impact on the landscape setting	Green

Townscape	Green	Continuation of the existing built form – appears to be a ‘rounding off’ of the settlement	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but the impact could be reasonably be mitigated. The site is bound on two sides by highway.	Green
Historic Environment	Green	War memorial opposite the site HES – Amber score	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Impact of crossroads on highway safety to be assessed by highways Highways score – Green. Subject to highway conditions in planning application to widen carriageway and provide a footway to the school.	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>	No significant impact on the historic environment (although note war memorial opposite the site)	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access would be achievable onto Fersfield Road however would need highways comments regarding proximity to the crossroads; Fersfield Road widens closest to the crossroads and there is an existing pedestrian footpath on the opposite side of the road	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural land	
<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>	The site rises to the north fairly significantly –when approaching the site in a southerly direction along Folly Lane the existing houses along Fersfield Road are not significantly visible	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Open boundaries around the site on all sides	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Potential ditch along the southern boundary (road frontage) however this was overgrown at the time of the site visit	
<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>	The site is very open and prominent in the surrounding landscape. Development of this site would have an adverse impact on the gateway entrance to Bressingham from Folly Lane, Fersfield Road and School Road	

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>	The site occupies a prominent position within the local landscape and development in this location could have an adverse impact on the surrounding area. The site is well connected and is in a sustainable location.	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)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
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:		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>	No additional evidence requested/ supplied but the site promoter has confirmed deliverability in their submission	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Not anticipated	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><i>Suitability</i></p> <p>Subject to the comments of the technical consultees, in particular highways and the landscape officer, the site is considered suitable for development, potentially of a scale greater than it has been promoted for. Local concerns have previously been raised about the potential for surface water run off towards the existing dwellings to the south of Fersfield Road.</p> <p><i>Site Visit Observations</i></p> <p>The site is prominent within the local landscape due to the typography of the land and development of the site would have an adverse impact on the local landscape. There are no significant existing boundary features. Dwellings opposite the site are a combination of one- and two-storey properties and due to the falling land levels these are less obtrusive in the landscape. Development of this site would create a hard edge to settlement when viewed from School Road, Fersfield Road and Folly Lane – existing views from School Road and Fersfield Road are of tree belts in the distance.</p> <p><i>Local Plan Designations</i></p> <p>No conflicts identified with the Local Plan designations</p> <p><i>Availability</i></p>

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

This site is considered to be achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to UNREASONABLE due to the adverse landscape impact development of this site would have on the local setting. The site is relatively well connected to existing services. However, development will be constrained by the need to protect the setting of nearby listed buildings, potential highways issues and the landscape concerns due to its position in a designated River Valley. Site is unlikely to achieve a level of development that would make it suitable for allocation.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17th June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN3010
Site address	Wyevale Garden Centre
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions relating to previous use as garden centre and associated uses
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.6 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocated site (for residential)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 80 dwellings= 31 dph (25 dph = 65 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

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	Potential access constraints to creating enlarged access and additional movements on A1066. NCC to confirm.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities	Amber	1.2 km walk to primary school – no footpath Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough. Bus stops close to site.	
<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		Public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber

Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		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	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Previous use may result in contamination issues	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Risk of SW flooding in SW section of site	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	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>		B4: Waveney tributary farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have detrimental impact on heritage assets	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated	Amber/red?

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Horticulture/employment. Issues of compatibility could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
------------------------	-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Impact on LB to west should be assessed	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Highway frontage may allow new access. NCC to confirm feasibility of new access and increased movements on A1066	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Existing employment use (garden centre). Loss of employment contrary to local plan policy	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Horticulture/employment. Issues of compatibility could be addressed through design.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Eastern and southern boundaries open to adjoining sites. Intermittent hedgerow and trees to north and west.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along northern boundary	
<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>	Previous use may result in contamination. Overhead lines near eastern side of site.	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Prominent in views from main road and from open land to south and east.	

