

Gillingham, Geldeston & Stockton
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0091	3
SN0207	10
SN0274REVA and REV B.....	19
SN0276 (FYI this is the same site as SN021SL) GNLP Reference: GNLP0276.....	27
SN0437	36
SN0207SL	44
SN4078.....	51

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0091
Site address	Land to the north and east of Church Farm, Church Road, Stockton
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	N/A
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.51
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Allocated site for Residential Development (6 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	HELLA: 6 dwellings = 11.7dph Unspecified 25dph/ha = 12.5 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	<p>Access via Church Road (immediately adjacent)</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</p> <p>Development of the site would lead to an intensification of slowing, stopping and turning movements onto A146 Principal Route. The local road network is limited in width, lacks passing provision and has no footways. No footway to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. Access visibility likely to be restricted by third party land.</p>	Red

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	Ellingham VC primary school 3700 meters from site.	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Ellingham Playgroup – 3500 meters from site.	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	All key services available, apart from main sewage and a gas supply. Note: sewage locally is via individual septic tanks and there is no gas supply locally.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site is within an area already served by faster available broadband technology.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an area affected by the ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Flood Zone 1 with a small section to the eastern boundary defined at a low risk of surface water flooding.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Amber	Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	X
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
	Green	C2-Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Detrimental impact on landscape character could be mitigated through design and landscaped treatment. The design of the dwellings would need to be sensitive to the character of the village.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Potential impact - character could be mitigated through design	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber		Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Church Farm farmhouse is Grade 2 listed. The local church (opposite side of the road) is Grade 2 listed. NCC HES - Amber	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 local network. NCC HIGHWAYS – Red Development of the site would lead to an intensification of slowing, stopping and turning movements onto A146 Principal Route. The local road network is limited in width, lacks passing provision and has no footways. No footway to the catchment primary school. The site is considered to be remote from services [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. Access visibility likely to be restricted by third party land.	Red

Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Residential, church and agricultural land	Green
------------------------	-------	---	-------

Part 4 Site Visit

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>	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>		
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Site is largely level	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Hedging and trees on 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>	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries	
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</i>		
<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 (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)		

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
IDBSouth Norfolk A146-Loddon Road		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No significant constraints to deliverability identified	Amber

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highway improvements likely to be required – NCC to advise	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No viability information submitted to date.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	N/A	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is of a suitable size to be allocated however it has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings (6 dwellings). Whilst the site is related to the existing settlement of Stockton and adjacent to existing dwellings, Stockton itself is a very small village, comprises of few houses that are remote from services, where development of the site would impact on the landscape. Highway constraints identified.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations The site is detached from the service and appears remote. The site is situated within a very rural area therefore development here would be intrusive into open landscape.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Within open countryside.</p> <p>Availability The site is promoted by the landowner and appears available based on the information provided.</p> <p>Achievability No further constraints identified.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for either an allocation or an extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is considered to be remote from services and cannot provide a reasonable or safe walking route to the primary school. The site is detached from the main areas of the settlement and is not adjacent to any existing settlement boundaries. Highway safety constraints have been identified; development of the site could lead to an intensification of slowing, stopping and turning movements onto A146 Principal Route The local road network is limited in width, lacks passing provision and has no footways. It has also been noted that visibility may be required 3rd party consent.</p> <p>referred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0207
Site address	Land off Old Yarmouth Rd/ Geldeston Hill, Geldeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	N/A
Site Area	0.42 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocated site for residential development of up to 12 dwellings and POS Due to the site size, the site is also considered for a SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	28dph
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)

<p>Access to the site</p>	<p>Amber</p>	<p>Access to the south via Ketts Acres. Access via this route would be through an existing car park which would result in the loss of spaces. Ketts Acres is also very narrow and restricted. Limited/nil opportunity to widen.</p> <p>Old Yarmouth road is the road that runs to the north – which would provide an alternative access.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</p> <p>Subject to access at Geldeston Hill - satisfactory visibility required, along with widening to a minimum of 5.5m and provision of a 2.0m wide footway for full extent of Geldeston Hill frontage, footway to connect with Kell's Acres. Improvement required at Geldeston</p> <p>Highways meeting –</p> <p>Would not be possible to access directly on to Old Yarmouth Road. Kell's Acres is an adopted road, but very narrow and concerned that any improvements would impact on two mature trees in the setting of the Tayler and Green housing. Visibility on to Geldeston Hill is sub-standard. No obvious solutions for this site.</p>	<p>Amber</p>
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	<p>Amber</p>	<p>Gillingham Primary School – 1900 meters from site</p>	<p>Amber</p>

