

Stoke Holy Cross, Shotesham, Caistor St  
Edmund & Bixley  
Village Cluster  
Site Assessment Forms

## Contents

GNLP0197.....	3
GNLP0202.....	10
GNLP0524.....	18
GNL0532.....	26
GNLP0534.....	33
GNLP0590.....	40
GNLP2091.....	48
GNLP4013.....	55
SN4028.....	62

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	GMLP0197
Site address	Land north of Long Lane, Stoke Holy Cross
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	3.2 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Residential development with landscaping and open space
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 50 dwellings (approx. 16 dwellings per hectare) 80 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>A suitable access could be achieved. Access could be taken through the recently completed site to the south. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Site is remote from the network and does not link to an existing road. Would need to be accessed via Harrold Place to the south.</p> <p><b>(Highways meeting 06/01/21 - the adopted highway (Harrold Place) doesn't extend to the boundary of this site, hence there would be a ransom strip)</b></p>	Red

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Nearest school is Stoke Holy Cross Primary School – c. 350metres with footways</p> <p>There is a bus stop within walking distance. First - Charcoal Line 40, 41 and X41 – c. 700 metres</p> <p>There is a PH and fish and chip shop in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses – c. up to 1.3km</p>	
		<p>Village Hall located to the west of the site. Pre-School operates through the village hall – c. 800m</p> <p>Playing field, football pitch's and over and under 12's play area and skate park – c. 425m</p> <p>Public House and restaurant – 1.3km</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to water supply and sewerage infrastructure network to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Green	The site is at low risk of flooding	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		Tas Rural River Valley ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site within an attractive valley landscape. Some containment around field boundaries although land to north protrudes into open countryside and would be visible across the valley.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site would break away from the existing settlement boundary and form a significant extension to the north of village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges around all site boundaries with some hedge trees	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on heritage assets <b>HES</b> – Amber	Green
Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rural local road network. Access could potentially be taken through the recently completed site to the south. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development. NCC to confirm if there is enough capacity in network.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Site is remote from the network and does not link to an existing road. Would need to be accessed via Harrold Place to the south. <b>(Highways meeting 06/01/21 - the adopted highway (Harrold Place) doesn't extend to the boundary of this site, hence there would be a ransom strip)</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural fields to north and east and residential properties to south and west.	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No likely impact on heritage assets. Some impact on the townscape as the site would be an extension to a recent allocation and would extend the village further to the north	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could potentially be taken through the recently completed site to the south. NCC have raised concerns regarding the local road network. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming on network.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural fields to north and east and residential properties to south and west. Uses are generally compatible with a residential development.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and hedge Hedges around all site boundaries with some matures trees.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature hedgerows and trees	
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 and out of the site from the north and east will likely have some significant impact on the rural landscape character, as well as across the valley setting.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape valley and significance of landscape harm that would result.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

### Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)	
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single 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	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 information 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>	Possible upgrades to water supply and foul water network; some highway works may be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed delivery of affordable housing on the site. No additional evidence submitted at this time.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None proposed as part of this site	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** As promoted the site is of a size that is considered to be excessive, however the site could be reduced in scale. A number of constraints have been identified that would be difficult to overcome including a ransom strip at Harrold Place preventing access into the site and the landscape impact of development in this location, particularly in long views across the Tas Valley.

**Site Visit Observations** Significant concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape and amount of housing protruding into the open countryside. Trees and hedgerows bounding the site. Rural road network. Good connectivity to the settlement.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting LP designations

**Availability** The promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable however a ransom strip has been identified which will impact upon achieving access into the site.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE for allocation. The site is well connected to the settlement, however there are significant highway concerns about access into the site. Concerns have also been raised about the existence of a ransom strip between this site and the adjacent development have been raised which could affect deliverability. Significant landscape concerns have also been raised in respect of the impact that further development in this location could have on the wider views across the Tas Valley. If it can be demonstrated that highway concerns can be overcome and a scheme that is acceptable in landscape terms is achievable then this site might be viewed as being reasonable, but this conclusion cannot be drawn at this point.