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>)	Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Loss of employment. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley		
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		
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No		
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	X	
	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 advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability Not considered suitable for allocation due to loss of employment and issues of townscape and landscape in the designated river valley, highways and connectivity. Heritage issues would also constrain development.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Loss of employment. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Within open countryside and designated river valley</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p>

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE. The site is poorly related to core services within the settlement and this is reinforced by the separation resulting from the main road. The site would result in a loss of employment. Development of the whole site would be outside the scale proposed by the VCHAP but smaller scale development would result in piecemeal development in an unsustainable location.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17th June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN3019SL
Site address	Land west of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.49 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	SL extension (but could the site be extended by 0.1ha to allow for it to be considered as an allocation?)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Site promoted for 5-10 dwellings (Site could accommodate 12 dwellings at 25 dwellings/ha)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	On site check required re. footpath provision; road frontage Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Green	Access to school, public house, village hall Primary School – approximately 125m Bus Service – approximately 945m Shop – approximately 530m	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall and play area – approximately 530m Public House – approximately 650m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints – the site promoter has confirmed availability of most services (excluding gas) to the site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Fibre technology is already available in this area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding – this forms the site frontage	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Yes
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALV – Grade 3 The site extends the settlement in a linear pattern further into the open countryside, outside of the existing built form	Green

Townscape	Green	<p>Continuation of existing built form along School Road - a linear pattern that is in keeping with the settlement; does not appear to extend the settlement to a detrimental degree</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. This would continue the development on this side of the road with linear development which is very characteristic of Bressingham.</p> <p>There is no existing hedgerow, but being peripheral and an entry to the village, re-establishment of hedgerow and setting building back from road with access drive may be beneficial to the more rural character of the settlement. Plot boundary line does appear to be drawn to allow scope for this. Don't want it to be too urban. Setting building back would also benefit setting of LB opposite</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No anticipated impact however any impact could be mitigated	Green
Historic Environment	Green	<p>LB opposite site and to south (Pine Tree Cottage and The Spinney)</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. The Setting of Pine Tree Cottage would be affected but agree that suitable development would not result in significant harm if well designed/good materials. The house faces away from the road and has quite an immediate setting. Setting should be mentioned in allocation to ensure better design and materials.</p> <p>HES – Amber score</p>	Amber

Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Views of Highways required – GNLP HELAA noted an amber score in this category Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to north; open fields to south and west	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	LB opposite the site but do not consider that it would have a significant impact on its setting – check with LB Officer Development of this site could be read as an extension of the recent development at Pascoe Place with a suitable site layout	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Yes – access directly from School Road and an existing footpath already extends along the site frontage	
<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>	The site is undulating and rises to the north and west- consideration would need to be given to the building heights to address this (e.g., the western-most dwelling at Pascoe Place is single storey)	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	No significant boundaries around the site to the west – no natural site delineation. An access track to a water pump installation forms the southern boundary	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	No	
<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>	There is a water pump to the south west of the site (adjacent to the site)	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	The site currently forms part of the gateway into the village on the approach from School Road and has a pleasant open aspect however it is immediately adjacent to the existing boundary of the village	

<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>The site is well connected and relates well to the settlement. Development of this site would not have a significant impact on the nearby listed buildings although due to the topography of the land it would be prominent within the landscape. With an appropriate design and layout, the development of this site would continue the existing built form along School Road without significantly encroaching further into the surrounding landscape.</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)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations identified	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	Y Green
	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>	No – not requested or submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	As promoted the site size would fall below the required size for affordable housing delivery. The site promoter would need to confirm that a larger number is viable and would deliver the required affordable housing contribution on this site.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

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

Site Visit Observations

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

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting Local Plan designations identified

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

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

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

Preferred Site: Yes (as an allocation)

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 18th June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN3020
Site address	Land west of School Road, Bressingham
Current planning status <i>(including previous planning policy status)</i>	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares <i>(as promoted)</i>	0.69ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density <i>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</i>	Promoted for 10 dwellings <i>(therefore below required number for allocation but the site could potentially be extended to 12 dwellings)</i>
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS <i>(if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)</i>	
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>Check local footpath provision on site visit; road frontage access</p> <p>Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school. Would need to be allocated with SN3019</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	Green	<p>Local services include: school, public house, village hall</p> <p>Primary School – approximately 274m</p> <p>Bus Service – approximately 950m</p> <p>Shop – approximately 670m</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – approximately 490m Village Hall, Playground – approximately 670m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No anticipated issues	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Provision already available within the area	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Areas within the eastern section of the site are shown as being at risk of surface water flooding – this forms the site frontage	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	Yes
		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 Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC – Grade 3 The site appears to be a prominent addition in the landscape	Amber

