

# Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan

## Site Options and Assessment 2022 Consolidated Report

**Prepared for: Diss Town Council (the 'Qualifying Body')** for and on behalf of Diss Town Council, Roydon Parish Council, Burston & Shimpling Parish Council, Scole Parish Council, Palgrave Parish Council, Stuston Parish Council and Brome & Parish Council

19 May 2022

## Quality information

<u>Prepared by</u>	<u>Checked by</u>	<u>Verified by</u>	<u>Approved by</u>
Yanny Tsang Senior Planner	Una McGaughrin Associate Director	Una McGaughrin Associate Director	Una McGaughrin Associate Director

## Revision History

<u>Revision</u>	<u>Revision date</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
V1	19/05/2022	Draft Report	UM	Una McGaughrin	Associate Director
/	26/05/2022	Review by the Qualifying Body		Eric Taylor Louise Cornell	
/	10/06/2022	Locality Review		Annabel Osborne	

Prepared for:

**Diss Town Council (the ‘Qualifying Body’)** for and on behalf of Diss Town Council, Roydon Parish Council, Burston & Shimpling Parish Council, Scole Parish Council, Palgrave Parish Council, Stuston Parish Council and Brome & Oakley Parish Council

AECOM Limited  
 Aldgate Tower  
 2 Lemn Street  
 London E1 8FA  
 United Kingdom  
 aecom.com

© 2022 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited (“AECOM”) for sole use of our client (the “Client”) in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

### Disclaimer

This document is intended to aid the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and can be used to guide decision making and as evidence to support Plan policies, if the Qualifying Body (QB) so chooses. It is not a Neighbourhood Plan policy document. It is a ‘snapshot’ in time and may become superseded by more recent information. The QB is not bound to accept its conclusions. If landowners or any other party can demonstrate that any of the evidence presented herein is inaccurate or out of date, such evidence can be presented to the Neighbourhood Plan at the consultation stage. Where evidence from elsewhere conflicts with this report, the QB should decide what policy position to take in the Neighbourhood Plan and that judgement should be documented so that it can be defended at the Examination stage.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	5
2. Policy Context .....	7
3. Methodology .....	26
4. Conclusions .....	51
Appendix A Site Assessment Proforma .....	114
Appendix B GNLP HELAA and BMJSLP SHELAA Review.....	384
Appendix C Site Assessment Conclusions Map (2022 Consolidated Report).....	427

## Figures

Figure 1 Diss and District Neighbourhood Area .....	6
Figure 2 Site Assessment Conclusions (2022 Consolidated Report) .....	54

## Tables

Table 1 AECOM Indicative Housing Density Calculation .....	28
Table 2 Sites identified for assessment .....	29
Table 3 Summary of Site Assessment.....	55

## Abbreviations used in the report

DDNP	Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan
DLUHC	Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities
GNLP	Greater Norwich Local Plan
Ha	Hectare
JCS	Adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011 with amendments adopted in October 2014)
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (now called Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities)
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
HELAA	Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
SOA	Site Options and Assessment
SHELAA	Strategic Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
VCHAP	Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan


# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report is an independent site assessment for the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan (DDNP) on behalf of Diss Town Council (the ‘Qualifying Body’). The DDNP is a joint Neighbourhood Plan led by Diss Town Council in partnership with six neighbouring parishes, including Burston and Shimpling, Roydon and Scole in South Norfolk and Palgrave, Stuston and Brome and Oakley in Mid Suffolk. The work undertaken was agreed with the Qualifying Body and the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) in December 2021 as part of the national Neighbourhood Planning Technical Support Programme led by Locality. **Figure 1** provides a map of the designated Diss and District Neighbourhood Area.
- 1.2 This report follows on from three previous Site Options and Assessment (SOA) reports undertaken in January 2019, December 2020 and April 2022 by AECOM to inform the Neighbourhood Plan. The three SOA reports assessed a total of 77 sites<sup>1</sup> within the Neighbourhood Area to provide a set of conclusions on which sites could be appropriate for allocation in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan based on whether each is suitable, available and achievable for development according to national planning policy.
- 1.3 The purpose of this consolidated report is to draw together all previous assessments into one evidence report to support the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. It provides a comprehensive review of all sites previously considered in light of updates to the adopted and emerging national and local policy<sup>2</sup>, as well as other new or updated information made available, including representations submitted through the DDNP’s Regulation 14 consultation. It updates and supersedes all previous Site Options and Assessment (SOA) undertaken in 2019 to 2022.
- 1.4 This report groups individual sites by their respective parishes and Local Authority as the relevant Local Plan and settlement context varies within the Neighbourhood Area. However, a boundary-blind approach has been taken as appropriate in site identification. Where a site boundary crosses parishes within the Neighbourhood Area, it is identified under the parish which contains the majority of the site, but with regards to the wider physical and environmental context.
- 1.5 This assessment in itself does not allocate sites. It is the responsibility of the Qualifying Body to decide, guided by this consolidated SOA report and other relevant information, which sites to select for allocation to best address the housing requirement and Neighbourhood Plan objectives.