PREFERRED:

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE:

REJECTED: Yes

Date Completed: Chris Watts

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0202
<b>Site address</b>	Land north of and adjoining Long Lane, Stoke Holy Cross
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	None
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	1.3 ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension</b>	Residential development with landscaping and open space  (Promoted for up to 20 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	Up to 20 dwellings (approx. 15 dwellings per hectare)  32 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>A suitable access could be achieved. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development. NCC to confirm if access is achievable either via the development to the west which adjoins the site or from Long Lane.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways -Amber.</b>                      Subject to achieving acceptable visibility, provision of 2m wide frontage footway to link with existing facilities and carriageway widening to 5.5m, along with speed limit extension. 2 points of access. One onto the existing estate road, the other onto Long Lane.  <i>(Highways meeting 06/01/21 - the majority of development would need to be from a shared access with the recently completed Ingram Homes site (Harold Place), which will need to be widened to 5.5m. Would also benefit from some frontage development onto Long Lane, to help reinforce the 30mph limit.)</i></p>	Amber

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Nearest school is Stoke Holy Cross Primary School (opposite side of Long Lane) – c. 225 m</p> <p>There is a bus stop within walking distance. First - Charcoal Line 40, 41 and X41 – c. 575m</p> <p>There is a PH and fish and chip shop in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses – up to 1.2km</p>	
		<p>Village Hall located to the west of the site. Pre-School operates through the village hall – c.650m</p> <p>Playing field, football pitch's and over and under 12's play area and skate park – c.285m</p> <p>Public House and restaurant – up to 1.2km</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to water supply and sewerage infrastructure network to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Green	The site is at low risk of flooding	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		Tas Rural River Valley ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site within an attractive valley landscape (Tas Valley) and would be visible in longer views across the valley. Some containment around field boundaries.  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> - Significant concerns with this site – it is not considered to be acceptable in landscape terms. The site is prominent in views across the valley and further development in this location would exacerbate an already poor situation	Red
Townscape	Green	Site would extend the settlement edge along Long Road, following the line of the recently completed development to the west.  <b>SENIOR DESIGN AND CONSERVATION OFFICER</b> – Green. This site continues the exiting development from the west.	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges around all site boundaries with some hedge trees  <b>NCC ECOLOGY</b> – Green. Orange DLL habitat risk zone for great crested newts. SSSI IRZ.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on heritage assets  <b>SENIOR DESIGN AND CONSERVATION OFFICER</b> – Green  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Green

Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	<p>Rural local road network. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development. NCC to confirm if there is enough capacity in network.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> -Amber.  Subject to achieving acceptable visibility, provision of 2m wide frontage footway to link with existing facilities and carriageway widening to 5.5m, along with speed limit extension. 2 points of access. One onto the existing estate road, the other onto Long Lane.  <i>(Highways meeting 06/01/21 - the majority of development would need to be from a shared access with the recently completed Ingram Homes site (Harrold Place), which will need to be widened to 5.5m. Would also benefit from some frontage development onto Long Lane, to help reinforce the 30mph limit.)</i></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural fields to north and east and residential properties to south and west.	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?</i>	No likely impact on heritage assets although the site would elongate the village to the north – townscape impact	
<i>Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?</i>	Access could be taken through the recently completed site to the west or from Long Lane. NCC have raised concerns regarding the local road network. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming on network.	
<i>Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)</i>	Agricultural field	
<i>What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)</i>	Agricultural fields to north and east and residential properties to south and west. Uses are generally compatible with a residential development.	
<i>What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)</i>	Generally flat	
<i>What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)</i>	Mature trees and hedges around site boundaries with some matures trees.	
<i>Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?</i>	Mature hedgerows and trees	
<i>Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)</i>	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	
<i>Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape</i>	Views into and out of the site from the north and east will likely have an impact on the rural landscape character. Impact on the valley setting.	
<b>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)</b>	Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape valley. However the site appears to form a logical extension to the existing settlement in this location.	Amber

## Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)	
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single 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	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 information 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)	Possible upgrades to water supply and foul water network. Off-site highway improvement works would be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has confirmed delivery but no additional evidence submitted at this time	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None proposed as part of the site promotion	

## Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b> The site is of a suitable size for allocation and relates well to the existing settlement. It also benefits from good connectivity. Some highway matters have been raised but these could be reasonably overcome. The wider landscape impact resulting from development of this site is a key concern.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b> Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural Tas Valley landscape however the site would form a logical extension to the existing settlement in this location subject to appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b> No conflicting LP designations</p> <p><b>Availability</b> Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b> Development of the site is achievable</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> This site is considered to be a REASONABLE site for allocation within this settlement. The site relates well to the existing settlement and benefits from good access to the local services. Access to the site would be achievable and off-site highway works could reasonably address the highways issues identified. However, development of this site would have an impact on the wider landscape setting, in particular in long views across the Tas Valley, and this would be difficult to mitigate.</p> <p><b>PREFERRED:</b>  <b>REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE:</b> Yes  <b>REJECTED:</b></p>