Townscape	Amber	The site would be prominent in the local landscape and separated from the main area of the settlement by an undeveloped parcel of land (SN3019). If SN3019 is not allocated development of this site would have an adverse impact on the townscape due to the continued linear development of the settlement.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may have an adverse impact but this could be subject to mitigation measures.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II LB (The Spinney) adj to southern boundary of the site. Views of the heritage officer to be sought HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of recreational space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Advice of highways required re. impact on local road network, including A1066 to south. Highways score – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, or lack of footpath provision. However, site has a significant frontage that would enable carriageway widening to 5.5m and a continuous 2.0m footway to the school. would need to be allocated with SN3019.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential to south; agricultural land to north and west	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Limited impact on the LB and this could be mitigated by design/ layout. The site is detached from the settlement with a parcel of land (promoted as SN3019SL) between this site and the existing development at Pascoe Place	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access is available from the site frontage onto School Road; the existing footpath stops before the site boundary begins but could potentially be extended within the site boundary	
<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>	The land rises to the north (towards the main settlement)	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Site boundaries are minimal and the site forms part of a larger agricultural field	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	No	
<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>	There is a water pump adjacent to the north west corner of the site	
<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 and this forms part of the approach into the main centre of the village	

<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>There is good connectivity to the site and it is well located in terms of access to the available services in the village however the site is separated from the existing built by a small parcel of land and this could result in an uncomfortable relationship if this site comes forward in terms of its impact on the local landscape, particularly due to it forming one of the gateways into 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)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations identified	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
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:		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>	No additional evidence requested/ submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	If highways request works – otherwise none anticipated	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	The number of dwellings on the site has been promoted below the affordable housing threshold. The promoter would need to confirm viability if the number of dwellings is increased.	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is considered to be suitable for development, subject to the comments of the technical consultees

Site Visit Observations

The site is well connected but would not relate well to the existing built form due to its separation from this by another parcel of land (SN3019). The site lies on one of the key approaches into the village and would therefore have an impact on the overall setting of Bressingham, particularly due to the open landscape and the topography of the land.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting Local Plan designations identified

Availability

The site is considered to be available

Achievability

The site has been promoted for 10 dwellings and has therefore scored a red rating as it falls below the affordable housing threshold for delivery

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE due to its poor relationship with- (separation from-) the existing settlement. The site is separated from and therefore has poor relationship with the existing settlement. Consequently, development of this site is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the local landscape setting and character and appearance of the area. This impact would be particularly significant if the adjacent site is not considered to be a reasonable option.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17th June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN3023SL
Site address	South of Darrow Lane
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.33 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 19 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:	
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 onto Darrow Lane requiring improvement CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	2km walk to primary school. No continuous footpath Limited retail services within 1800m Limited bus service to Diss	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber

Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		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	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW flood risk	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	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>		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would have no detrimental impact on any designated heritage assets HES - Amber score	Amber

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Any potential impact on local network could be reasonably mitigated CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	No direct impacts	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Visibility likely to be achievable with loss of hedgerow. NCC to confirm impact on capacity of narrow lane	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Vacant. Last use for outside storage.	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerow including trees	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along boundaries and within 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 evidence	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Site is visually contained by established landscaping and neighbouring residential curtilages	
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>	Small site separated from development boundary and isolated from services by poor walking environment. Issues relating to highways, residential amenity and trees likely to constrain development. Not likely to achieve required numbers so not suitable for allocation	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?	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 advising same	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted. Proposing bungalow development	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Small site, separated from development boundary and isolated from services by poor walking environment. Issues relating to highways, residential amenity and trees likely to constrain development. Not likely to achieve required numbers so not suitable for allocation</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Within open countryside.</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable –The site is isolated from, and poorly related/connected to the existing settlement. There are further Identified constraints including highway and amenity issues and landscape (tree) constraints.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN3036
Site address	South of Low Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Permissions relating to previous use as plant nursery and aquatics centre
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.89 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Allocated site (for residential-led mixed use)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	21 dph (approximately 40 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

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	Potential access constraints to creating enlarged access and additional movements on A1066. NCC to confirm.	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	Amber	1.3 km walk to primary school – no footpath Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough. Bus stops adjacent to site.	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green

Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		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	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Previous use may result in contamination issues	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW flood risk	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	X
		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>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development would not have detrimental impact on heritage assets HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated	Amber/red?

