

Rockland St Mary, Hellington &
Holverston
Village Cluster
Site Assessment Forms

Contents

SN0165	3
SN0531	10
SN2007	17
SN2061REV.....	24
SN2063	31
SN2064REV.....	38
SN2070	45

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	<u>SN0165</u>
Site address	Land north of Bramerton Lane & Rookery Hill, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Promoted for development of 10 dwellings which would be a SL extension, however big enough to allocate for 12 – 25 dwellings – assessed as a potential allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	10dph (as a SL extension) 25dph (as an allocation)
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:

Detail	Comments
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 likely to be difficult to achieve CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 350 metres On route of peak time bus service with nearest bus stop 150 metres Distance to village shop 500 metres	N/A
<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 	N/A	Distance to village hall 370 metres Distance to New Inn public house 2km	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity should 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	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some surface water risk on site and also on Bramerton Road and Run Lane	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade - TBC	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Respects linear pattern of settlements, however intrudes into more open landscape. Close to or within area with high agricultural soil classification	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Respects linear pattern of settlements, however may dilute rural dispersed character of settlement to west off main village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Within 3km buffer distance of SAP, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve to north-east of site	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to south, including grade II* listed church to south-east HES Score – Amber	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	NCC highways to advise CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	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 would extend existing pattern development out into open countryside to west. However, would have an adverse impact on more rural pattern of development to south of junction of Run Lane with Rookery Hill / Bramerton Road including heritage assets	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Unclear as to where access would be achieved given the bending nature of the road past the site frontage and the junction with Run Lane. Footway link would also need to be established which could require loss of trees and hedgerow at south-eastern corner of site	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to north, residential to east and some further residential to west on opposite side of Bramerton Road, agriculture to south with farm on Run Lane	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Undulating site	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and trees on some of highway boundary, hedge on northern boundary	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in tree and hedgerows on boundary	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from public highway, including approaching site along Run Lane from south	N/A
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)	Unsuitable due to impact on the landscape and character of this part of Rockland St Mary. May have adverse impact on heritage assets so should get views of Senior Conservation and Heritage Officer if the site is to progress further	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)
None	N/A	N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)

Question	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 provision identified by the highway authority as likely to 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	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	N/A

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site is of suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Undulating site which contributes to dispersed rural feel to this entrance to the village. Development of the site would significantly affect this character. There are also potential access issues.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to 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: The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE due to the impact its development would have on the character of the western entrance to the village. Potential access issues also identified.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	<u>SN0531</u>
Site address	Land west of Lower Road, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	14.8 hectares, of which approx. 10 hectares is proposed for dwellings
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	200 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	20 dph (approx.)
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:

Detail	Comments
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 may be difficult to achieve CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 1.35 km Distance to peak time bus service 200 metres Distance to village shop 890 metres Distances measured using pedestrian access indicated to north-west of site. Footways then available for entire route	N/A
<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 	N/A	Village hall 1.4km using pedestrian access indicated to north-west of site. Footways then available for entire route Playing field 255 metres using public right of way to north Distance to New Inn public house 330 metres using public right of way to north and then footway along New Inn Hill	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Some 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>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Loss of high quality agricultural land. Site would also potentially impact on Broads and would not respect linear character of settlement	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Poor relationship with existing form and character of settlement	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer zone for SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar Site and National Nature Reserve	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed buildings to north-west HES Score - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Access onto rural road with no footways CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Although partly adjacent to existing built form development of the site would have a very poor relationship with the existing settlement due to the remote access arrangement as well as being of a scale and form that would not be appropriate for the settlement	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access option is potentially achievable but would be remote from main part of village and therefore would have poor connectivity	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural with no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north-west and north-east by mainly agricultural. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Undulating, descends to east into Yare Valley	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedges on some boundaries	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Number of trees and hedgerows that could be affected. Also involves a large amount of development close to The Broads	N/A
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 or adjacent to site	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public right of way passes through site from which views would be heavily affected, plus views from public highway	N/A
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 to be allocated as too large with poor relationship to existing settlement. Also have impact on rural feel of character and on Broads	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)
None	N/A	N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately & Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)

Question	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>	Likely to require off-site works given scale of development	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Open space above policy requirement	N/A

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site is too large for allocation of 12-25 dwellings that is sought and does not lend itself to easily being reduced in size

Site Visit Observations

Number of fields to south-east of village. Access would be very remote from the main part of the settlement, and the scale and form of any development would not relate well to the existing settlement.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but partly adjacent to development boundary of existing settlement.