Date Completed: Chris Watts

Officer: 31 July 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0524
<b>Site address</b>	Land south of Long Lane, Stoke Holy Cross
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	None
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	6.56 ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension</b>	Allocation  Residential development and new Long Lane Park containing 4.32 ha of green infrastructure and new play equipment (2.24 hectares for residential development)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	30 market and affordable dwellings equates to 13dph  25 dph would equate to 56 dwellings on 2.24ha
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>A suitable access could be achieved as the site has a road frontage.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber.</b>                      Subject to achieving acceptable visibility, provision of 2m wide frontage footway to link with existing facilities and carriageway widening to 5.5m, along with speed limit extension. 2 points of access. Likely to require removal of all existing frontage hedges/trees.  <b>(NCC HIGHWAYS 06/01/21: in highways terms the main problem with this site would be securing a footway across the front of the adjoining Hopkins Homes development, also extending the speed limit further west when there is already relatively poor compliance with the existing 30mph)</b></p>	Amber

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul> <p><i>Part 2:</i></p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Nearest school is Stoke Holy Cross Primary School – c. 375m</p> <p>There is a bus stop within walking distance. First - Charcoal Line 40, 41 and X41 – c. 750m</p> <p>There is a PH and fish and chip shop in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses – up to c. 1.3km</p>	
		<p>Village Hall located to the west of the site. Pre-School operates through the village hall – c. 815m</p> <p>Playing field, football pitch's and over and under 12's play area and skate park – c. 450m</p> <p>Public House and restaurant – up to c. 1.3km</p>	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Enhancements to water supply and sewerage infrastructure network to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	There is some risk of surface water flooding. A surface water flow path runs through the site.	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		Tas Rural River Valley ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site within an attractive valley landscape. Some containment around field boundaries.  <b>SNC LANDSCAPE OFFICER</b> – Significant concerns about the landscape impact of this site, especially in longer views across the Tas Valley.	Amber
Townscape	Green	Site would extend the settlement along Long Lane towards Upper Stoke. Development in this location would have a significant impact on townscape character.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges around site boundaries and within site, including trees.	Amber
Historic Environment	Green	No impact on heritage assets  <b>HES</b> – Red. Earthworks of a medieval settlement.	Red
Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rural local road network. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to achieving acceptable visibility, provision of 2m wide frontage footway to link with existing facilities and carriageway widening to 5.5m, along with speed limit extension. 2 points of access. Likely to require removal of all existing frontage hedges/trees. <i>(NCC HIGHWAYS 06/01/21: in highways terms the main problem with this site would be securing a footway across the front of the adjoining Hopkins Homes development, also extending the speed limit further west when there is already relatively poor compliance with the existing 30mph)</i>	Amber

Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural fields to north, south and west and residential property/ farm to the east.	Green
------------------------	-------	--	-------

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	No likely impact on heritage assets	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be taken from Long Lane. NCC have raised concerns regarding the local road network. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming on network.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural fields to north, south and west and residential property/ farm to the east. Uses are generally compatible with a residential development.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and hedges around site boundaries and within site, including some matures trees.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature hedgerows and trees. Pond located to south east of site which forms part of ditch network and surface water flow path. Pond appears dry at present.	
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 and out of the site from will likely have some significant impact on the rural landscape character, in particular across the valley.	

<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape valley and townscape character.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single 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	Yes	Green
	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 information 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>	Possible upgrades to water supply and foul water network, as well as possible off-site highway works	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Possible requirement for affordable housing based on site area/ numbers.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Delivery of new green infrastructure comprising 4.32 ha of GI to offset development pressures on other existing open spaces.	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** As promoted the site is of an excessive scale however it could potentially be reduced in size to address this issue and development of 25 units would be achievable on this site. The site has a road frontage access however concerns have been raised about highway safety issues, including current speed compliance and difficulties creating a safe pedestrian footway. The site benefits from good connectivity however significant landscape concerns have also been identified, especially in wider views of the site.