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – 300 meters from site Camp site – 500 meters from site Village play area – immediately adjacent	
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints.	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	All key services are readily available, however query regarding the supply of gas and main sewage	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site is within an area already served by faster available broadband technology.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	Green	The site is not within an area affected by the ORSTED cable route.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1. Very low risk of surface water flooding across the 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>)	Amber	ALC – Grade 3 Waveney River Valley ENV3 C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	Amber

Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Detrimental impact on landscape could be mitigated through design and landscape treatment.</p> <p>Landscape meeting - Oak trees and high bank on eastern side of road. Development of this site would negatively impact on the landscape character of the valley setting, extending development to the junction of Geldeston Hill and Old Yarmouth Road.</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Potential impact of the character could be mitigated through careful design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Potential impact on the presence of any protected species, however these could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Borders Geldeston Conservation Area. 4 Grade II LB within 250 meters of the site</p> <p>NCC HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC HERITAGE OFFICER No objection heritage and townscape subject to appropriate design and landscaping etc. so agree with amber – reference to setting of LB and CA.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any designated open space, however site is adjacent to a play area where the site appears to be used for recreational purposes.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on local network and concerns regarding provision of a suitable and safe access.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS - Red</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Located within a predominantly residential area.	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	The site sits higher than the rest of the village to the south. The site also has a gentle slope from the north to the south.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	One access via this route would be through an existing car park which would result in the loss of spaces. Ketts Acres is also very narrow and restricted. Limited/nil opportunity to widen. Old Yarmouth road is the road that runs to the north – which would provide an alternative access; however, this is narrow and visibility could be poor. Geldeston Hill to the east is an unsuitable route for access due to its narrow width.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Unused grass land – adjoins play area.	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Recreational and residential	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Slopes gentle – northern point is the highest	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Recreational to the west Thick and dense hedging to the north and east. Residential rear gardens to the south	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site appears well maintained.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Nonvisible	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site is well screen to the north. Open to the south and east where the existing play area is located.	

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 relatively constrained in terms of access.	
--	--	--

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)
Waveney River Valley ENV3 (C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland)		
Conclusion	The site is located within a River Valley landscape	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	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>	The promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable.	
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highways improvement likely to be required – NCC Highways to advise	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No viability information submitted to date.	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The site has been put forward under the GNLP to include public open space	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is of an appropriate size for a SL extension and a small allocation. The site is well related to the existing settlement and adjacent to existing dwellings. Development of the site would not significantly encroach into the open countryside however development in this location would be visible in long views from the north towards the site, including from the River Valley. Development of the site will have potential highways concerns with regards to a suitable and safe means of access.

Site Visit Observations

Site is heavily constrained in terms of access. Ketts Avenue is also very narrow and restricted. Limited/nil opportunity. Recreational play area to the west. The site relates well to the settlement and existing services.

Local Plan Designations

Within open Countryside. The site is located within a River Valley.

Availability

No further constraints identified.

Achievability

The site is promoted by the landowner and appears available based on the information provided

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The site is considered unreasonable due to number of highways constraints that are unresolvable. The site also sits elevated within the landscape where impact upon the landscape protection designations may not be mitigated against. Access to the site via Old Yarmuth Road (to the north) is not a suitable access for development. Therefore, the only other access is off Geldeston Hill, via Ketts Acres to the east. Whilst Kell's Acres is an adopted road, it is very narrow and there are concerned that any improvements would impact on two mature trees in the setting of the Tayler and Green housing. Development of this site would also negatively impact on the landscape character of the valley setting and also the adjoining Conservation Area.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 30th December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0274REVA and REV B
Site address	Land to the south of the A143 and A146 roundabout, Gillingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	To the south of the road - Allocated GIL 1 under existing local plan 2019/1013 - Residential development of 22 dwellings, together with associated public open space, access roads, garaging and car parking.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1ha
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocated for residential dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25/1ha
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access via The Street to the south</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber Subject to acceptable visibility at access, provision of frontage 2.0m footway and carriageway widening to 6.0m minimum (bus route) - will require removal of frontage hedge. Highway safety concern due to adjacent acute blind bend and on-street parking at The Street.</p> <p>Highways meeting – Potential opportunity to widen this part of The Street and provide further enhancements (bearing in mind this is a bus route), could be preferable in highways terms.</p>	Amber

Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport <i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Primary School - 250 meters from site Service station – 650 meters from site Morrisons – 2000 metres from site (Blyburgate) Within close proximity to Blyburgate	Amber
		Pre-School – 600 meters from site Village hall – 650 meter from site	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No Known constraints	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Unknown	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site is within an area already served by faster available broadband technology.	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	Amber	The site is not within an area affected by the ORSTED cable route.	Amber
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Amber
Flood Risk		Part of the site falls within Flood Zones 2/3. LLFA – Few or no constraints.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	Amber	Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		ALC: Grade 3c	
Overall Landscape Assessment		<p>Detrimental impact on landscape could be mitigated through design and landscape treatment.</p> <p>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER- Existing frontage hedgerow and trees along the site frontage mean that development of the site would be contrary to existing policy. Frontage development on this site would be a significant landscape issue however development of these sites could offer an opportunity to enhance the connectivity of the services to the north to the village.</p>	Amber
Townscape		<p>Potential impact of the character could be mitigated through careful design.</p> <p>SNC Heritage Officer No heritage or townscape concerns</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity		<p>Potential impact on the presence of any protected species, however these could be reasonably mitigated.</p>	
Historic Environment		<p>NCC HES – Amber</p> <p>SNC Heritage Officer No heritage or townscape concerns</p>	Amber

Open Space		No impact on public open space	Green
Transport and Roads		<p>Potential impact on local network and concerns regarding provision of a suitable and safe access.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</p> <p>Subject to acceptable visibility at access, provision of frontage 2.0m footway and carriageway widening to 6.0m minimum (bus route) - will require removal of frontage hedge. Highway safety concern due to adjacent acute blind bend and on-street parking at The Street.</p> <p>Highways meeting –</p> <p>Potential opportunity to widen this part of The Street and provide further enhancements (bearing in mind this is a bus route), could be preferable in highways terms</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses		Residential to the south – GIL 1	

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?		
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access via The Street to the south	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and agricultural	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)		
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerows to the southern boundary along the highway	

Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No ponds visible	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Telegraph poles cross north end of field	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	There is a petrol station and fast food restaurant is north of the site at the A146/A143 roundabout	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)		

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private ownership. Promotor is owner.		
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No		
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	X	Yes
	Within 5 years		

	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is considered a suitable size for allocation. Potential highway safety concerns have been raised – the site is adjacent acute blind bend and on-street parking at The Street. Flood zone 2/3 constraints identified. Opportunity to create a linkage between the services extension and the village to the south.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations The site is located opposite current allocated site (GIL 1) which is currently under construction. Footpath runs to the south of the site (connected GIL 1 to the south and north)</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Countryside</p> <p>Availability Confirmed to be available.</p>

Achievability

No further constraints identified.

OVERALL CONCLUSION:

It should be noted that REV A and REV B are immediately adjacent to one another and have therefore been assessed together.

It has been identified that the development to the south (app ref:2019/1013) also falls within Flood Zone 2/3a but was recently approved and considered acceptable for 22 residential dwellings. In relation to 2019/1013 the applicant submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which identifies the actual 'Residual Risk and Flood Zones' on site, which has sited all proposed development within Flood Zone 1. It is therefore acknowledged that further investigation would be required to determine the extent of flooding prior to allocation. The site has few other constraints. The Highways Authority have recognised that the site could provide further highways enhancements with the widening of The Street. In addition, an application to extend the service station to the north of the site has recently been approved, where a linkage to the rest of the village has been suggested. It is considered that development of the site could provide this linkage and development in this location could be coherently planned to maximise any opportunities for connections to be created.

Due to the sites being adjacent and of the same ownership, it has been identified that the site boundary could extend across REVA and REVB to help mitigate flood risk issues.