<sup>1</sup> Excluding duplicated sites identified through different sources

<sup>2</sup> Key updates to the adopted and emerging policy context include: (1) Revision to the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021); (2) Publication of the Regulation 19 Greater Norwich Local Plan (now submitted and under examination) – note that Paragraph 420 of the draft Plan advises that decision on the allocation or reallocation of development land in Diss are devolved to the neighbourhood planning process; (3) Publication of the Regulation 19 Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (now under examination and pending modification) ; and (4) Publication of the Draft South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocation Plan (Regulation 18). In addition, a number of new evidence base has also been published since, including the Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) Addendum III (December 2020), the Greater Norwich Local Plan settlement-specific site assessment booklets (December 2020), the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) (October 2020) and the Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (September 2020)

**Figure 1 Diss and District Neighbourhood Area**



Source: Extract from Mid Suffolk District Council's website<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Available at <https://www.babergh.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-planning-in-mid-suffolk/diss-and-district-neighbourhood-plan/>

## 2. Policy Context

- 2.1 All Neighbourhood Development Plan policies, including allocations, must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan and should have regard to emerging Local Plan policies. A number of sources have been reviewed in order to understand the context for potential site allocations. This includes national policies, local policies and relevant evidence base documents.
- 2.2 National policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (Revised in July 2021) and is supported by the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The NPPF is a high-level document which sets the overall framework for the more detailed policies contained in Local and Neighbourhood Plans. It should be noted that the NPPF has been revised since the preparation of the 2019 and 2020 SOAs.
- 2.3 At the local level, the relevant development plan documents for the Diss and District Neighbourhood Area include:

### **South Norfolk (includes Burston and Shimpling, Diss, Roydon and Scole)**

- The adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011 with amendments adopted in 2014)<sup>4</sup>
- The adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (October 2015)<sup>5</sup>
- The adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)<sup>6</sup>
- The emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP)<sup>7</sup>
- The emerging South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP)<sup>8</sup>
- The adopted and emerging Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework

### **Mid Suffolk (includes Palgrave, Stuston and Brome and Oakley)**

- The adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008 with focused review adopted in 2012)<sup>9</sup>
- Saved policies from the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998 with alterations in 2006)<sup>10</sup>
- The emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (BMSJLP)<sup>11</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Available at <https://www.gnlp.org.uk/sites/gnlp/files/2021-01/JCS-adopted-doc-2014.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> Available at <https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk/downloads/file/245/development-management-policies-document>

<sup>6</sup> Available at <https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk/downloads/file/220/ssapd-section-0-1-contents-and-introduction-major-growth-locations>

<sup>7</sup> Available at <https://www.gnlp.org.uk/>

<sup>8</sup> Available at <https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk/emerging-local-plan/south-norfolk-village-clusters-housing-allocations-plan>

<sup>9</sup> Available at <https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/adopted-documents/mid-suffolk-district-council/>

<sup>10</sup> Available at [https://localplan.midsuffolk.gov.uk/contents\\_written.htm](https://localplan.midsuffolk.gov.uk/contents_written.htm)