**Site Visit Observations** Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural valley landscape and townscape character. The site is well connected to the settlement.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting landscape 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 option for allocation. An overall reduction in size could address concerns about the scale of development proposed however further concerns have also been raised about the landscape impact of development in this location and highways safety matters, including ongoing speed compliance issues and the difficulties creating a safe pedestrian footpath to the south.

**PREFERRED:**

**REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE:**

**REJECTED:** Yes

Date Completed: January 2021

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	GNL0532
Site address	Land east of Norwich Road, Caistor St Edmund
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.5ha
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Residential development
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	5 dwellings (10dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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	Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that the possibility of creating suitable access to the site is constrained. The site is relatively remote.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> As per previous GNLP comments – No- Remote, Network, Access issues	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	No primary school or secondary school in village. Nearest schools are some distance away (Stoke Holy Cross Primary School) with no footpath connectivity/ safe walking route – in excess of 3km from the site  There is a bus stop within walking distance. Services are infrequent.  No services in village, but there is a large Tesco in the parish at Harford so there are local employment opportunities.	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village hall no longer in use. No sports/recreational facilities or public house etc in village	Red
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be checked	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	No known constraints	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Could be contamination issues from adjacent site (water works)  <b>NCC M&amp;W</b> - This site is under 1ha and is underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If this site is allocated then information that future development would need to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan would be required.	Amber
Flood Risk	Amber	Some areas of the site at risk of surface water flooding	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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 (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Tas Rural River Valley  ALC – Grade 3	

Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Development would potentially be visible from east, south and west, however some mitigation may be possible by providing new planting	Amber
Townscape	Green	No townscape setting	Green
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Geological SSSI to the north – chalk quarry	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Scheduled monument to the south  <b>HES</b> – Amber. We have commented on a previous application (2018/2698, our ref CNF48540). The archaeological implications of developing this site are considerable, predetermination evaluation by trial trenching is required.	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Rural road network but land may be available for improvements. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable and enough capacity in network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. As per previous GNLP comments – No- Remote, Network, Access issues	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Water works to immediate north/ agricultural fields to remainder of site boundaries. Possible amenity issues from water works and quarry further north i.e. noise and dust.	Amber

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Limited likely impact on Historic Environment but would introduce development into a rural setting	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC raised concerns regarding the possibility of creating suitable access. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming visibility and impact on network.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Water works immediately north of site and quarry further north. May be issues in respect to residential amenity.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Short section of hedge to front of site along Stoke Road. Some planting along northern boundary.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to some boundaries	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Possible contamination, pipelines on adjacent site (water works)	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Immediate views from along Stoke Road. Some visual containment of wider views, but likely visible from Tas Valley.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Concerns over the suitability of the site access, remoteness of site, possible on-site constraints and amenity issues as well as the visual impacts of development in this location.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)	
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single 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	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>	Possibly associated with the adjacent quarry use of the site	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No requirement for affordable housing based on current site numbers proposed	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b> The site is of a size that could be considered suitable for an allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings. The site is not in close proximity to an existing settlement limit. A number of constraints have been identified that could not reasonably be overcome, including poor connectivity and distance from the closest services, highways issues, landscape concerns and possible on-site and/or adjacent contamination/amenity issues associated with the adjacent quarry use.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b> Concerns over the suitability of the site access, remoteness of site, and possible visual impacts. No school nearby and limited services.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b> No conflicting Local Plan designations</p> <p><b>Availability</b> Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b> Although development of the site is considered achievable a wide number of constraints have been identified.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> This site is considered to be UNREASONABLE as both an allocation and a settlement limit extension. The site has poor connectivity and is remote from services, including the local primary school. Other identified constraints include highways access, residential amenity and potential landscape issues.</p> <p>PREFERRED: REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE: REJECTED: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 26 June 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0534
<b>Site address</b>	Land north of The Street, Shotesham
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	None
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.67 ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension</b>	Allocation (but the site has been considered as both an allocation and a settlement limit extension due to its overall size)  (The site has been promoted for 5 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	5 dwellings would equate to 8dph  16 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Highway evidence has indicated that potential access constraints could be overcome</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Amber.</b>                      Access likely subject to carriageway widening to 5.5m and 2m footway across whole site frontage. Footway to connect with existing provision to the north. Visibility would require complete removal of existing frontage hedge. No continuous footway to the catchment primary school.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Red	<p>No primary school or secondary school in village. Nearest schools are some distance away (Stoke Holy Cross Primary School).</p> <p>There is a bus stop within walking distance. Services are infrequent, no evenings or weekend services</p> <p>There is a PH in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses.</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Playing field (just grass and goal posts) Bowling Green (members only) Public House and use of privately-owned meeting room/hall.	Red
Utilities Capacity	Green	Enhancements to wastewater treatment capacity may be required	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Minimal risk of flooding	Amber
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		Tas Rural River Valley ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site within an attractive valley landscape, although it could be self-contained with appropriate mitigation	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site located at south eastern edge of village forming a gateway into the village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges along front site boundary	Amber

