

Burston, Shimpling & Gissing
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0208SL	3
----------------	---

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0208SL
Site address	Land at Common Road, Gissing
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	2000/0057 – approval for 4 dwellings (SNC) 2010 & 2012 – approval for storage, packing shed and polytunnels
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.26 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	SL extension (The site has been promoted for 6 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 6 dwellings = 23 dph (25 dph = 6.5 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	<p>NCC to confirm feasibility of achieving safe access</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. Access via southern boundary only, carriageway widening of Common Rd cul-de-sac required to 5.5m at frontage. No safe walking route to school. 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.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Red	Primary school greater than 3km away Limited employment opportunities within 1800m Bus service including peak time (bus stop adjacent site)	
		Public house within 1800m	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter advises water and electricity available to site. No UKPN constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site outside the proposed fibre installation area	Red
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Unaffected by the identified ORSTED cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	Contamination issues due to previous use could be mitigated – this would need to be confirmed if the site is to be progressed	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood zone 1. Small area of identified SW flood along adjacent highway	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: N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is visually contained. Detrimental landscape impacts of development could be reasonably mitigated	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	Detrimental impacts could be mitigated	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No detrimental impact on any heritage assets NCC HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	Development would not result in the loss of any open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC to confirm impact on local network NCC Highways – Red. Access via southern boundary only, carriageway widening of Common Rd cul-de-sac required to 5.5m at frontage. No safe walking route to school. 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.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential/agriculture	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No direct impacts on heritage assets	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC to confirm if safe access can be achieved	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Small scale market garden	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential/agriculture	
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)	Enclosed by hedgerow/trees	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some significant trees along eastern boundary and possibly within site. Ditch along eastern boundary with highway	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of utilities infrastructure. Potential contamination from previous use should be investigated	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site screened by boundary hedgerows/trees but prominent in views along the road	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site remote from primary school but accessible to peak bus service. Limited impacts on townscape and landscape which could be reasonably mitigated.	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	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
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</i>	Statement from promoter confirming same however the	Amber

<i>information to be included as appropriate)</i>	existing land tenancy would need to cease	
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 access improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	N/A	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is not considered suitable for general housing due to lack of access to services including the primary school. The site could be considered under current Development Management policies as a possible Exception Site.

Site Visit Observations The site is in a remote location, a significant distance from services although a peak time bus service is available. Development would have a limited impact on the townscape and landscape, both of which could be reasonably mitigated.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter has advised availability within plan period, although the existing tenancy would need to cease. No significant constraints to delivery identified.

Achievability Promoter advise that existing tenancy would have to be terminated – associated loss of small scale employment.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is an UNREASONABLE settlement limit site due to its poor connectivity and relationship to services, including the primary school. There would be an associated loss of small scale employment on the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 27 July 2020