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Horticulture/employment. Issues of compatibility could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
------------------------	-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Well distanced from any heritage assets so no direct impacts identified	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Existing access in separate ownership. Highway frontage may allow new access. CC to confirm feasibility of new access and increased movements on A1066	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Vacant. Previously in horticultural use	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Horticulture/employment. Issues of compatibility could be addressed through design.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Western and southern boundaries open to adjoining sites. Hedgerow and trees to north and east.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along eastern boundary	
<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>	Previous use may result in contamination. Overhead lines cut across western side of site	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Prominent in views from main road and from open land to south	

<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>Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.</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 <i>(UNIFORM)</i>	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Designated river valley		
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	
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
	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 advising same	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is considered unsuitable. The site is poorly related to the main settlement and is constrained by highways issues.

Site Visit Observations Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation of a reduced area at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside and designated river valley

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified

Achievability No additional constraints identified

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is detached from the main settlement and separated from it by the A1066. This results in a poor relationship with resultant detrimental impacts on the landscape and character and appearance of the area and diminished access to services and facilities. The site is potentially constrained by highways issues.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN3037
Site address	North of Low Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	Small scale development associated with horticulture 1979 – LV overhead lines
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	6.47 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	23 dph (approximately 148 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

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	Potential access constraints to creating enlarged access and additional movements on A1066. NCC to confirm.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities	Amber	800m walk to primary school – no footpath Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough. Bus stops close to site.	
<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		Public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber

Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		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	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Previous use may result in contamination issues	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood zone 1. Areas of identified SW flood risk in centre of site and along southern boundary.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	X
		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>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of LB but impact could be reasonably mitigated HES – Amber score	Amber

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Site opposite entrance to Bressingham Hall and other LBs in vicinity. Impact on setting to be assessed	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Multiple site accesses from A1066. NCC to confirm feasibility of new access and increased movements on main road	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Horticulture. Much of site does not appear in use	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Residential/agriculture - compatible	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Generally flat but elevated from main road	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Trees and planted hedge to north, west and east	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Some significant trees at entrance/boundaries. Constructed pond at northern end which may now have ecological value	
<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>	Previous use may result in contamination. Overhead lines.	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Limited views from main road. Visually contained in views to/from other directions	
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)	Poorly related to important core services. Development likely to be constrained by highways and townscape issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley		
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	
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
	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 advising same	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is considered unsuitable. The site is poorly connected and does not relate well to the main settlement. It is also constrained by highways and townscape issues.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Poorly related to important core services. Development likely to be constrained by highways and townscape issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Within open countryside and designated river valley</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is not well connected to the main settlement, nor does the site relate well physically to the main settlement. This results in detrimental impacts on the landscape and character and appearance of the area and diminished access to services. The site is likely to be constrained by highways issues.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 19 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN3038
Site address	South of High Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2.33 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 21 dph (Up to 49 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Brownfield

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	Potential access constraints to creating enlarged access and additional movements on A1066. NCC to confirm. CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	1.4 km walk to primary school – no footpath Retail services and employment opportunities within 1800m Limited bus service to Diss and Attleborough. Bus stops close to site.	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Public house, sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green

Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water, mains sewage and electricity available to site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		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	Amber	No known ground stability issues. Previous use may result in contamination issues	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Small area of identified SW flood risk in south west corner	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	X
		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>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	Development could have detrimental impact on setting of nearby LB but could be reasonably mitigated HES – Amber score	Amber

Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Potential impact on functioning of A1066 may not be reasonably mitigated CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Horticulture/residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	Technical officer to assess impact on setting of LB to north if the site is to be progressed as a Reasonable Alternative	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Existing access in separate ownership. Highway frontage may allow new access. NCC to confirm feasibility of new access and increased movements on A1066	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Vacant. Previously in horticultural use	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Horticulture/residential - compatible	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedges and trees to west and north. Open boundaries to east and south	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Possibly significant trees along western boundary	
<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>	Previous use may result in contamination	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Prominent in views from main road and from open land to south and east	
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)	Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.	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)
Designated river valley		
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	
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
	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 advising same	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Yes. NCC to confirm re. highways improvements	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is unsuitable. The site is poorly connected and is constrained by highways issues. The separation of the site from the main settlement is reinforced by the A1066 which acts as a barrier between the two.