Historic Environment	Amber	Site is in Conservation Area and opposite a LB (Malthouse Farm Cottage)  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rural road network but land may be available for improvements. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable and enough capacity in network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access likely subject to carriageway widening to 5.5m and 2m footway across whole site frontage. Footway to connect with existing provision to the north. Visibility would require complete removal of existing frontage hedge. No continuous footway to the catchment primary school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Bowls Green to north and agricultural fields to east and residential properties to west	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on CA and LB. There may be some potential to overcome the harm by careful design.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC raised concerns regarding the possibility of creating suitable access. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming visibility and impact on network.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Bowls Green to north and some residential properties to the east. Uses are generally compatible with a residential development.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedge to front of site which contributes to CA	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedgerow to some 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 into and out of the site from the north east which will likely have some impact on landscape character but could potentially be mitigated.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the conservation area and nearby listed building as well as landscape impacts.	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)
Conservation Area		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)	
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single 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	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? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible extension to public footpath subject to access being achievable.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No requirement for affordable housing based on site area/numbers proposed	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION
<p><b>Suitability</b> The site is of a suitable size for allocation but has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings. The site is in a sensitive location due to its impact on the historic environment. The site is poorly connected and exceeds reasonable distances to the local services, including the local primary school. Concerns have also been raised about highways issues.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b> Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the conservation area and nearby listed building as well as landscape impacts. No schools nearby and very limited services.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b> Conservation Area</p> <p><b>Availability</b> Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b> Development of the site is achievable</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> The site is UNREASONABLE for either allocation or as a settlement limit extension. The site is poorly connected to the local services, including the local primary school. Development of the site would have an impact on the historic environment, including Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area.</p> <p>PREFERRED: REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE: REJECTED: Yes</p>

Date Completed: 26 June 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	GMLP0590
<b>Site address</b>	Land north of The Street, Shotesham
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	None
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	2.98 ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension</b>	Both  (The site has been promoted for a lower number of dwellings – 5 – as well recreational space but is of a size that would be suitable for allocation)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	5 dwellings would equate to 8dph  74 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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>Highway evidence has indicated that potential access constraints could be overcome through development.</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Access likely into the site subject to confirmation of road width is at least 4.8m, 2m frontage footway and complete removal of all existing frontage trees and hedges. Footways to the south &amp; north restricted in width. No continuous footway to catchment primary school.</p>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> ○ Primary School ○ Secondary school ○ Local healthcare services ○ Retail services ○ Local employment opportunities ○ Peak-time public transport	Amber	<p>No primary school or secondary school in village. Nearest schools are some distance away (Stoke Holy Cross Primary School).</p> <p>There is a bus stop within walking distance. Services are infrequent, no evenings or weekend services</p> <p>There is a PH in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses.</p>	

Part 2: Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Playing field, just grass and goal posts. Bowling Green, members only. Public House and use of privately-owned meeting room/hall.	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Green	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Mains sewerage noted as not available on the site	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Minimal risk of flooding	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		Tas Rural River Valley  ALC – N/A	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site within an attractive valley landscape. Some containment around playing field although land to north east protrudes into open countryside.	Amber

Townscape	Amber	Site located at south eastern edge of village forming a gateway into the village. The site currently forms a break in the built form – retaining the playing field along the road frontage would not change this but development to the rear of the playing field would impact on the perceived openness of the townscape in this location.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges along front site boundary	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is located on edge of the Conservation Area and close to LB (Forge Cottage)	Amber
Open Space	Amber	Site is currently used as a playing field	Amber
Transport and Roads	Green	Rural road network. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable and enough capacity in network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Access likely into the site subject to confirmation of road width is at least 4.8m, 2m frontage footway and complete removal of all existing frontage trees and hedges. Footways to the south & north restricted in width. No continuous footway to catchment primary school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural fields to northeast and residential properties to west and east.	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on CA and LB. There may be some potential to overcome the harm by careful design. Development of land to the rear of the playing field will also have an impact on the townscape.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	NCC raised concerns regarding the possibility of creating suitable access. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming visibility and impact on network.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Site currently used as a playing field but it is proposed that this is retained and residential development is to the rear of the playing field	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural fields to northeast and residential properties to west and east. Uses are generally compatible with a residential development.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature trees and hedge to front of site and west boundary. Intermittent trees and vegetation on east boundary. Northern boundary of site is open fields.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature hedgerows and trees	
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 and out of the site from the north east which will likely have some impact on landscape character, but could potentially be mitigated.	

