

Needham, Brockdish, Starston & Wortwell
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0057	3
SN0156 (SN0156REV is a larger site area, southwards to the river).....	11
SN0385	18
SN0464	25
SN2001	33
SN2006	40
SN2036	47
SN2065REV.....	55
SN2121A.....	63
SN2121B.....	71
SN2121C.....	79
SN4063SL	87
SN4066SL	94
SN4069SL	101
SN4084.....	109

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0057
Site address	Land south of Sancroft Way, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary - unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.58 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Both (The site has been promoted for 6-8 units but would just be large enough for a small allocation)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8 dwellings equates to 13dph 25dph would equate to 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	<p>If the site progresses clarification will be needed as to whether access from Sancroft Way is achievable</p> <p>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Site would not appear to extend up to the existing highway which would preclude the creation of an access onto Sancroft Way. Low Road is substandard due to limited width and lack of footway provision. Uncertain whether adequate visibility and footway provision could be secured at Low Road / High Road junction.</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>Alburgh and Denton Primary School (not catchment school) 2.7km. Harleston primary school is over 3.5km</p> <p>Distance to bus service 630 metres</p> <p>Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 3.5km</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 900 metres Distance to the Wortwell Bell public house 530 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some very small areas of surface water flood risk on 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	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Estate development to north and development along Low Road contains the site within existing pattern of development	Green

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km and two CWS somewhat closer	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Some potential for impact on setting of nearby heritage assets – to be considered further if the site progresses HES – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Site would not appear to extend up to the existing highway which would preclude the creation of an access onto Sancroft Way. Low Road is substandard due to limited width and lack of footway provision. Uncertain whether adequate visibility and footway provision could be secured at Low Road / High Road junction.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site would be reasonably contained in regard to surrounding uses but this is reduced by the prominence of the site from its raised position	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access would be very difficult to achieve given levels difference between Sancroft Way and site. NCC Highways also doubt whether public highway adjoins site boundary – possible ransom strip. No other feasible access arrangement.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north, east and south. Agricultural land to west. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site rises from east to west. Sharp drop in levels from site onto Sancroft Way to north.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees to south. Other boundaries are less vegetated.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundary.	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination.	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views of site possible from Low Road due to land rising behind dwellings fronting the road and also of edge of site from Sancroft Way. Potential views also possible in wider views across valley.	

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to prominence of site being raised above existing settlement along Low Road and on Sancroft Way and also lack of available access.	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is single private ownership		
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	Yes	
	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>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has acknowledged that affordable housing may be required but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is of a suitable size to be considered as an allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings. The site is adjacent to an existing settlement limit. The site is wholly located within a River Valley landscape designation. Highways concerns have been raised about achieving an access to the site from Sancroft Way and an alternative access would not appear to be achievable.

Site Visit Observations Site is raised above existing settlement along Low Road and on Sancroft Way and development on the site would be prominent. There is also no clear available access – apparent ransom strip from Sancroft Way.

Local Plan Designations Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Wortwell. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for both allocation and as an extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is contained however it is also in an elevated position and would intrude into the River Valley landscape. Concerns have also been raised about the connectivity of the site – access via Sancroft Way appears to be subject to a ransom strip and access via Low Road is not achievable in highway safety terms.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0156 (SN0156REV is a larger site area, southwards to the river)
Site address	Site opposite village hall, High Road, Needham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	A number of historic refused applications for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Access appears achievable.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Amber. Access subject to providing acceptable visibility, frontage development and provision of 2.0m frontage footway.</p> <p>Walk to school route required crossing of A143 and includes footways of sub-standard width, improvement may be required.</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>Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.8km</p> <p>Bus stop adjacent to site</p> <p>Distance to shop 1.7km</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Opposite village hall and play area Distance to The Red Lion public house 770 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that services are available however mains sewerage would need to be clarified	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified 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	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is within protected river valley landscape. No loss of high-grade agricultural land. SDC Landscape Officer - Not acceptable in landscape terms. The site would impact significantly on the views of the Church from the Angles Way trail and the wider footpath network.	Red