<sup>11</sup> Available at <https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/new-joint-local-plan/>

- The adopted Suffolk Minerals & Waste Local Plan (July 2020)<sup>12</sup>
- 2.4 A number of other policy sources and evidence base documents have also been reviewed in order to understand the context for potential site allocations, including:
- The Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) Addendum III (December 2020)<sup>13</sup>
  - The Greater Norwich Local Plan settlement-specific site assessment booklets (December 2020)<sup>14</sup>
  - The Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) (October 2020)<sup>15</sup>
  - The Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (September 2020)<sup>16</sup>
- 2.5 The section below highlights the key policies (including parts) relevant to this Site Options and Assessment. It should be read in conjunction with the adopted or published draft versions of the original documents referenced in Paragraph 2.3 of this report.

## National Planning Policy Framework (Revised in July 2021)

- 2.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)<sup>17</sup> sets out the Government's planning policies and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.
- 2.7 **Paragraph 8** highlights that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives; an economic objective, a social objective, and an environmental objective.
- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
  - b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

<sup>12</sup> Available at <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/minerals-and-waste-policy/suffolk-minerals-and-waste-development-scheme/>

<sup>13</sup> Available at <https://www.gnlp.org.uk/sites/gnlp/files/2021-10/HELAA%20Addendum%20III%20-%20Dec%202020.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> Available at [https://www.gnlp.org.uk/sites/gnlp/files/2021-10/Diss%20Booklet\\_0.pdf](https://www.gnlp.org.uk/sites/gnlp/files/2021-10/Diss%20Booklet_0.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Available at <https://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/JLPEXamination/CoreDocLibrary/E-EvidenceBase/Housing-EH/EH06-BMSDC-Joint-SHELAA-Report-Oct-2020.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Available at <https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/evidence-base/current-evidence/landscape-sensitivity-assessment/>

<sup>17</sup> Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

- c) an environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.
- 2.8 **Paragraph 13** states that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.
- 2.9 **Paragraph 29** reiterates that neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies.
- 2.10 **Paragraph 69** states that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built-out relatively quickly. Furthermore, **paragraph 70** highlights that neighbourhood planning groups should also consider the opportunities for allocating small and medium sized sites (paragraph 69a states that 10% of the housing requirement should be accommodated on sites no larger than one hectare) suitable for housing in their area.
- 2.11 **Paragraph 79** states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.
- 2.12 **Paragraph 80** requires planning policies and decisions to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the stated circumstances apply.
- 2.13 **Paragraph 159** states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future risk).
- 2.14 **Paragraph 175** states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in the NPPF. **Footnote 58** suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a high quality.
- 2.15 **Paragraph 179** seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity through the plan-making process. In particular, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gain for biodiversity.
- 2.16 **Paragraph 180** requires local planning authorities to apply a list of principles in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity when determining planning applications. Principle (A) states that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting

from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

- 2.17 **Paragraph 189** explains that heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites. These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be considered in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.
- 2.18 **Paragraph 199** states that great weight should be given to the assets' conservation when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage assets, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. **Paragraph 200** explains that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.
- 2.19 **Paragraph 201** states that local planning authorities should refuse consent where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the criteria set out apply.
- 2.20 **Paragraph 202** states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

## Adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011 with amendments adopted in October 2014)

- 2.21 The adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk as amended in January 2014 sets out the overarching strategy for growth across the three districts to 2026. It identifies key locations for housing and employment growth and sets out policies to ensure that future development is sustainable. It plans for 36,820 new homes and 27,000 jobs between 2008-2026.
- 2.22 It designates Diss as a major centre, which therefore is one of the 'focal points for communities to have access to quality jobs, healthcare, education and community facilities and shops'. The surrounding rural area 'will retain its distinctive Norfolk character and will continue to be working and tranquil, recognising the Broads, and other locally and nationally important habitats', while the Main Town Diss will:
- Provide for a safe and healthy quality of life
  - Retain an attractive historical centre as a focus for continued success serving the rural catchment
  - Enjoy greater economic prosperity with new opportunities for business

- Accommodate moderate new housing allocations of 300 new homes, to be developed in a sustainable manner complementing the town's form, function, historic character and quality, and incorporating good sustainable transport links to town centres, local employment locations and good recreation, leisure and community facilities
- Be enhanced by cultural activities including those arising from Diss' former 'Cittaslow' (slow town) status

**2.23 Policy 1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets** requires development to be located to minimise flood risk and the need to travel; as well as to make the most efficient appropriate use of land, with the density of development varying according to the characteristics of the area, with the highest densities in centres and on public transport routes.