<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the conservation area as well as landscape impacts.	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)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Green

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single 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	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>	Possible upgrades to public footpaths subject to access being achievable.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Possible requirement for affordable housing based on site area but due to the low numbers of dwellings proposed delivery has not been confirmed	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Large area of public open space (but this land is currently already used as public open space)	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is excessive in size and development in its entirety would be inappropriate however the site promoter has suggested a low number of dwellings and the retention of the existing playing field. A significantly lower number of dwellings has been proposed on the site and whilst this would be more representative of the low density development within this settlement it would also be an ineffective use of the land. Access to the site is considered possible however to achieve this would necessitate the complete removal of the mature trees and hedgerow along the road frontage which would have a detrimental impact on both the townscape and the landscape, as well as the Conservation Area setting. There is also poor connectivity to the key local services, including the local primary school.

**Site Visit Observations** Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the conservation area as well as landscape impacts. No schools nearby and limited services.

**Local Plan Designations** No conflicting Local Plan designations

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** This site is considered to be UNREASONABLE as both a settlement limit extension and an allocation site. The site is poorly connected to local services, including the local primary school. Development of the site is proposed to retain the existing playing field however it would result in the loss of the existing trees and hedgerows along the road frontage to create an acceptable access. Development of this site would therefore also have a harmful impact on the local landscape character, the townscape and the Conservation Area.

PREFERRED:

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE:

REJECTED: Yes

Date Completed: 03 July 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	GNLP2091
Site address	Land of Norwich Road, Stoke Holy Cross
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Unallocated
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.24 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	12 dwellings (approx. 9 dwellings per hectare) 31 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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	A suitable access and other road improvements appear to be achievable by development of the site.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Subject to widening frontage footway to 2m.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Green	Nearest school is Stoke Holy Cross Primary School – c. 1.2km  There is a bus stop within walking distance. First - Charcoal Line 40, 41 and X41 – c. 300m  There is a PH and fish and chip shop in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses – c. 1km	

<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus oVillage/ community hall oPublic house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities		Village Hall located to the north of the site. Pre-School operates through the village hall – c. 700m  Playing field, football pitch's and over and under 12's play area and skate park – c. 1.1km  Public House and restaurant – c. 1km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Green	Water infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No known risk of surface water flooding.	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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> )		Tas Rural River Valley  ALC – Grade 3	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site within an attractive valley landscape. Some containment around field boundaries.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Site would extend the settlement along Norwich Road to towards Holy Cross Church elongating the settlement further south. Development in this location would have an impact on townscape character.	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Hedges around site boundaries and within site, including trees.	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	Impact on the nearby Grade II* listed Church of Holy Cross approximately 100 metres to the southeast	Amber
Open Space	Green	No impact on public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Green	Rural local road network. Highway constraints could potentially be overcome through development.  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green. Subject to widening frontage footway to 2m.	Green
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural fields to south and west and residential to north the east.	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on the nearby Grade II* listed Church of Holy Cross approximately 100 metres to the southeast. Townscape impact – development in this location has a loose urban grain reflecting transition from rural setting - settlement. Introduction of an estate style development in this location – even at a small scale – would impact on this gateway	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access could be taken from Norwich Road.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural field	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural fields to south and west and residential to north the east.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Generally flat	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Trees and hedges around the site boundaries	

Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Mature hedgerows and trees. Ecological considerations are that the site is immediately east of the River Tas, within the River Valley Landscape designation area, and within the impact risk zone for Shotesham Common SSSI. The constraints identified would need addressing but could potentially be mitigated.	
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 and out of the site from will likely have some impact on the rural landscape character.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Significant concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape valley and townscape 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)
River Valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Amber