Rejected:

Reasonable Alternative: Yes

Preferred:

Date Completed: November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0276 (FYI this is the same site as SN021SL) GNLP Reference: GNLP0276
Site address	Land to the east of the Village Hall, Gillingham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	N/A
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.6ha – SN0276 0.3ha- SN021SL
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Residential Development: Allocated site – 0.6ha SL Extension – 0.3ha
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15dph
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 (larger 0.6ha GNLP site –has Flood Zone 3 to the south)
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)

<p>Access to the site</p>	<p>Red</p>	<p>Access via Norwich Road There is a potential access point off Loddon Road</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber Subject to access at Geldeston Hill - satisfactory visibility required, along with widening to a minimum of 5.5m and provision of a 2.0m wide footway for full extent of Geldeston Hill frontage, footway to connect with Kell's Acres. Improvement required at Geldeston Hill junction with Old Yarmouth Road to provide visibility in accordance with DMRB. The requirements to deliver safe highway access will necessitate removal of mature trees at the site frontage. No safe walking route available to catchment school.</p> <p>Highways meeting- Access needs to come through the village hall car park, requiring negotiation with the parish council. Issues with junction visibility to the north and south on Loddon Road (which is a busy route from the A146 into Beccles), which might be difficult to resolve with the junction to The Street opposite</p>	<p>Amber</p>
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	<p>Amber</p>	<p>Primary School – 600 meters from site</p> <p>Hair dressers – 150 meters from site</p> <p>Local employment: The Swan Motel, beauticians</p> <p>Within close proximity to Beccles</p>	<p>Amber</p>

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities	Amber	Pre-school – 250 meters from site (site is located to the rear) Village Hall – less than 100 meters from site	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	No known constraints	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	All key services available. Query over gas supply	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site is within an area already served by faster available broadband technology.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		The site is not within an area affected by the ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues. To the south east corner - immediate pressure pipelines	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Northern section (0.3ha) Flood Zone 1. Small area along eastern boundary has a low risk of surface water flooding. Small area to the south west falls within/adjacent to the Broads area.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	Amber	Rural River Valley	
		Tributary Farmland	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>)	Amber	C2 – Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Detrimental impact on landscape character could be mitigated through design and landscaped treatment. The design of the dwellings would need to be sensitive to the character of the village.	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Potential impact - character could be mitigated through design</p> <p>SNC Heritage Officer No significant issues –Gillingham is virtually not seen from the bypass so seeing development here would break from that – also the noise of the bypass – faster traffic is noisier. Therefore, will require additional landscaping along Norwich Road both to mitigate noise and visually (in design terms would wish to prevent a very visible acoustic fence for example)</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Potential impact on potential presence of protected species within site.</p> <p>TPO Gillingham OLD A146 located to the north</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>2 Grade II Listed buildings located within 300 meters of site.</p> <p>SNC Heritage Officer - Green There are the Forge Green Taylor and Green listed buildings to the northwest (a terrace of properties so under one listing). These will not be impacted upon as the plan shows the retention of a significant area of landscaping to the north west of the site.</p> <p>NCC HES - Amber</p>	Green
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of any open space.	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on local network.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Residential, village hall and agricultural.	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?		
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?		
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)		
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)		
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)		
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)		
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?		
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)		
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape		
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)		

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
IDB		
Conclusion		

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

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 significant constraints to deliverability identified	Amber

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highway improvements likely to be required – NCC to advise	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No viability information submitted to date. A mix of affordable and open market has been suggested.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	N/A	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site has been forward for either an allocation or a SL extension. The site is being promoted for 11 dwellings across the site, whilst theoretically the site could accommodate 15 dwellings (based on the 0.6ha allocated site area) there are areas of the site which fall within a flood zone and therefore the site is better suited to 11 dwellings fewer.

The site is well related to the existing settlement and adjacent to existing dwellings. development of the site may impact om the broads and the identified intermediate pressure pipeline, located to the south east corner.

Site Visit Observations

The site is heavily vegetated to the northern section of the site where any development of this area would result in taking down many mature trees.

Local Plan Designations

Within open countryside and adjacent to the development boundary of Gillingham.

Availability

The site is promoted by the landowner and appears available based on the information provided.

Achievability

No further constraint's identified. .