Site Visit Observations Poorly related to core services, reinforced through separation by main road. Development likely to be constrained by highways issues and river valley designation. Scale of this site is outside of the scope of this assessment. Allocation at this time would result in piecemeal development. Not suitable for allocation.

Local Plan Designations Within open countryside and designated river valley

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified

Achievability Access issues may impact on achievability (see clarifications)

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is detached from the main settlement and separated from it by the A1066. This results in a poor relationship with resultant detrimental impacts on the landscape and character and appearance of the area and diminished access to services and facilities. The site is potentially constrained by highways issues.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 19 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4026
Site address	Land east of Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Agricultural land – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8ha
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	18dph 12-15 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:	
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	Single track road; no pedestrian footpath; site has road frontage Highways score – Green	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 	Red	Primary school – c. 2km Access to village shop - approximately 1690 metres from the site	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village hall and playing field – approximately 1690 metres from the site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber

Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Unknown - assumed key utilities are available as the sites is adjacent to existing dwellings however this has not been confirmed as part of the site promotion	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		The site is within a planned delivery area	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No identified contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	Yes
		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 Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC – Grade 3 Frontage development would continue the linear form of development on the opposite side of Darrow Lane, although it would further extend the settlement.	Green
Townscape	Amber	Separated from the main settlement; development in this part of the village is linear in form and sporadic	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but the impact could be mitigated NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.	Green

Historic Environment	Green	No impact on the historic environment HES – Amber score	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Impact to be checked with Highways	Amber
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>	No impact on historic environment but the site is located some distance from the centre of the settlement and whilst there is some linear development along Common Rd, development in this location would have an adverse impact on the wider setting	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Vehicular access into the site would be achievable – although would require the removal of the hedgerow. 30mph speed limit would likely need to be extended and the road is between 1.5-2 car widths. There is no existing pedestrian footpath and limited footpath provision into the main village	
<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 – no issues	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Generally a level site	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedgerow along the site frontage but no significant trees – hedgerow would require removal for access	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Not seen on site visit – ditches may have been overgrown	
<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>	Development on the site would be prominent due to the open nature of the site and the surrounding landscape. Development in this location would result in a 'hard edge' in what is otherwise a rural setting	
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 this site is not considered acceptable due to the impact of the development on both the townscape and the landscape setting.	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)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations identified	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Unknown	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	
	5 – 10 years	
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments: A timescale has not been provided but it has been indicated that it would be soon after allocation	Amber

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 – not requested or submitted	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highways improvements would likely be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Based on the desktop exercise the site is generally considered to be acceptable for development, subject to the technical consultee comments. Issues noted include poor linkages to the main settlement and the future connection to Broadband.

Site Visit Observations

For the reasons set out above the site visit observations concluded that the site is not considered to be appropriate for development. In summary, the site is considered to be poorly connected and development of this site would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting.

Local Plan Designations

No conflicting LP designations identified

Availability

The land is considered to be available

Achievability

Development of the site is considered to be achievable

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is detached and poorly connected to the main settlement. This diminishes access to services and facilities. The site is prominent within the landscape and its development would result in a hard edge in what is an otherwise rural setting. This results in detrimental impacts on the landscape. Highway concerns have been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 17th June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4033
Site address	Rear of 34 Common Road, Bressingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	No relevant history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.54 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified (25 dph = 14 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:	
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	Existing access is very narrow and in separate ownership. NCC to assess potential access via no. 34 Highways score – Green.	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 	Amber	1.3 km walk to primary school. No continuous footpath Limited retail services within 1800m Limited bus service to Diss	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Sports/rec facilities within 1800m	Green

