

SN Village Clusters Housing Allocation Document – Site Assessment Form

Part 1 Site Details

Site Reference	N/a (opposite to site VNNEE1, ref SN2065REV)
Site address	11 High Road, Needham, IP20 9LB
Current planning status (including previous planning status)	Outside development boundary Residential with agricultural paddock to rear
Planning History	Permission previously granted for, and site occupied by, large detached residential dwelling with various outbuildings.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.9 ha
Promoted site use	Promoted for up to 12 dwellings
Promoted site density (if known otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	13 dwellings / ha
Greenfield/Brownfield	Residential, with greenfield plot (paddock) to rear

Part 2 Absolute Constraints

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

Part 3 Suitability Assessment

HELAA Score:

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

Site Score:

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

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

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT			
Constraint HELAA	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>	<p>Existing vehicular access to the site servicing the residential property. This would need to be widened slightly for a larger development. Alternatively, due to slight curvature in road the site access may be better re-located opposite Harmans lane.</p> <p>NCC Highways designated opposite site (VNNEE1) as 'Green' and would be expected to arrive at same conclusion for this site. NCC Highways also noted pedestrian pavement along opposite side of road – this footway may need widening.</p> <p>As per the Highways Meeting for opposite site VNNEE1 – “This is the old A143 pre-bypass therefore access/visibility etc. should not be an issue. There is a continuous footway to Harleston, the main limitation of this site is the need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout, however the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge.”</p>	Green <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>

<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p>Part 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Primary School o Secondary school o Local healthcare services o Retail services o Local employment opportunities o Peak-time public transport 	<p>Amber</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>	<p>Distance to Harleston Primary School 2.4km</p> <p>Bus service passes site with bus stop around 150 metres away</p> <p>Distance to shop 1.4km</p>	
<p>Part 2:</p> <p>Part 1 facilities, plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Village/ community hall o Public house/ cafe o Preschool facilities o Formal sports/ recreation facilities 		<p>Distance to village hall and play area 150 metres</p> <p>Distance to The Red Lion public house 1km</p>	<p>Green</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>
Utilities Capacity	<p>Amber</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed. Existing residential property is not on mains drainage.	<p>Amber</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>
Utilities Infrastructure	<p>Green</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>	Mains water and electricity are already available but not connected to mains drainage	<p>Amber</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	<p>Green</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	<p>Green</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>
Contamination & ground stability	<p>Green</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>	<p>No known contamination or ground stability issues</p> <p>As per VNNEE1: <i>“NCC Minerals – site under 1ha underlain or partially underlain by safeguarded sand and gravel resources. If these sites were to go forward as allocations then a requirement for future development to comply with the minerals and waste safeguarding policy in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, should be included within any allocation policy”</i></p>	<p>Green</p> <p><i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i></p>

Flood Risk	Amber (proposed) (Note: opposite site VNNEE1 is 'Red')	<p>Unlike VNNEE1 this site is not believed to be within Flood Zones. This site and adjacent sites have not experienced any moderate/ significant flooding.</p> <p>River Waveney is to the far rear of the property but distance and topography means there is no flood risk from potential river overflows.</p>	Green (proposed) (Note: opposite site VNNEE1 is 'Amber')
Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type (Land Use Consultants 2001)		Rural River Valley	X
		Tributary Farmland	
		Tributary Farmland with Parkland	
		Settled Plateau Farmland	
		Plateau Farmland Valley	
		Urban Fringe	
		Fringe Farmland	
SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)		A5 Waveney Rural River Valley	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>	<p>Site is in protected river valley landscape designation. Site is largely residential apart from rear paddock and there would be no loss of high grade agricultural land.</p> <p>To the rear of site is a mixture of unsightly farm buildings plus some open views across the river valley. The site has a number of mature trees and hedgerows within it and along the boundaries. Existing boundary trees/hedges would be expected to be largely retained to limit any potential harm to landscape, particularly to the river valley to the rear.</p>	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>
Townscape	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>	<p>Sporadic pattern of development in this location.</p> <p>As per VNNEE1: "SDC Heritage Officer - No heritage or design issues"</p>	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>	<p>Site is within 3km of SSSI</p> <p>As per VNNEE1: "NCC Ecology – Green. Potential for protected species/habitats and Biodiversity Net Gain"</p>	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>