**2.24 Policy 1** also seeks to protect, maintain and enhance the environmental assets of the area and improves the benefits for residents and visitors. All new developments will ensure that there will be no adverse impacts on European and Ramsar designated sites and no adverse impacts on European protected species in the area and beyond. In areas not protected through international or national designations, development will:

- Minimise fragmentation of habitats and seek to conserve and enhance existing environmental assets of acknowledged regional or local importance
- Protect mineral and other natural resources identified through the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework

**2.25 Policy 1** also states that the built environment, heritage assets, and the wider historic environment will be conserved and enhanced through the protection of buildings and structures which contribute to their surroundings and the protection of their settings.

**2.26 Policy 2 Promoting good design** requires development proposals to respect local distinctiveness including as appropriate:

- The historic hierarchy of the city, towns and villages, maintaining important strategic gaps
- The landscape setting of settlements including the urban/rural transition and the treatment of 'gateways'
- The landscape character and historic environment, taking account of conservation area appraisals and including the wider countryside and the Broads area
- Townscape, including the city and the varied character of our market towns and villages
- The need to increase the use of public transport
- The need to design development to avoid harmful impacts on key environmental assets and, in particular SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites

**2.27 Policy 3 Energy and Water** states that the release of land for development will be dependent on there being sufficient water infrastructure to meet the additional requirements arising from the new development and to ensure that

water quality is protected or improved, with no significant detriment to areas of environmental importance.

2.28 **Policy 4 Housing Delivery** states that allocations will be made to ensure at least 336,820 new homes can be delivered between 2008 and 2026, of which approximately 33,000 will be within the Norwich Policy Area (defined in Appendix 4), distributed in accordance with the policies for places. On affordable housing, the policy states that sites that would not normally be released for housing will be considered for schemes that specifically meet an identified local need for affordable homes at appropriate settlements. Such schemes must ensure that the properties are made available in perpetuity for this purpose.

2.29 **Policy 5 Economy** states that sufficient employment land will be allocated in accessible with the policies for places in the Core Strategy to meet identified need and provide for choice. In particular:

- The needs of small, medium and start-up businesses will be addressed through the allocation of new smaller scale employment sites and the retention of, and the potential expansion of, a range of existing small and medium employment sites across the area and by requiring the provision of small-scale business opportunities in all significant residential and commercial developments
- Larger scale needs will be addressed through the allocation of sufficient land to provide a choice and range of sites
- Land identified for employment uses on proposals map will be considered for other uses that are ancillary and supportive to its employment role. Employment land with potential for redevelopment for other uses will be identified in supporting DPDs and SPDs

2.30 **Policy 5 Economy** also seeks to support the rural economy and diversification through (amongst other named): a preference for the re-use of appropriate redundant non-residential buildings for commercial uses, including holiday homes to support the tourism industry (affordable housing may be an acceptable alternative use).

2.31 **Policy 6 Access and Transportation** aims to improve access to rural areas. This will be achieved (among others named):

- Concentration of development close to essential services and facilities to encourage walking and cycling as the primary means of travel within public sector for wider access
- Continuing to recognise that in the most rural areas the private car will remain an important means of travel

2.32 **Policy 13 Main Towns** suggests that Diss will accommodate significant expansion in and adjacent to the town centre and employment growth to meet the needs of town and large rural catchment, including a minimum of 300 additional dwellings subject to resolution of servicing constraints.

2.33 **Policy 15 Service Villages** defines the parishes of Roydon and Scole as 'Service Villages' as part of the settlement hierarchy. Land will be allocated for small-scale housing development subject to form and character considerations. Small-scale employment or service development appropriate to the scale and

needs of the village and its immediate surroundings will also be encouraged. Existing local shops and services will be protected.