Townscape	Red	Adverse impact on key section townscape with church and village hall	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Country Wildlife Site to west of site. NCC Ecology – Green. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Red	Grade I listed church opposite which development would have significant impact on setting. Other designated and non-designated heritage assets in vicinity include Grade II listed Ivy Farmhouse and non-listed village hall. HES - Amber	Red
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is of a reasonable standard. NCC Highways - Amber. Access subject to providing acceptable visibility, frontage development and provision of 2.0m frontage footway. Walk to school route required crossing of A143 and includes footways of sub-standard width, improvement may be required.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential, agricultural land, place of worship and village hall	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would have the effect of severing the setting of the church from the valley floor to the east. In addition, it would harm the character of the area by infilling a key gap in the townscape opposite the church and village hall	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable, but will result in loss at least part of hedgerow on highway boundary	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north-east and south-west. Agricultural land to south-east. Village hall and church on opposite side of road. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level, slight slope to river.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on highway boundary. Domestic boundaries to dwellings on either side. Undefined rear boundary as part of wider field	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat potential in hedging on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Long views across site and valley from High Road. Potential views across site towards church from opposite side of valley	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to harm to setting of Grade I listed church.	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	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>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Footway improvements likely to be required, crossing/refuge at A143	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability</p> <p>The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations</p> <p>Open aspect within village opposite church. Development would have the effect of severing the setting of the church from the valley floor to the east. In addition, it would harm the character of the area by infilling a key gap in the townscape opposite the church and village hall</p> <p>Local Plan Designations</p> <p>Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.</p> <p>Availability</p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability</p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is adjacent to the settlement limit and the services of the village are accessible as there is a continuous footpath along High Road. However, the site is within the river valley with open, uninterrupted views from and of the Listed church. It would have a significant detrimental impact on the setting of the church and within the landscape, from the Angles Way trail and the wider footpath network.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0385
Site address	Land west of Church Lane, Brockdish
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.7 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation – 50 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	29dph (42 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>Potential constraints on access.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, 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	Red	<p>Distance to Harleston Primary School over 6km</p> <p>Distance to bus service 260 metres</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Brockdish village hall 800 metres Distance to The Old King's Head public house 1km	Red
Utilities Capacity	Green		Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter unsure whether mains water, sewerage and electricity are available	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Identified areas of surface water flood risk along Church Road by site and on eastern edge 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	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high-grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site adjacent to existing estate development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green

Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed The Rectory to south-west of site plus possible impact on Grade I listed Church of St Peter and St Paul. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained. NCC Highways – Red. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction layout, 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	Amber	Residential to south and agricultural land to west and east. Potential noise from A143	Amber

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is adjacent to existing estate development but would not be well related to the existing townscape with poor connectivity	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Local road network is highly constrained with the required footway provision / carriageway widening to satisfactorily access an allocation may not be achievable within the highway	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land, no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to south, and agricultural land to east and to west on opposite side of Church Road. A143 to north which may require some mitigation in terms of noise.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Largely open boundaries. Domestic fencing on boundaries with residential properties to south	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited potential habitat	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power cable runs east west across site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from Church 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)	Not suitable due to distance to school, poor relationship with existing settlement and connectivity and intrusion into landscape	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	A143 to north which may require some mitigation in terms of noise.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability</p> <p>Site is of a suitable size to accommodate an allocation.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations</p> <p>Site in open landscape to north of settlement into which development would be intrusive. Although there is estate development to the south development would not relate well to this with poor connectivity.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations</p> <p>Outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Brockdish. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.</p> <p>Availability</p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability</p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: UNREASONABLE. The site is adjacent to the settlement limit, and although it is 6k to the primary school it does have access to other facilities. However, Church Road is narrow and achieving an adequate access would be problematic. Because access would be from Church Road as there is no opportunity through the existing estate, it would have a poor relationship with the existing settlement. It would also be a significant intrusion into the landscape extending the built-up area northwards and not respecting the existing pattern of development.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN0464
Site address	Land west of Mill Road, Thorpe Abbots
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.62 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Settlement limit extension to accommodate five dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	8dph (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	<p>Potential access constraints. Old field access central, over a ditch.</p> <p>NCC Highways - 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.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Red	<p>Harleston Primary School 8km away</p> <p>Distance to bus service 1km</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to village hall 250m, Brockdish village hall 2.6km Distance to The Old Kings Head public house, Brockdish 3km	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber		Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Identified surface water flood risk on highway past site and western 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	
		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 lead to erosion of rural character of settlement. No loss of high-grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Development of site would extend existing pattern of development from south matching that on eastern side of road	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green

Historic Environment	Green	Site is in conservation area. HES - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Red	Local road network is constrained. NCC Highways - Red. 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
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of the site would lead to the erosion of the rural character of the site which is an important component of the conservation area	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to the site is likely to be achievable although NCC Highways raise concerns about the suitability of the local road network	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to south and on opposite side of road to east. Agricultural land to west. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Bushes and trees on site boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Site contains a number of bushes and trees and other vegetation with potential habitat value	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination. Telegraph poles along frontage.	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from road. No longer views.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to erosion of rural character of settlement and distance to services	Red

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	x	
	Within 5 years	x	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has not stated that affordable housing will be provided, although it may be required depending on the size of the site. No evidence of viability provided	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site is not suitable for a settlement limit extension as it is not adjacent to any defined settlement limit.

Site Visit Observations

Site contains a lot of vegetation and provides open aspect contributing to the rural character of the site and the setting of the Conservation Area.

Local Plan Designations

Outside and removed from any development boundary.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Thorpe Abbots is a small hamlet with very few services and facilities and is 8k from the nearest primary school. The roads are narrow and there is no footpath provision resulting in access being predominantly by car and no safe walking route to the school. The site is within a Conservation Area and its open aspect contributes to the rural character of the hamlet and development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and townscape. Achieving an access and footway would require on site and frontage hedge/tree removal and there is a surface water flood risk.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2001
Site address	Land west of Cross Road, Starston
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Settlement Limit extension (The site has been promoted for 2-4 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 dwellings equates to 20dph 25dph equates to 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	Access options are constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access visibility unlikely to be deliverable. Cross Road and the surrounding highway are restricted in width, lack passing provision and lack footway. Limited visibility at adjacent junctions. Remote from catchment school.	Red
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	Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.8km Distance to bus service 2km Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 2.2km	