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity should be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site	Amber
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	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. No identified SW flood risk LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Green
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	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>)		B4: Waveney tributary farmland ALC Grade TBC	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on landscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development would have a detrimental impact on townscape which could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Development may impact on protected species but impact could be reasonably mitigated NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain	Green

Historic Environment	Green	Development would have no detrimental impact on any designated heritage assets HES – Amber score	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Any potential impact on local network could be reasonably mitigated CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts identified	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Improvement of existing narrow access does not appear feasible. NCC to assess proposal to take access through plot of 34	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential garden	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/ AW pumping station/grazing	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Residential curtilages to west and south. Hedgerow and trees to north and east.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Large number of trees within site including oak. Would significantly reduce developable area	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No but AW pumping station to east. AW owns existing narrow access	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site is visually contained with limited views in and out.	
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)	Reasonably well connected to services. No continuous footpath – this is feature of this settlement. Issues relating to highways, residential amenity and trees likely to constrain development. Not likely to achieve required numbers so not suitable for allocation	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?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	X
	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? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Statement from promoter advising same	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes. NCC to confirm	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has advised that affordable housing contribution could be met but no evidence submitted. Proposing bungalow development	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is unsuitable; constrained by issues relating to highways, residential amenity and landscaping.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Reasonably well connected to services. No continuous footpath – this is feature of this settlement. Issues relating to highways, residential amenity and trees likely to constrain development. Not likely to achieve required numbers; not suitable for allocation.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Within open countryside; no conflicting LP designations</p> <p>Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period. No significant constraints to delivery identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: UNREASONABLE – Whilst the site is reasonably well located to services in distance terms there is no continuous footpath, which diminishes accessibility. The site is constrained by issues relating to highways, residential amenity and landscaping (trees).</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 18 June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

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

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	<p>Access available from site frontage; site located immediately opposite the primary school; footpath on opposite side of the road</p> <p>Highways score – Green. Suitable for limited frontage development only and subject to c/w widening to min of 5.5m and provision of 2.0m frontage footway.</p>	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 	Green	<p>Access to services including: school, village hall, public house</p> <p>Primary School – approximately 20m</p> <p>Bus stop – c. 50m</p> <p>Village shop – approximately 440m</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall, playing field – c. 440m Public House – approximately 800m	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No anticipated issues as the site is adjacent to the existing development within the settlement	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Provision already available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination and ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small area of surface water flooding in southern corner of site adjacent to Pine Tree Cottage LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	Yes
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Waveney Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC – Grade 3 The site is well related to existing development and its development would have limited additional impact on the landscape	Green

Townscape	Green	<p>Frontage development along School Road would continue the existing linear form of the settlement</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Bressingham is predominantly linear development, and this would result in some clustering. However, at some point linear development becomes detrimental and inefficient, and perhaps the time has come for clustering. There is no particular significance attached to the area in the village character, and the field is quite well enclosed in landscape views, however there do appear to be some good trees around it. This site would allow a more efficient layout and provision of safer public space away from the School Lane. It would be good to set building back with establishment of a frontage boundary rather than creating too much of an urban character. There would probably need to be a need for landscape buffer strip for housing to the north.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>LB (Pine Tree Cottage) immediately adjacent to the south of the site. Heritage Officer views to be sought.</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Development would impact upon cottage which is to a degree isolated but it's character and setting does not depend on it being isolated. The north side is a plain pantiled roof with no windows facing north. I would however suggest mitigation at south end.</p> <p>HES – Amber score</p>	Amber

Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Highways to advise on the impact on the local road network Highways score – Amber	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on the LB to the south to be assessed by the heritage officer The site is well related to the existing built form of the settlement	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site is possible from School Road. There is an existing footpath opposite the site along the school frontage. The footpath also extends further to the south.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Scrub land	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The site appeared to be level but access onto the site was not possible	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Small tree and hedgerow. Existing vegetation provides screening between site and properties to the north. No significant boundaries between the site and the LB.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow along the site frontage which would likely be removed in its entirety for access and visibility	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles along the site frontage	

Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is enclosed within the streetscene due to the existing built form in the environs	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is well connected and related to the centre of the village. It also relates well to the existing built form and would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape. The impact on the LB would need to be assessed however the location of the proposed school car park closest to the LB could address both the noted SW flooding issue and mitigate the impact of development on the setting of the LB.	Green

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Conclusion	No conflicting LLP designations identified	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private – multiple ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Enquiries received but not actively marketed		
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:		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>	No – evidence not requested/ provided	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Unlikely to be required	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes but supporting evidence not submitted at this stage	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Part of the site is promoted for off-site parking for the primary school located opposite the site	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

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

Site Visit Observations

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

Local Plan Designations

No constraints identified

Availability

The land is considered to be available

Achievability

The land is considered to be achievable

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

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17th June 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

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

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Site frontage adjoins Fersfield Road a single track road; drainage ditch along site frontage; no existing footpath provision Highway score – Green	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Access to services including primary school, public house, village hall Primary School – approximately 300m Bus stop – approximately 265m Village Shop – approximately 495m	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		Village Hall, Playground – approximately 495m Public House – approximately 1000m	Green

Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	The site promoter has advised 'unknown' however the site is adjacent to existing development and it is anticipated that infrastructure would be available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Provision already available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not in an identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No identified contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Small area of surface water flooding identified in south west corner of the site LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	Yes
		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 Tributary Farmland – open landscape with distant views, mix of building styles including old farm buildings and processing plants	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	ALC - Grade 3 Development of the site appears to have limited impact on the landscape when viewed from the east or west. The landscape impact from the north and south may be an issue.	Amber

Townscape	Green	<p>PROW adjacent to the western boundary of the site; infill plot between existing residential properties; adjacent development is linear in form however it also extends along onto School Road; Poplar Farm has a number of agricultural buildings on the site.</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer - Bressingham is predominantly linear development, and this would result in some clustering. However, at some point linear development becomes detrimental and inefficient, and perhaps the time has come for clustering. farm complex is to west so rear plot line already created. This site will have less impact on existing residents in terms of views/relationship to open countryside – although views are quite expansive compared to SN3019. Restablishing a hedgerow to the lane would be good.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ – potential for protected species and biodiversity net gain.</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>LB Poplar Farm adjacent to the western boundary of the site</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. The LB is in a relatively big plot and existing thick landscaping will separate it from the development. Landscaping and appropriate materials/building design can mitigate harm, particularly along the frontage.</p> <p>HES – Amber score</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>HA to advise on local road network</p> <p>LOCAL CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, educational and agricultural land use	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

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

<p>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</p>	<p>The site is between two residential properties and due to the surrounding trees the visual impact of development when viewed from Fersfield Road would be minimised. Due to the local topography, development of the site would be visible on the approach north along School Road but this would be viewed within the context of the existing development at Pascoe Place. Loss of the existing vegetation across the site would be necessary in order to develop this site.</p>	
<p>Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)</p>	<p>The site is well connected to the main areas of the settlement and there is potential to join the existing footpath provision. Whilst development would be visible in the landscape from different approaches this would be read in the context of the existing built form and would not be detrimental to the local landscape. Existing vegetation currently provides screening between the site at the adjacent LB.</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)
Conclusion	No conflicting LP designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private – multiple site owners	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Enquiries received but the site is not being actively marketed	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	Yes
	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? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No additional evidence requested/ submitted	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Yes – highways improvements likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Yes	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability</p> <p>Subject to the comments of the technical consultees, the site is considered to be suitable for development. In particular the comments of the highways department and the heritage officer will be key to determining the overall suitability of this site.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations</p> <p>The site is well related to the main centre of Bressingham and existing footpath provision could potentially be extended to allow for safe pedestrian access. A small development in this location could relate well to the existing built form and from School Road would be viewed in the context of existing development at Pascoe Place. The loss of the tree along the site frontage would likely be necessary for safe vehicular access and this would be regrettable in terms of the local landscape.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations identified</p> <p>Availability The site is considered to be available</p> <p>Achievability The site is considered to be achievable</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site relates well to the existing settlement and would not have a detrimental impact on the landscape or townscape. It is anticipated that other constraints identified could be subject to suitable mitigation measures..</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Yes Rejected:</p>

Date Completed: 17th June 2020