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development. The site is considered unreasonable option for allocation or an SL extension, due to highway safety constraints. Access to the site would need to come through the village hall car park which is 3rd party land that has not been presented as an option. In addition to this, if access could be achieved there would be issues with junction visibility to the north and south on Loddon Road (which is a busy route from the A146 into Beccles). It is considered that this would be difficult to resolve with the junction to The Street opposite. The site is also heavily constrained by tree cover and also suffers from some small areas at risk of fluvial or surface water flooding to the eastern boundary. It is also noted that the majority of the site falls within the Broads Authority executive area.

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 30th December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0437
Site address	Land off Kells Way, Geldeston, Norfolk NR34 0LS
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	N/A
Site Area	0.83 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocated site for residential development of up to 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Unspecified 25dph = 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	<p>The site would be assessible from Kells Way and by a proposed adopted highway included as part of the new development being progressed to the south of the site.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Green Access via Kells Way subject to satisfactory layout. No safe walking route to catchment school. Visibility from Geldeston Hill to Old Yarmouth Rd limited. 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 [or housing for non-residential development] so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes.</p> <p>Highways meeting – Key issue is whether access can be achieved through the recent FW Properties development. The adopted road stops short of the site boundary and looks to be of limited width, which could compromise the ability to accommodate a footway. If this can be achieved, the site is OK.</p>	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	Gillingham Primary School – 2000 meters from site	Amber

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Public House – 300 meters from site Camp site – 600 meters from site Village play area – immediately adjacent		
Utilities Capacity	Amber	No known constraints.		
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	All key services are readily available, however there no current supply of gas.	Green	
Better Broadband for Norfolk	Green	Site is within an area already served by faster available broadband technology.	Green	
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	Green	The site is not within an area affected by the ORSTED cable route.	Green	
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues.	Amber	
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1.		
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>)		ALC – Grade 3 Waveney River Valley ENV3 C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland		

Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Detrimental impact on landscape could be mitigated through design and landscape treatment.</p> <p>SNC Landscape Officer - The preferred site in landscape terms within Geldeston however it should only be accessed from the south (the new development). This site has a better relationship with the valley setting</p>	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Potential impact of the character could be mitigated through careful design.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Potential impact on the presence of any protected species, however these could be reasonably mitigated.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Borders Geldeston Conservation Area. 4 Grade II LB within 250 meters of the site</p> <p>NCC HES - Amber</p> <p>SNC HERITAGE OFFICER – Setting of CA but not as important to setting of CA as SN0207.</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Potential impact on local network and concerns regarding provision of a suitable and safe access.</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red</p>	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Located within a predominantly residential area.	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?		
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is available through existing development to the south	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and recreational	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	The land is sloping to the south	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	To the south – existing dwelling rear gardens – close boarder fencing To the east is hedging and a play area West and north are dense vegetation	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Nonvisible	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Nonvisible	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The site slopes to the south therefore this potential overlooking issues in this direction. The site is well screen to the north Views in to the play area to the west are open.	
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 is located to the north of an existing residential development which is still currently being developed. The	

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)
Waveney River Valley ENV3		
Conclusion	The site is located within a River Valley landscape	

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>	The promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable.	

<i>information to be included as appropriate)</i>		
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highways improvement likely to be required – NCC Highways to advise	
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No viability information submitted to date.	
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	The site has been put forward under the GNLP to include public open space	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is of an appropriate size for allocation. The site is well related to the existing settlement and adjacent to existing dwellings which have recently been approved and currently being developed.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Site is located adjacent to an existing residential development which is currently being progressed. Whilst access could be achieved via this development, this would need to be confirmed.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Within open Countryside. The site is located within a River Valley</p> <p>Availability Promoter has confirmed the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability No further constraints identified.</p> <p>OVERALL COCLUSION: The site is considered to be a REASONABLE option for development. The site has a good relationship with the existing built form of the settlement and would benefit from good connectivity. The site is located to the north of an existing residential development, recently approved and developed. Development of the site would be subject to an access through this recent development as no other access is suitable (Old Yarmouth Road to the north is not viable). Whilst the site adjoins the Conservation Area, any impacts could be mitigated against through careful design and layout. It has been acknowledged that this site has a better relationship with the Valley setting due to existing boundaries.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Yes Reasonable Alternative: Rejected:</p>