<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities			Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified 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	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Erosion of open landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Green	Site within small pattern of settlement.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity	Green

Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity HES – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Access visibility unlikely to be deliverable. Cross Road and the surrounding highway are restricted in width, lack passing provision and lack footway. Limited visibility at adjacent junctions. Remote from catchment school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Site is in sporadic area of development where new development would erode rural character.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow country lane. NCC Highways have advised the visibility is unlikely to be achievable.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues.	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential property to south and on opposite side of road to south-east, otherwise agricultural land. No compatibility issues.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Largely open boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Limited habitat potential	

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 existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Open views across site from Cross 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 is not suitable for development as it is remote from main areas of settlement, access constraints and detrimental to impact on rural character.	Red

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	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>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Affordable housing would not be required for this size of site or scale of development	n/a
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension however there are currently no existing settlement limits within the village of Starston. The site is in a rural location where sporadic development is characteristic of the built form. A linear form of development would be similar to the dwellings to the south east of Cross Road however it would encroach into the countryside to the west of Cross Road. Significant highways concerns, particularly relating to the wider road network, have been identified.

Site Visit Observations Part of wider field in rural area with sporadic development along narrow lane. New development would be intrusive into rural open landscape.

Local Plan Designations No conflicting LP designations

Availability Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability Development of the site is achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE settlement limit extension. Starston currently does not have a settlement limit. The site is in a rural location and would represent an encroachment into the open countryside. Significant highways concerns, particularly relating to the wider road network, have been identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2006
Site address	Land north of High Road (between No171 and Meadow Cottage), Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Appeal dismissed for four dwellings (2019/0911)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.25 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Settlement limit extension (Promoted for one dwelling)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	1 dwelling equates to 4dph 25dph would equate to 6 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	Potential access constraints NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Unclear whether suitable visibility can be provided for local speed restriction/vehicle speeds. Subject to appropriate visibility splays access would require widening the site frontage footway and complete removal of all trees to frontage.	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	Distance to Alburgh and Denton Primary School (not catchment school) 2.4km Bus service passes site with bus stops in close proximity	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 1.3km Distance to The Wortwell Bell Public House 880 metres	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site in area under consideration for further upgrades	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified 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	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in identified river valley landscape area. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Development of site could be within linear pattern of development	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south-east of site	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Adjoining building potentially constitutes non-designated asset – to be assessed if the site progresses further	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road is of a reasonable standard with footway NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Unclear whether suitable visibility can be provided for local speed restriction/vehicle speeds. Subject to appropriate visibility splays access would require widening the site frontage footway and complete removal of all trees to frontage.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	In dismissing the recent appeal, the Inspector found that the undeveloped gap makes a positive contribution to the character of the area therefore townscape and landscape impact of development in this location	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be achievable to the site (note potential visibility issues identified)	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues (note promoters comment about previous residential use of the site – dwelling now demolished)	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties either side, no compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site rises from highway into site	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on site boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging and trees on boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Planning Inspector – due to sloping topography views of site not only from High Road but also from areas across the floodplain of the River Waveney.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable for settlement limit extension as removed from existing development boundary and would result in loss of undeveloped gap that contributes positively to character of area.	Red

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	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>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Affordable housing would not be required from this size of site or scale of development	n/a
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability The site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension however there are no existing settlement limits in close proximity to the site. The site lies wholly within a River Valley designation. Potential highways constraints have been identified, including concerns about achieving a suitable visibility splay. A recent Appeal decision noted the importance of the site for maintaining the rural character of the local landscape.

Site Visit Observations Rising site that makes a positive contribution to the semi-rural character of the area.

Local Plan Designations River Valley designation

Availability Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site has been assessed and is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for an extension to the settlement limit. The site is in a rural setting with limited development, and lies wholly within a River Valley setting. Development of the site would result in the loss of a gap that contributes positively to the rural character of the area.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2036
Site address	Bell Field, High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Land is allocated under policy WOR1 for approximately five dwellings
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development (well before the current allocation was adopted)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.31 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Promoted for allocation for a larger number of dwellings. Exact number not specified
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 (other than very small section at southern end of site)
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 NCC Highways – Amber, would need to demonstrate adequate visibility at Low Road / High Road junction can be secured as well as adequate footway provision which is likely to require some re-alignment of the junction. Low Road would require widening to at least 5.5m between the site and High Road.	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	Distance to Harleston Primary School 3.2km, Alburgh and Denton Primary School (not catchment school) 2.2km Bus service passes site with bus stop within 100 metres Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 3.5km	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 380 metres In close proximity to the Wortwell Bell public house	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	To be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues NCC Mineral & Waste - Sites over 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Areas of site that are not already allocated for development are within flood zones 2 and 3	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Unallocated part of site is within protected river valley landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	In central core of village with in which part of site has already been allocated	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats. Adjacent to candidate County Wildlife Site	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Less than 50m from two Grade II listed buildings and potential impact on other Grade II listed buildings to the south	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is unsuitable in terms of road or junction capacity, although this may be able to be mitigated NCC Highways – Amber, would need to demonstrate adequate visibility at Low Road / High Road junction can be secured as well as adequate footway provision which is likely to require some re-alignment of the junction. Low Road would require widening to at least 5.5m between the site and High Road.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential including caravan park. Public house nearby	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Principle of development on part of site has been established through existing allocation	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable given that it has been accepted for current allocation	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Caravan park based around lakes to east. Residential properties to north and to west including a public house. Agricultural land to south and south-west. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and trees on boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees, hedging and grassland on site as well as proximity to water courses and ponds	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from highway and from public footpath that cuts across site	
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)	Wider site would have landscape/habitat concerns in relation to the River Valley landscape (inc. footpath across the site), and trees/hedging around the site, and proximity to watercourses/ponds.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Part of site that is not allocated is within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)	
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
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:		