Availability

Promoter states the site is available.

Achievability

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

OVERALL CONCLUSION: As promoted the site is of excessive scale but could be reduced in size to meet the objectives of the VCHAP and address concerns that would otherwise be encountered regarding the impact of development in this location on both the landscape and the townscape . A combination of SN2007 and the north west corner of SN0531 is preferred in order to create a site of 25 dwellings . Development of this site would require cooperation between the landowners of SN2007 and SN0531.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 17 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	<u>SN2007</u>
Site address	Land south of New Inn Hill, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.55 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Allocation of 15 dwellings or more
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	27 dph
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:

Detail	Comments
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access should be achievable from New Inn Hill Highways score – Amber. Access visibility requirement likely to result in removal of mature tree. Subject to provision of 2.0m frontage f/w to link with existing facility to west. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 1.5km Peak time bus service passes site with bus stop 300 metres away Distance to village shop and surgery 1km	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<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 	N/A	Village hall 1.2 km away Distance to New Inn public house 270 metres away	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known issues of contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste – the site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site progresses as an allocation then future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, if the site area was amended to over 1ha, it should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk LLFA score (GNLP) – Green (standard information required)	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Respects linear pattern of settlements, however intrudes into more open landscape. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Extends into area of more loose development Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. Logical location for next development. Rockland is a very linear settlement however continual linear extension is not necessarily efficient. 15 houses planned here - suggest would say 10-15 with scope to expand to 15 if it can be shown to work without too high a density.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar and National Nature Reserve	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No identified heritage assets in close proximity Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green. No heritage impact. HES Score – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Road and footway access should be satisfactory Highways score – Amber. Access visibility requirement likely to result in removal of mature tree. Subject to provision of 2.0m frontage f/w to link with existing facility to west. Subject to highway conditions in planning application.	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 would have impact on landscape but could relate to Eel Catcher Close development adjacent extending the existing pattern of development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access should be achievable	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to west; agricultural to south and to north on opposite side of road. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site itself is level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and trees on highway boundary. Open boundary with public footpath to east, but hedge behind that.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in hedges and trees	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views from public highway and also public footpath to east.	N/A
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)	If access can be secured (both highway and through provision of footway) without loss of tree and minimal loss of hedging then this could be an acceptable site to allocate, whilst accepting some harm to the local landscape.	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)
None	N/A	N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately & Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	N/A

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Site just large enough to allocate for 12 dwellings, though this would not be in a linear form.

Site Visit Observations

Extends beyond eastern extent of main village and fairly prominent as on ridge. However, precedent for development by adjoining Eel Catcher Close development. Access should be achievable.

Local Plan Designations

Outside but adjacent to 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: Whilst the site extends beyond the eastern extent of the main village and is fairly prominent as it is on a ridge, the precedent for development has been established by the adjoining Eel Catcher Close development. A suitable access is expected to be achievable. As a standalone site, this site is unlikely to be suitable for up to 15 dwellings, however there is a potential for the site to be extended into the adjacent SN0531 site to create a larger development. SN0531 appears to offer the potential for an additional footway access back to the main village.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	<u>SN2061REV</u>
Site address	North of The Street, Rockland St Mary (access between No101 and 103 The Street)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation (Revised to accommodate 12-25 dwellings)
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 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:

Detail	Comments
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 from The Street likely to be difficult to achieve CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 910 metres Distance to peak time bus service 250 metres Distance to village shop and surgery 450 metres	N/A
<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 	N/A	Village hall 930 metres away Distance to New Inn public house 920 metres	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage, gas and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	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 surface water flood risk in south-east of site LLFA score – Green (standard planning information required)	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrudes into open landscape to north away from linear pattern of development. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Does not relate to existing linear pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to the Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ Potential for protected species, habitats and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to candidate geodiversity site.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity HES Score – Amber	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	The Street has capacity and adequate footways Highways score - Green	Green
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 relate poorly to the form and character of the settlement	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Narrow access from The Street which may not be sufficient to provide adoptable road. In addition passes very close to existing dwelling and rear garden resulting in residential amenity issues.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south along The Street, agricultural to north. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Drop in levels to north of site	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and fences on boundaries with residential properties, open boundary with rest of field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some in hedging	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues likely	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden in views from The Street due to position behind existing development, however potentially visible due to relief of land from the north	N/A
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 inadequate access and poor relationship with existing pattern of development and intrusion into open countryside	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)
None	N/A	N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately & Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)

Question	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><i>Suitability</i></p> <p>Site is of a suitable size for allocation</p> <p><i>Site Visit Observations</i></p> <p>Site is to the rear of linear pattern of development with a very constrained access that is unlikely to be of sufficient size to allow an adoptable highway to be constructed. Development would be out of character and intrusive into the open landscape to the north.</p> <p><i>Local Plan Designations</i></p> <p>Adjacent to but outside the development boundary.</p> <p><i>Availability</i></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><i>Achievability</i></p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p>OVERALL CONCLUSION: UNREASONABLE – Development of the site would intrude into open landscape to the north, away from the existing linear pattern of development of the settlement.</p>

CONCLUSION

This is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. There are also concerns about whether a suitable access to the site could be formed.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	<u>SN2063</u>
Site address	Land north of The Street (behind Post Office), Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	2 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12.5dph – 25 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:

Detail	Comments
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 through garden of existing dwelling CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 530 metres Distance to peak time bus service 380 metres to bus stops Village shop and surgery in close proximity	N/A
<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 	N/A	Village hall 550 metres away Distance to New Inn public house 1.3km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues Minerals & Waste comment – the site is over 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site becomes an allocation then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy.	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	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>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrudes into open landscape to north away from linear pattern of development. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Does not relate to existing linear pattern of development	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance of SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in close proximity HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	The Street has capacity and adequate footways CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	Green
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 relate poorly to the form and character of the settlement	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is through existing garden of No47 which would have potential amenity issues	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south along The Street, agricultural to north. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedge and fences on boundaries with residential properties, open boundary with rest of field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some in hedging	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues likely	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden in views from The Street due to position behind existing development	N/A
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 poor relationship with existing pattern of development and intrusion into open countryside. Potential access issues.	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)
None	N/A	N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Under option to a developer/ site promoter	N/A
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)

Question	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	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	N/A

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is a suitable size for allocation, however it would be at a low density.

Site Visit Observations

Site is to the rear of linear pattern of development with access through the curtilage of an existing dwelling which may result in amenity issues. Development would be out of character and intrusive into the open landscape to the north.

Local Plan Designations

Adjacent to but outside the 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: Development of the site would intrude into the open landscape to the north, away from the existing linear pattern of development of the settlement. This is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. There are further concerns about whether a suitable access could be formed.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	<u>SN2064REV</u>
Site address	Land south of The Street, Rockland St Mary (rear of surgery)
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Allocation – 12-25 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 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:

Detail	Comments
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 through surgery grounds	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Local healthcare services <input type="checkbox"/> Retail services <input type="checkbox"/> Local employment opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Peak-time public transport	Green	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 530 metres Distance to peak time bus service 380 metres to bus stops Village shop and surgery in close proximity	N/A
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <input type="checkbox"/> Village/ community hall <input type="checkbox"/> Public house/ cafe <input type="checkbox"/> Preschool facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Formal sports/ recreation facilities	N/A	Village hall 550 metres away Distance to New Inn public house 1.5km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	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 surface water flood risk LLFA score – Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland ALC Grade TBC	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrudes into open landscape to south away from linear pattern of development, although mitigated by School Lane to west. Agricultural soil classification unclear	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Townscape	Amber	<p>Does not relate to existing linear pattern of development, although mitigated by School Lane to the east</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Amber. There are two established clusters to the east end and west end of the village – with this central area still very linear in its grain of development without backland development. Consequently there are not that many accesses in the centre of the village, and with gaps in housing it retain a rural scale. Introduction of a third central clustered area would create more of precedent for other backland areas to be developed in the same vain, fundamentally changing character of the village. I therefore have townscape concerns.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>Close to Broads and within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve</p> <p>NCC Ecology score – Green. SSSI IRZ potential for protected species/ habitats and biodiversity net gain. Adjacent to priority habitat.</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	<p>No heritage assets in close proximity.</p> <p>Senior Heritage & Design Officer – Green.</p> <p>HES Score – Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>The Street has capacity and adequate footways</p> <p>Highways score – Green</p>	Green
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 not relate to linear pattern of development along The Street heading east from the site. However to the west The Street bends to the south with development along School Lane protruding to the south	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access adjacent to surgery which would be tight – seek clarification with Highway Authority as to whether there is sufficient room for an acceptable access arrangement	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and surgery to north along The Street, agricultural to south. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Relatively level	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and tress on boundaries other than southern which ins undefined as part of larger field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Habitat in hedges and trees	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No contamination issues likely	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Largely hidden in views from The Street due to position behind existing development	N/A
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)	Could be acceptable given existing development along The Street further to the south as the road curves to the west and development protruding to the south along School Lane to the west. However, clarification that access is achievable required	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)
None	N/A	N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Under option to a developer/ promoter	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	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?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	None

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

The site is of a suitable size to be allocated.

Site Visit Observations

Site to the rear of existing linear pattern of development, however pattern of development to west could mitigate for this to some extent. As a consequence there are some townscape concerns. Access by the side of the surgery looks tight and needs clarifying if achievable.

Local Plan Designations

Adjacent to but outside the 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: Whilst the site extends into open space beyond the linear pattern of existing development there is existing development to the south of The Street, as the road curves to the west with development protruding to the south along School Lane to the west of the proposed site. It would need to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Highways Officer that an appropriate access into the site, with adequate visibility, can be achieved.

Preferred Site: Yes

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected:

Date Completed: 8 July 2020

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	<u>SN2070</u>
Site address	West of the Oaks, Rockland St Mary
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No relevant planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	SL extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	6 dph – 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:

Detail	Comments
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 constraints in delivering access. Poor connectivity to the settlement. CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT ACCESS TO THE SITE	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport 	Amber	Distance to Rockland St Mary school 1.2km, with majority along fast rural road not suitable pedestrian use Bus stops for peak time bus service close by, but poor pedestrian connectivity Distance to village shop and surgery 1.4 km with part of this along fast rural road not suitable pedestrian use. Footways once you are within main part of settlement	N/A
<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 	N/A	Village hall 1.2km, with majority along fast rural road not suitable pedestrian use. Playing field 2.5 km on opposite side of settlement Distance to New Inn public house 3km on opposite side of settlement	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Green
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Unclear from information available	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	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 issues	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	Tributary Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area (<i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i>)	N/A	B3 Rockland Tributary Farmland	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Intrusive into open countryside. High value agricultural soil classification	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Poorly related to existing settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Within 3km buffer distance to SAC, SPA, SSSI, Ramsar site and National Nature Reserve	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No heritage assets in proximity HES Score – Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Fast rural road with no footways CURRENT HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK	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 is remote from settlement and therefore has poor relationship with existing development	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access may be difficult to achieve given nature of road. Visibility requirements may require removal of trees and hedges	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no redevelopment or demolition issues	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural to south and on opposite side to north. Residential to east. No compatibility issues	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Largely level site	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow with trees on northern, western and eastern boundaries. Southern boundary is undefined as part of wider field	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows	N/A
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 exiting infrastructure or contamination that would prevent development	N/A
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 highway	N/A
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 as remote from settlement with erosion of rural 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)
None	N/A	N/A
Conclusion	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)

Question	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Single private ownership	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	Unknown	N/A
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Within 5 years	Green

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)

Question	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	n/a
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	n/a

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Suitability

Not adjacent to any existing development boundary so not suitable as an extension and too small to allocate

Site Visit Observations

Site remote from settlement and rural in character

Local Plan Designations

Outside and remote from 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: UNREASONABLE - Not suitable to be included in development boundary due to poor connectivity and remoteness from the settlement

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 8th July 2020