Historic Environment	Green <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>	No heritage assets in close proximity. As per VNNEE1: <i>"SDC Heritage Officer - No heritage or design issues HES – Amber"</i>	Green <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>	Reasonable road and footway provision. NCC Highways designated opposite site (VNNEE1) as 'Green' and would be expected to arrive at same conclusion for this site. NCC Highways also noted pedestrian pavement along opposite side of road – this footway may need widening. As per the Highways Meeting for opposite site VNNEE1 – <i>"This is the old A143 pre-bypass therefore access/visibility etc. should not be an issue. There is a continuous footway to Harleston, the main limitation of this site is the need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout, however the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge."</i>	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>	Agricultural and residential	Green <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>

Part 4 Site Visit – Comments are from promoter with reference to the site findings for VNNEE1

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Less developed area of village, although site still falls within clusters of development. Would therefore have a small urbanising effect on character of immediate vicinity	
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access to site currently available, may need modification for more dwellings.	
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Residential property with various outbuildings. All in poor condition. Agricultural paddock to rear.	

What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Agricultural land to north, west and south of site. Residential dwelling immediately to east, with farm buildings to south-east	
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Land to rear is initially level but begins to fall away towards river (note: the neighbouring farm buildings are closer to the river)	
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Mature hedges/trees align the entirety of the residential curtilage. The rear paddock boundary is marked by post and wire fence	
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some potential habitat in hedgerow and the trees	
Utilities and Contaminated Land– is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Existing residential property served by electricity, mains water and telephone/broadband. Cesspit dedicated to property. No evidence of other existing contamination.	
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Site screened by mature trees/hedges to north (roadside), east and west. To the rear (south/south-east) there are limited views to/from the river valley.	
Initial site visit conclusion (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Limited loss of rural character from roadside and village entry/exit. Some potential harm to rear, although no worse than neighbouring farm buildings. Any potential harm can be mitigated by retention and promotion of existing hedgerows/trees	

Part 5 Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (<i>UNIFORM</i>)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
River Valley		
Conclusion	Site is entirely within river valley landscape designation	Amber (Proposed as per VNNEE1)

Part 6 Availability and Achievability

AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)			
	Comments		Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership		
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Not currently		
When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>	Immediately		
	Within 5 years	X	Green
	5 – 10 years		
	10 – 15 years		
	15 – 20 years		
	Comments:		

ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)		
	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>	This self assessment form has been prepared to support the site. A tree survey of the site has also been provided. Some of the existing trees will need to be retained, but this can be accommodated at design stage. No other known significant constraints to delivery.	Green <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? <i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>	Need to cross the A143 bypass at the roundabout to access Harleston, the site could provide for enhancement, such as a central refuge.	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter acknowledges that affordable housing may be required but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber <i>(Proposed as per VNNEE1)</i>
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

Part 7 Conclusion

CONCLUSION

Comments are from promoter with reference to the site findings for VNNEE1 (formerly known as SN2065REV at Reg 18 stage)

Suitability

Site is of a suitable size to accommodate an allocation.

Site Visit Observations

Level site already occupied by detached dwelling with a number of outbuildings. The site is well screened by existing trees and hedges. River valley to the rear.

Local Plan Designations

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

Availability

Promoter confirms that the site is available.

Achievability

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable, and retention of some of the boundary trees to limit impact on surrounding area.

OVERALL CONCLUSION (*PROPOSED*): REASONABLE

The site is just outside the settlement limit. The services of the village are accessible by foot as there is a continuous footpath opposite the site along High Road. The site could provide for enhancement to cross the A143, such as a central refuge, to improve connectivity to Harleston and the school. The site is within the river valley but is generally shielded by trees along the south-east boundary and the south-east corner of the site. There are some limited views to/from the river valley from the rear – promotion of new and existing foliage in the rear paddock would mitigate any potential harm. The views from this direction are already significantly affected by the neighbouring farm buildings.

The assessment criteria for this site in general closely match proposed allocation VNNEE1 (opposite) as demonstrated in this assessment form. Proposed allocation VNNEE1 has been considered “Reasonable”, and this site (at 11 High Road) is also expected to be classified as “Reasonable” in a formal assessment. However, this site as opposed to VNNEE1, would be on land which is already classified as residential, and would therefore avoid/minimise loss of any new greenfield land opposite. This is a clear advantage over VNNEE1, and would significantly help retain the rural character of the village.