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>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green

<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>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Possibility of a wildlife habitat around the new drainage pond	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability Site is of a suitable size to be allocated and within a reasonable distance of the limited services in Wortwell. Part of site is already allocated for 5 units (WOR1); however, the remainder of site not considered suitable due to flood risk. The site is promoted for a small increase in the overall numbers, with an element of affordable housing and a wildlife resource on the area subject to flood risk. However, the allocated site is already 0.4ha and could therefore accommodate 10 dwellings at 25/ha and the policy makes provision for amenity/recreation land outside, but adjacent to the allocated site.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Wider site would have landscape/habitat concerns in relation to the River Valley landscape (inc. footpath across the site), and trees/hedging around the site, and proximity to watercourses/ponds.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Site is part allocated (WOR1) and part outside development boundary. Part of site that is not allocated is within River Valley landscape designation and the current WOR1 Policy makes it clear that this is to be brought forward as amenity land.</p> <p>Availability Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: Reasonable – Part of the site is already allocated for approximately 5 dwellings in the current Local Plan (WOR1). The site promoter is seeking a small increase in</p>

numbers, with some affordable units and an area of wildlife/amenity land. This should be achievable within the existing allocated site, which extends to 0.4ha, and Policy WOR1 already requires provision of amenity space on adjoining land, outside the Settlement Limit. However, any amended Policy would need to emphasise the requirements to protect the setting of the listed pub opposite and the rural gap between the parts of Wortwell centred on High Road and Low Road. Any increase in numbers could also have implications in terms of further highways improvements. The remainder of the site which is not currently allocated is Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, and contributes to the rural gap within the village, and therefore would not be appropriate to allocate for housing

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2065REV
Site address	Land north of High Road and Harmans Lane, Needham
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Historic refusals for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Promoted for 11 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12dph (22dph)
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>Potential access constraints.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Green. Subject to frontage development and acceptable visibility, frontage footway widening required to 2.0m minimum. No access to Harman Lane.</p> <p>Highways Meeting - This is the old A143 pre-bypass therefore access/visibility etc. should not be an issue, however a greater length of frontage development may help reinforce the 30mph speed limit. There is a continuous footway to Harleston, the main limitation of this site is the need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout, however the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge.</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 	Amber	<p>Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.4km</p> <p>Bus service passes site with bus stop around 150 metres away</p> <p>Distance to shop 1.4km</p>	
<p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Village/ community hall ○ Public house/ cafe ○ Preschool facilities ○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to village hall and play area 150 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Red Lion public house 1km</p>	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p>NCC Minerals – site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.</p>	Green

Flood Risk	Red	Rear of site within Flood Zones 2 and 3, however development may be achievable within the front of the site. LFFA – Green. The site is adjacent to moderate/significant flooding (flowpath). This must be considered in the assessment. Standard 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	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land. SDC Landscape Officer - The site is open in landscape terms however it could potentially be accessed without the loss of significant roadside hedgerow if the site is accessed via a private driveway behind the hedgerow (and the hedgerow is therefore retained).	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Sporadic pattern of development in this location. SDC Heritage Officer - No heritage or design issues	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site is within 3km of SSSI NCC Ecology – Green. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber

Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity. SDC Heritage Officer - No heritage or design issues HES - Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Reasonable road and footway provision. NCC Highways - Amber. Subject to frontage development and acceptable visibility, frontage footway widening required to 2.0m minimum. No access to Harman Lane. Highways Meeting - This is the old A143 pre-bypass therefore access/visibility etc. should not be an issue, however a greater length of frontage development may help reinforce the 30mph speed limit. There is a continuous footway to Harleston, the main limitation of this site is the need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout, however the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Less developed area of village, although site still falls within clusters of development. Would therefore have some urbanising effect on character of immediate vicinity	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable but may require removal of part or all of hedgerow	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	

What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties opposite and to either side along the northern side of High Road. Agricultural land to north of site	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land falls away to the rear of the site	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along part of highway boundary. Open boundary with Harmans Lane. Domestic boundary to property to north-east. Rear boundary is undefined as part of larger field	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some potential habitat in hedgerow	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site available from Harmans Lane and High 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)	Some loss of rural character by infilling open gap in pattern of development, however this harm could be outweighed by the need to allocate some housing within the village cluster.	Amber

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>		
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>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout to access Harleston, the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has acknowledged that affordable housing may be required but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to accommodate an allocation.