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private single 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	Yes	Green
	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 information 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>	Possible upgrades to water supply and foul water network	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	The site promoter has not confirmed this so delivery would need to be confirmed	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Delivery of new green infrastructure comprising 4.32 ha of GI to offset development pressures on other existing open spaces.	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is excessive in size however the promoter has indicated that a smaller parcel of land would be developed only with the remaining land to be retained as GI space. The site has been promoted for approximately 12 dwellings and is therefore considered to be a suitable size for allocation. Access to the site is considered to be possible, and there are no highway network constraints identified. The site is also well connected to the main services in the settlement. However, the site is a gateway to the settlement and the scale of development proposed is not considered to be characteristic of the loose form of development in this location and would therefore have a detrimental impact on the gateway to the village. There are also heritage concerns associated with the development of this site.

**Site Visit Observations** Significant concerns over the impact of developing this site on the rural landscape and townscape character.

**Local Plan Designations** River Valley setting

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable and mitigation having regard to landscape and heritage impacts.

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE site for allocation. Whilst the site benefits from good connectivity and no significant highways concerns have been identified, the site forms an important gateway to the settlement and development of the scale proposed would have a harmful impact on both the landscape and townscape setting. It would also contrast with the existing loose pattern of development in this location. Heritage concerns have also been identified due to the proximity of the site to the Grade II\* Church of Holy Cross.

**PREFERRED:**

**REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE:**

**REJECTED:** Yes

Date Completed: 28 August 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP4013
<b>Site address</b>	Land to North East of Shotesham Road, Shotesham
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	Planning Permission on part of the site for a single dwelling (refs 2012/2263, 2010/1414, 2009/1774)
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.73 ha
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension</b>	Allocation  (The site has been promoted for a minimum of 12 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	12 dwellings would equate to 16dph  18 dwellings at 25dph
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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 constraints could possibly be overcome – to be confirmed by Highways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> Substandard highway network. No safe walking route to school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	No primary school or secondary school in village. Nearest schools are some distance away (Stoke Holy Cross Primary School).  There is a bus stop within walking distance. Services are infrequent, no evenings or weekend services  There is a PH in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses.	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Playing field, just grass and goal posts. Bowling Green, members only. Public House and use of privately-owned meeting room/hall.	Amber

Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	No known constraints	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ground stability. There have been no historical works undertaken on the site that would have resulted in any known ground stability issues. The site has not been previously developed.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Minimal risk of flooding. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 in its entirety.  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard planning information required.	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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>		Tas Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Red	Site is within an attractive rural landscape valley and adjacent to The Common/ SSSI. Distant views from Hallow Lane and Hawes Green	Red
Townscape	Amber	The site is located in the Conservation Area which contributes to the setting of the village.	Amber

Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site forms part of a paddock laid to grassland bounded by some hedges and vegetation.  <b>NCC ECOLOGY</b> - SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to Shotesham Common SSSI/Registered Common. Potential for protected species/habitats, and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Site is located in the Conservation Area	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Rural road network but land may be available for improvements. NCC to confirm if visibility achievable and enough capacity in network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Red. Substandard highway network. No safe walking route to school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural fields to northeast and residential properties to west and east.	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Impact on CA. There may be some potential to overcome the harm by careful design.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Concerns regarding the possibility of creating suitable access. This may be possible to overcome subject to NCC confirming visibility and impact on network.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Sites forms part of a paddock laid to grassland bounded by some hedges and vegetation.	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural fields to northeast and residential properties to west and east. Uses are generally compatible with a residential development.	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site on a shallow valley side sloping towards road. Changes in level of approx. 12-13 m from road to upper boundary.	

What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Site forms part of a paddock laid to grassland bounded by some hedges and vegetation.	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some mature hedgerows and trees	
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 and out of the site will likely have significant impact on landscape character.	
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the conservation area as well as landscape impacts and SSSI.	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		
River Valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Amber

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No 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>	Possible upgrades to public footpaths subject to access being achievable. Off-site highway improvement works would be required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	To be confirmed	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is of a suitable size for allocation and is well related to the settlement of Shotesham. The site is considered to be too large for consideration as an extension to the existing settlement limit. However, the site is poorly connected to the wider services, including the local primary school. Concerns have also been identified relating to the landscape impact of development in this location, the impact of development on the Conservation Area and the impact on the wider highway network.

**Site Visit Observations** Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the conservation area, SSSI as well as landscape impacts. No schools nearby and limited services.