Date Completed: 30th December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0207SL
Site address	Land off Old Yarmouth Rd/ Geldeston Hill, Geldeston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	
Site Area	0.3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocated site for for 4-5 dwellings SL extension would be suitable given the size of the site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 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	Amber	NCC Highways - Red Safe access not achievable due to visibility constraint caused by adjacent building. No safe walking route to catchment school. Local highway network not of a suitable standard for development traffic.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities	Amber		
<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 			
<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 		The Wherry Inn	

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Local wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter has confirmed that there access to all main services access to all main services at the site	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within the area already served by fibre technology	
Identified ORSTED Cable Route			
Contamination & ground stability	Green	There are no known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1.	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>)		ALC – Grade 3 Waveney River Valley ENV3 C2 - Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber		

Townscape	Amber	To the north of the site there is an area of open land with woodland beyond. To the east of the site is Geldeston House and the associated gardens. To the south east of the site is a small area of development, which includes The Wherry Inn Public House and a number of residential properties. To the immediate south is the pub car park and a wedge of land comprising the Village Green. The land to the west includes Hill House (formerly the Knowle), a large pre-second World War construction. A modern bungalow (now known as the Knowle) has been built in its lower garden fronting The Street. The allocation of the site for housing would not conflict with the neighbouring uses in any way. In fact, the proposed residential units would be well related to existing development and facilities in the village.	
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	The site was previously used for Allotments. Site is heavily overgrown –	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Borders Geldeston Conservation Area. 4 Grade II LB within 250 meters of the site	Amber
Open Space	Green	Development of the site would not result in the loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC Highways - Red Safe access not achievable due to visibility constraint caused by adjacent building. No safe walking route to catchment school. Local highway network not of a suitable standard for development traffic.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Public house and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

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>	Former Allotment Gardens	
<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	Some conflicting landscape 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>	Site is not currently being marketed	
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>	Promoter has confirmed that the site is deliverable	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Potential highway improvements	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed that there are no known viability issues	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is of a suitable size for a SL extension. Heritage and highways constraint have been identified. The site is also extremely overgrown (last used as an allotment) therefore the site has high potential for habitats and biodiversity.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations The site is accessed via a narrow single track which appears to be accessed adjacent to the public (shared access space as there is no demarcation to separate)</p> <p>Local Plan Designations</p> <p>Availability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>Achievability No additional constraints identified</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: It is considered that safe access is not achievable due to visibility constraint caused by adjacent building. Whilst the site is located adjacent to the existing SL limited, the site is backland development, out of keeping with the existing settlement pattern, with potential amenity concerns for existing residents. It has also been identified that the site is located within the Geldeston Conservation Area where is also a number of listed buildings within close proximity.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: November 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

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

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

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

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

Part 4 Site Visit

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

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

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Countryside		
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	
--	--

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

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is considered suitable for allocation, subject to access via GIL1 to the north. The site would appear as an extension to the existing allocation which is currently being constructed.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations The site is adjacent to the existing GIL 1 allocation which is visible to the east as land is this directly is relatively flat and open.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Countryside</p> <p>Availability Land available.</p> <p>Achievability No further constraints identified.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered a REASONABLE option for development, subject to achieving access via GIL1 to the north. Development of the site would be accessed through the exiting GIL1 allocation, (Hopkins development) which is currently under construction, which appears to offer a suitable access. It is recognised that upgrades may be required/numbers restricted and that the highways constraints to be resolvable. It is noted that much of the surrounding area falls within flood zone 2/3, where land immediately to the south of the site falls within this zone. However, the promoter advised that the report produced by Evans Coastal and Rivers in connection with GIL1, identified the land to be in Zone 1 in relation to Flood. Further investigation (FRA) would be required to confirm</p>

this prior to allocation. It has also been noted that the boundaries of the site can be adjusted if required, due to same landowner owning surrounding fields. Landscape constraints have been identified, as previously experienced with the existing allocation GIL1, as site is in close proximity to the Broads (King's Dam) and footpaths run parallel to the south and west of the site. A landscape assessment would need to be undertaken to ensure that neither the Broads nor the public routes would be adversely impacted.

Reasonable Alternative:

Preferred: Yes

Rejected:

Date Completed: November 2020