Site Visit Observations

Field that slopes to the rear. In between existing development where frontage development could be acceptable.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Needham. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: REASONABLE- The site is adjacent to the settlement limit and the services of the village are accessible as there is a continuous footpath along High Road. The site could provide for enhancement to cross the A143, such as a central refuge, to improve connectivity to Harleston and the school. The site is within the river valley but contained within the landscape on the opposite side of the road to the river. The frontage hedge is not continuous, and access could be achieved with minimal loss. The site area has been reduced to remove from Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the rear.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2121A
Site address	Land south of High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Prior notification for agricultural building on the site (2019/2530)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Approx. 1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
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	<p>Potential constraints on access</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, access onto High Road is on the inside of a bend. Visibility of at least 2.4m x 120m would be required. Does not appear achievable. Site is remote from village centre. Access would require 2m wide footway across the site frontage appropriate crossing facilities to the northern side.</p>	Red
<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 	Amber	<p>Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.7km</p> <p>On bus route with bus stops 170 metres away</p> <p>Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 3km</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 400 metres Distance to Wortwell Bell public house 450 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	AW TBC AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues NCC Mineral & Waste - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u> , should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Parts of site have identified surface water flood risk LLFA - Significant mitigation required for severe constraints. Recommend a review of the site and potential removal from the local plan.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Estate development on site would not respect adjacent linear character	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km and 2 CWSs somewhat closer NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Road is of reasonable standard with footway NCC Highways – Amber, access onto High Road is on the inside of a bend. Visibility of at least 2.4m x 120m would be required. Does not appear achievable. Site is remote from village centre. Access would require 2m wide footway across the site frontage appropriate crossing facilities to the northern side.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Estate development in this location would not be in keeping with the linear form and character of the adjacent part of the settlement	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways have raised concerns as to whether visibility could be achieved as access would be on to inside of bend	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Planning permission for residential properties on adjoining land to east, agricultural land on other boundaries. No compatibility issues	
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)	Hedge along highway boundary, with trees including one which is subject to a TPO	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedges along highway boundary	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from public footpath to west as well as glimpsed views through hedgerow from highway	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of the site would extend the village west into the open countryside and also create an area of estate development that does not relate well to the linear pattern of development to the east.	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>		
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:	

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for allocation and reasonably located in relation to the limited facilities in Wortwell. Significant Highways concern that the required visibility splays can not be achieved as the site is situated on the inside of long bend in High Road, potentially exacerbated by the TPO tree on the highways boundary. The LLFA consider that significant mitigation measures would be required for the identified surface water flood risk. The development would be out of keeping with the form and character of the area, which is linear, frontage only, not in depth – in any event, this site would extend further west than development on the opposite site of High Road, intruding further into the designated River Valley landscape.

Site Visit Observations

Site projects west beyond the existing extent of development along High Road. In addition the existing development of this part of the site is just linear development.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but close to the development boundary for Wortwell (and the small area in between has now been developed). The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable - Whilst the site is reasonably located for the local facilities in Wortwell, pedestrian access would require a suitable crossing on High Road. However the site has a number of overriding constraints: it has not been demonstrated that suitable visibility splays can be achieved on the inside of the bend in High Road, particularly given the TPO tree on the highway boundary; there are likely to be significant mitigation measures necessary to address surface water flood risk (if this is achievable at all); the site as proposed would be out of keeping in terms of townscape, introducing an uncharacteristic form of estate development; and even reduced to frontage only development, the site would extend the settlement further into the designated River Valley Landscape.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2121B
Site address	Land west of Low Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Planning permission refused for four dwellings to north of site (2018/2633) and one dwelling to south of site (2017/2080), which was also dismissed on appeal
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Approx. 1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (s) Allocated site (t) SL extension	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
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	<p>Potential access constraints</p> <p>NCC Highways – Amber, would need to demonstrate adequate visibility at Low Road / High Road junction can be secured as well as adequate footway provision which is likely to require some re-alignment of the junction. Low Road would require widening to at least 5.5m between the site and High Road.</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>Distance to Harleston Primary School 3.3km, Alburgh and Denton Primary School 2.3km</p> <p>Distance to bus service 130 metres</p> <p>Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 3.5km</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 400 metres Adjacent to the Wortwell Bell public house	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Capacity tbc AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues NCC Mineral & Waste - sites under 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, <u>if the site area was amended to over 1ha</u> , should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Surface water flood risk along highway with some small areas within site adjacent to highway boundary LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site within protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Infill of gap that separates distinct parts of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to north and south	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC Highways – Amber, would need to demonstrate adequate visibility at Low Road / High Road junction can be secured as well as adequate footway provision which is likely to require some re-alignment of the junction. Low Road would require widening to at least 5.5m between the site and High Road.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural, residential and public house	Amber

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would infill gap between different parts settlement on Low Road and High Road which are currently distinct. It would also have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed public house to the north and potentially to the listed buildings to the south	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that carriageway widening, footway provision and possibly works to the junction of Low Road and High Road would be required to secure safe access to site	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to north and public house. Whilst site does immediately adjoin public house, development could be designed to ensure dwellings can be accommodated on the site without being subject to noise and disturbance from public house. Agricultural land to south and west.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site rises to north and west	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge along highway boundary	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedging.	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overheard power line running east - west across north of site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from both Low Road and public footpath that runs through site	

Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of site would have adverse impact on setting of listed Wortwell Bell as well having an adverse impact on the river valley and eroding the separate areas of settlement along Low Road and High Road	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	NCC Highways note that carriageway widening, footway provision and possibly works to the junction of Low Road and High Road would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is centrally located within the village; however, this location would have implications for the character of the area and the local landscape, as it would significantly close the gap between the parts of the village along High Road and Low Road. Highways improvements would be needed to the Low Road/High Road junction, including potential realignment. The site would also impact on the setting the adjacent listed public house.