**Local Plan Designations** Within the Conservation Area and River Valley

**Availability** Promoter states the site is available.

**Achievability** Development of the site is achievable

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE for allocation due to the constraints that have been identified. These include the impact it would have on the landscape character of the area, the impact on the Conservation Area of Shotesham and the overall poor connectivity of the site to local services.

PREFERRED:

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE:

UNREASONABLE: Yes

Date Completed: 03 July 2020

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

<b>Site Reference</b>	SN4028
<b>Site address</b>	Land at Highview, The Common, Shotesham, NR15 1YD
<b>Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)</b>	Unallocated
<b>Planning History</b>	1986/0865 REF
<b>Site size, hectares (as promoted)</b>	0.3ha (The site form incorrectly notes this site as being 0.8ha)
<b>Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension</b>	Settlement Limit Extensions  (The site has been promoted for 3 dwellings)
<b>Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)</b>	7 dwellings at 25dph  3 dph at 3 dwellings
<b>Greenfield/ Brownfield</b>	Greenfield

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

<b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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	The site has a road frontage and is accessible from The Common  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> Substandard highway network. No safe walking route to school.	Red
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	No primary school or secondary school in village. Nearest schools are some distance away (Stoke Holy Cross Primary School).  There is a bus stop within walking distance. Services are infrequent, no evenings or weekend services  There is a PH in the village which may offer some very limited employment opportunities as well as some existing businesses.	
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Playing field, just grass and goal posts. Bowling Green, members only. Public House and use of privately-owned meeting room/hall.	Amber

Utilities Capacity	Amber	No mains sewerage available	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Available	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within the identified ORSTED cable route	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood risk 1  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. Few or no constraints. Standard planning information required.	Green
<b>Impact</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
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>		Tas Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber	Site is within an attractive rural landscape valley and adjacent to The Common/ SSSI. Distant views from Hallow Lane and Hawes Green.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is located in the Conservation Area which contributes to the setting of the village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	Site forms part of a paddock laid to grassland bounded by some hedges and vegetation.  <b>NCC ECOLOGY</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Adjacent to Shotesham Common SSSI/Registered Common. Potential for protected species/habitats, and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	The site lies within the Conservation Area	Amber

Open Space	Green	No loss of green space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Queries regarding the local road network  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS – Red.</b> Substandard highway network. No safe walking route to school.	Red
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Residential and agricultural – no conflicting land issues	Green

#### Part 4 Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development on this site would have an impact on the Conservation Area but could be mitigated through careful design.	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Road frontage available – NCC to advise about creating a suitable access	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Grassland	
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and paddock land	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site on a shallow valley side sloping towards road. Changes in level of approx. 12-13 m from road to upper boundary.	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Dense hedgerow along the frontage boundary	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential ecological value of the 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	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views into and out of the site will likely have significant impact on landscape character.	

<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (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)	Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the conservation area as well as landscape impacts and SSSI.	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		
River Valley		
<b>Conclusion</b>	Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations	Amber

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private – multiple ownership	
Is the site currently being marketed? <i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No but have been approached by developer	
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately	
	Within 5 years	
	5 – 10 years	x
	10 – 15 years	
	15-20 years	
	Comments:	Amber

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/A/G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	No additional information has been submitted at this time	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Highway works	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Not applicable due to the site size	N/A
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	

## Part 7 Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

**Suitability** The site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension and is adjacent to an existing linear development. The site is within the Conservation Area, as well as a SSSI. The site is within a River Valley setting and is in a sensitive location. Highways concerns have been raised about the suitability of the wider highway network. The site is poorly connected to the local highways network, including the primary school.

**Site Visit Observations** Concerns over the impact of developing this site on the conservation area, SSSI as well as landscape impacts. Significant valley setting of the site, including changes of levels which would significantly increase the prominence of development in this location. No schools nearby and limited services. Rural highway network.

**Local Plan Designations** Conservation Area and River Valley

**Availability** The site promoter has advised that the land would be delivered in the medium term

**Achievability** The site is considered to be achievable

**OVERALL CONCLUSION:** The site is considered to be UNREASONABLE as an extension to the settlement limit extension. The site is poorly connected to the local services, including the primary school, and development in this location would have a significant impact on a sensitive landscape setting due to the changes in topography of the site. The landscape impact of development in this location could not reasonably be mitigated.

Preferred Site:

Reasonable Alternative:

Rejected: Yes

Date Completed: 20/01/21