Site Visit Observations

Development of site would have adverse impact on setting of listed Wortwell Bell as well having an adverse impact on the river valley and eroding the separate areas of settlement along Low Road and High Road.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Wortwell. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable - The site is centrally located within the village; however, this location would have implications for the character of the area and the designated River Valley landscape, as it would significantly close the gap between the parts of the village along High Road and Low Road. An application for a single dwelling in this gap was refused at appeal in 2018 due to the impact on the character of the area. The site would also impact on the setting of the adjacent Wortwell Bell public house. A 2018 planning application on the part of the site closest to the pub was also refused due to the loss of important hedgerow and possible conflict between the amenity of future residents and the viability of the pub.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 21 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN2121C
Site address	Land north of Sancroft Way, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	Proposal one dwelling on part of site adjoining Low Road was dismissed on appeal (2017/2080)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Approx. 1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (u) Allocated site (v) SL extension	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
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	<p>Potential constraints on access.</p> <p>NCC Highways – Red, in the vicinity of the site Low Road is limited in width with limited footway provision. Low Road is substandard due to limited width and lack of footway provision. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision.</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	<p>Distance to Harleston Primary School 3.5km, Alburgh and Denton Primary School 2.5km</p> <p>Distance to bus service 500 metres</p> <p>Distance to shops in Harleston town centre over 3.5km</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 600 metres Distance to the Wortwell Bell public house 230 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues NCC Mineral & Waste - Sites over 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Identified surface water flood risk on highway LLFA - Few or no constraints. Standard information required at a planning stage.	Amber
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Infill of gap that separates distinct parts of settlement, as noted in the 2018 appeal decision.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed buildings to east of site	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC Highways – Red, in the vicinity of the site Low road is limited in width with limited footway provision. Low Road is substandard due to limited width and lack of footway provision. The local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity, or lack of footpath provision.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would infill part of gap between different parts settlement on Low Road and High Road which are currently distinct. It would also have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed buildings to east of site	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways raise concerns about Low Road having limited width and limited footway provision	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to south and east. Agricultural land to north and west. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site rises from east	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge on highway boundary. Majority of boundaries are undefined as they form part of wider fields	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging on boundary	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into site from Low Road. Longer views from public footpath to west of site	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of site would have adverse impact on setting of listed Says Farmhouse and adjoining listed barn as well having an adverse impact on the river valley and eroding the separate areas of settlement along Low Road and High Road	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	NCC Highways note that carriageway widening, footway provision and possibly works to the junction of Low Road and High Road would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The planning history of the site indicates that it is not suitable, as a single dwelling was dismissed at appeal in 2018 due to the impact on the rural character of the area, within the designated River Valley, particularly in terms of eroding the attractive gap between the parts of Wortwell centred on High Road and Low Road. The appeal was also dismissed in terms of impact on the two listed properties on the opposite side of Low Road, Says Farmhouse and Tyrells Barn. The appeal was dismissed despite a lack of land supply at the time. Highways consider Low Road in this vicinity to be substandard in terms of width and footways.

Site Visit Observations

Development of site would have adverse impact on setting of listed Says Farmhouse and adjoining listed barn as well having an adverse impact on the river valley and eroding the separate areas of settlement along Low Road and High Road.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Wortwell. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable – the site would erode the attractive River Valley landscape that separates the areas of Wortwell centred on High Road and Low Road. The site would also adversely impact on the setting of the two listed buildings on the opposite side of Low Road, Says Farmhouse and Tyrells Barn. A single dwelling on this site was dismissed at appeal in 2018 for the aforementioned reasons, despite a lack of land supply at the time. Highways also consider Low Road in this vicinity to be substandard in terms of width and footways.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 23 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4063SL
Site address	Mill Hill, High Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Historic refusal for residential development
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.4 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (w) Allocated site (x) SL extension	Settlement limit extension (The site has been promoted for six dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6 dwellings equates to 15dph 25dph would equate to 10 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	Constrained access options NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Not clear how access might be achieved. Subject to access and localised footway widening.	Red
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	Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.8km On bus route with bus stops 160 metres away Distance to shops in Harleston town centre 3km	
<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 		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 370 metres Distance to Wortwell Bell public house 420 metres	Green

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but unsure about mains sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified 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	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Backland development in area of settlement characterised by linear development. Form of development that would be possible on the site would have a weak relationship with the existing built form.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green

Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road is of a reasonable standard with footway NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber. Not clear how access might be achieved. Subject to access and localised footway widening.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Playing field, agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Poor relationship with existing linear pattern of development.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is constrained. Only likely to be suitable for a private drive serving one or two dwellings.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to south and playing field to east. Otherwise agricultural land. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Evergreen hedge with playing field to east. Highway tree and hedge planting along boundary with A143	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in vegetation on site boundaries	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from public footpath on site boundary. Some brief views may be possible from A143	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to constrained access and poor relationship with linear pattern of development.	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership		
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	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Affordable housing would be required on site of this size or the scale of development proposed	n/a
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified other than intended high standard of eco-credentials	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability The site is a suitable size for a settlement limit extension but would not complement the existing form of development in evidence. Access, landscape and townscape constraints have been identified.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Narrow access would be a constraint on any development that could take place on this site. Development would be backland in part of settlement characterised by linear pattern of development.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Wortwell. The site is entirely within the River Valley landscape designation.</p> <p>Availability Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE extension to the existing settlement limit. The site would have a poor relationship with the existing linear pattern of development and which would result in an adverse landscape and townscape impact. Significant highways concerns have also been raised about the potential to create a suitable vehicular access to the site.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 23 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4066SL
Site address	Land adjacent to 29 Low Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Refusal in 2002 for three dwellings (2002/1974)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (y) Allocated site (z) SL extension	Settlement limit extension (The site has been promoted for three or four dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	4 dwellings equates to 20dph 25dph would equate to 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	Yes (southern half of site)
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 NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Red
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	Over 3km from any primary school Distance to bus service 930 metres	
<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 		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 1.3km Distance to the Wortwell Bell public house 830 metres	Green

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Red	Majority of site is in flood zones 2 or 3 LLFA – Amber. Significant or severe constraints, significant information required. The site is affected by and adjacent to significant flooding (flowpath). The north of the site is not affected by flooding. This must be considered in the site assessment.	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	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	Frontage development could respect linear pattern of development	Green

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	County Wildlife Site to south-east NCC ECOLOGY – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain. May include candidate County Geodiversity site/ Close to CWS.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings either side of site	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC HIGHWAYS – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Infill development of the site could potentially be accommodated within the existing townscape, although potential impacts on setting of listed buildings	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Safe access could be achievable, albeit local road network is constrained with no footways	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Largely greenfield sites, although there are some derelict structures in the site	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to east and west. Woodland and grazing land to south. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site is wooded which also forms the boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Wooded site on edge of flood plain	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Unlikely to be any contamination, subject to what the derelict structures were used for	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across the site from Low Road are restricted by its wooded nature, although there are some openings and limited views through	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Not suitable due to the wooded nature of site, flood risk and distance to services	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Affordable housing would not be required from development on a site this size or at the scale proposed	n/a
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 of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension. The site is located to at the edge of the settlement, opposite an existing linear pattern of development and in close proximity to the existing settlement boundary. Significant areas of identified flood zone would restrict the developable area of the site to frontage development only. Highways constraints have been identified. The site lies wholly within a River Valley designation and close to ecologically recognised areas too.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations Wooded site with some derelict structures on the site. Site may be of ecological value and development would also have adverse impact on the landscape character of area due to loss of woodland.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Wortwell. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation. Significant areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 identified.</p> <p>Availability Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for an extension to the existing settlement limit. The site is at significant risk of flooding although a frontage development scheme may be acceptable subject to significant flood risk assessment. However, the site is wooded and contributes significantly to the landscape character and development of the site would consequentially result in an adverse impact on the River Valley landscape setting. Highways constraints have also been identified.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Reasonable Alternative: Rejected: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 23 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4069SL
Site address	Land south of Scole Road, Brockdish
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	There have been a number of historic refusals for residential development, the most recent dismissed on appeal (2006/1596)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.18 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (aa) Allocated site (bb) SL extension	Settlement limit extension – 2 to 3 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	16dph (4 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>Established access suitable for minor residential development.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Green. No acceptable walking route to catchment school at Harleston</p> <p>Highways Meeting - Would provide an extension to the built form. No safe walking route to school (which is 6km away). Highways would have no issues with SL extension for 2 dwellings, subject to adequate visibility and access</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	<p>Harleston Primary School is 6km away</p> <p>Bus service passes site with bus stops within 100 metres</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Distance to Brockdish village hall 100 metres Distance to The Old Kings Head public house 360 metres	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues. NCC Minerals – site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Surface water flood risk on highway past site. LLFA – Green. Surface water flooding. Site adjacent to significant flooding (flowpath). Must be considered when doing a site assessment. Standard 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	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	

SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	<p>Site is in protected river valley landscape. No loss of high-grade agricultural land.</p> <p>SDC Landscape Officer - Acceptable in landscape terms</p>	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Would continue existing pattern of development.</p> <p>SDC Heritage Officer - no heritage objection to SN4069. During the Conservation Area Appraisal consultation for Brockdish a couple of years ago there was concern at removing the corner area of housing (chalet bungalows) from the CA and that this was somehow connected to allowing this site to be developed in future. However, I can see no heritage reasons why it couldn't be and the Conservation Area remains on the north side so its setting will still be taken into account.</p>	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>County Wildlife Site to south-east</p> <p>NCC Ecology - Green. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain. Close to Brockdish Common and Adj. Meadow CWS and Registered Common.</p>	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	<p>In conservation area and opposite Grade II listed building.</p> <p>SDC Heritage Officer - no heritage objection to SN4069. During the conservation area appraisal consultation for Brockdish a couple of years ago there was concern at removing the corner area of housing (chalet bungalows) from the CA and that this was somehow connected to allowing this site to be developed in future. However, I can see no heritage reasons why it couldn't be and the conservation area remains on the north side so its setting will still be taken into account.</p> <p>HES - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Road is of a reasonable standard with footway.</p> <p>NCC Highways - Red. No acceptable walking route to catchment school at Harleston.</p> <p>Highways Meeting - Would provide an extension to the built form. No safe walking route to school (which is 6km away). Highways would have no issues with SL extension for 2 dwellings, subject to adequate visibility and access</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	A small development of one or two dwellings could potentially be accommodated on this site without having an adverse impact on the historic environment or townscape	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Existing access which should be satisfactory for minor residential development	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to east and on opposite side of Scole Road to north	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Domestic fencing with hedging on eastern boundary	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Evergreen hedging on highway boundary, other bushes and trees on other boundaries	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination on site	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views are limited into site other than through access	
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)	Potential for a small additional amount of development through a settlement limit extension	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green

Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Affordable housing would not be required	n/a
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p>Suitability</p> <p>Site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension.</p> <p>Site Visit Observations</p> <p>Site is well contained visually but even if evergreen hedging were to be removed there is potential for site to accommodate one or two dwellings in the context of the existing pattern of development.</p> <p>Local Plan Designations</p> <p>Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Brockdish. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.</p> <p>Availability</p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p>Achievability</p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: REASONABLE for extension to settlement limit. The site is adjacent to the settlement limit, and although it is 6k to the primary school it does have access to other facilities. It is in the main part of the village and would be an extension to the built form respecting the existing pattern of development with only a very localised and limited impact on the river valley and Conservation Area. There is an existing access and any loss of Leylandii along the frontage would not be detrimental.</p> <p>Preferred Site: Yes Reasonable Alternative: Rejected:</p>

Date Completed: 23 December 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	SN4084
Site address	Land east of Low Road, Wortwell
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Approx. 1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (cc) Allocated site (dd) SL extension	Allocation – 12 to 25 dwellings
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	Yes (southern part of site)
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 NCC Highways – Red, substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Red
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	Distance to Harleston Primary School 3.4km, Alburgh and Denton Primary School 2.4km Distance to bus service 200 metres Distance to shops in Harleston town centre over 3.5km	
<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 		Distance to recreation ground and community centre 500 metres Distance to the Wortwell Bell public house 100 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Capacity TBC AW advise sewers crossing the site	Green

Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues NCC Mineral & Waste - Sites over 1ha which are underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Majority of site is in flood zone 2 or 3 LLFA - Significant mitigation required for severe constraints. Recommend a review of the site and potential removal from the local plan.	Red
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		Rural River Valley	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland	
		Valley Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Infill of gap that separates distinct parts of settlement	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	SSSI within 2km NCC Ecology – Green, SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed buildings to west of site	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Local road network is constrained NCC Highways – Red, substandard highway network. No safe walking route.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would infill gap between different parts settlement on Low Road and High Road which are currently distinct. It would also have a poor relationship with existing development along Low Road and have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed buildings to the west	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC Highways note that carriageway widening, footway provision and possibly works to the junction of Low Road and High Road would be required to secure safe access to site	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site with no redevelopment or demolition issues	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential properties to west and caravan park around lakes to east. Agricultural land to south. No compatibility issues	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging on site boundaries	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedging on site boundaries, grassland on site and in connection with watercourses on valley flood plain and nearby ponds	
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 existing infrastructure or contamination	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Important views across site and valley from Low Road which would be lost by development	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development of site would have adverse impact on the river valley and eroding the separate areas of settlement along Low Road and High Road. Also would damage setting of heritage assets and is at risk of flooding	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)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>			
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	Yes	
	Within 5 years	Yes	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15-20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	NCC Highways note that carriageway widening, footway provision and possibly works to the junction of Low Road and High Road would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is almost entirely within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, and the LLFA has also identified severe constraints, requiring significant mitigation, in terms of surface water flood risk. The site is entirely within the designated River Valley and would significantly erode the rural gap between the parts of the settlement centred on High Road and Low Road; notwithstanding this, the form of the site would have a poor relationship with existing development on Low Road. There are also potential impacts on the rural setting of the listed Tyrells Barn, when approaching from the north. Highways have identified that Low Road is substandard in the vicinity of the site.

Site Visit Observations

Development of site would have an adverse impact on the river valley and erode the separate areas of settlement along Low Road and High Road. It would also have a poor relationship with the existing pattern of development along Low Road and have adverse impact on setting of Says Farmhouse and adjacent listed barn.

Local Plan Designations

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary for Wortwell. The site is entirely within the river valley landscape designation.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

OVERALL CONCLUSION: Unreasonable - The site is almost entirely within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, and the LLFA has also identified severe constraints, requiring significant mitigation, in terms of surface water flood risk. The site would significantly erode the rural River Valley gap between the parts of the settlement centred on High Road and Low Road and the form/layout of the site would have a poor relationship with existing development on Low Road. There are also potential impacts on the rural setting of the listed Tyrells Barn, when approaching from the north. Highways have identified that Low Road is substandard in the vicinity of the site.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 23 December 2020