2.34 **Policy 16 Other Villages** identifies Burston as 'Other Villages' with defined development boundaries to accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings and small-scale business or services, subject to form and character considerations. The supporting text elaborates that these villages are defined by their limited or non-existent local service levels and would not provide a sustainable location for significant new development. While significant expansion is termed unsustainable in 'Other Villages', and no allocations are proposed in Burston, some locations with basic essential services would be capable of accommodating very limited windfall infill development without affecting the form and character of the villages. Housing to provide for local needs may also be suitable. In exceptional circumstances, a larger scale of development may be permitted where it would bring local facilities up to the level of those in a Service Village and is acceptable having regard to other policies in the development plan.

2.35 The remaining settlements in the Neighbourhood Area are not located in South Norfolk and therefore are not mentioned in the JCS.

2.36 **Policy 17 Small Rural Communities and the Countryside** states that in the countryside (including villages not identified in one of the above categories), affordable housing for which a specific local need can be shown will be permitted in locations adjacent to villages as an exception to general policy. Farm diversification, home working, small-scale and medium-scale commercial enterprises where a rural location can be justified, including limited leisure and tourism facilities to maintain and enhance the rural economy, will also be acceptable. Other development, including the appropriate replacement of existing buildings, will be permitted in the countryside where it can clearly be demonstrated to further the objectives of this Joint Core Strategy.

2.37 **Policy 19 Hierarchy of Centres** encourages the development of new retailing, services, offices and other town centres at a scale appropriate to the form and functions defined.

## Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (October 2015)

2.38 The adopted Development Management Policies Document forms part of the South Norfolk Local Plan that guides development proposals to ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable developments across South Norfolk.

2.39 **Policy DM 1.3 The sustainable location of new development** states that

1) All new development should be located so that it positively contributes to the sustainable development of South Norfolk as led by the Local Plan. The Council will work with developers to promote and achieve proposals that are:

- Located on Allocated Sites or within the development boundaries of Settlements defined on the Policies Map, comprising the Norwich Fringe, Main Towns, Key Service Centres, Service Villages and Other Villages; and

- Of a scale proportionate to the level of growth planned in that location, and the role and function of the Settlement within which it is located, as defined in the Local Plan.

2) Permission for development in the Countryside outside of the defined development boundaries of Settlements will only be granted if:

- Where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or
- Otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environment dimensions as addressed in Policy 1.1.

2.40 **Policy DM 2.1 Employment and business development** notes that proposals for employment uses on new sites located with the development boundaries will be supported subject to the policies of the Local Plan.

2.41 **Policy DM 2.2 Protection of employment sites** seeks to safeguard sites and buildings allocated for business class and other employment uses. It also seeks to safeguard all other land and buildings currently in or last used for an employment use. Proposals leading to the loss of such sites and buildings will be permitted where:

- The possibility of re-using or redeveloping the site / premises for a range of alternative business purposes has been fully explored and it can be demonstrated that the site or premises is no longer economically viable or practical to retain for an Employment Use; or
- There would be an overriding economic, environmental or community benefit from redevelopment or change to another use which outweighs the benefit of the current lawful use continuing.

2.42 **Policy DM 3.16 Improving the level of community facilities** states that the change of use of existing community facilities will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:

- Adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs; or
- No reasonable prospect of continued viable use

2.43 **Policy DM4.4 Natural Environmental Assets – Designated and Locally Important Open Space** identifies natural environmental assets in South Norfolk. At the Important Local Open Spaces identified on the Proposals Map, development will only be permitted where it retains the open character and appearance of the site, where it respects the contribution which the identified open site or open frontage makes to the form and character of settlement and where there is no significant adverse impact on the setting of any existing buildings. New development impacting these designated heritage assets will be required to contribute positive improvement of these natural environmental assets where opportunities arise.

## Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)

- 2.44 The adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document designates area of land to deliver housing, employment, recreation, open spaces and community uses up to 2026.
- 2.45 **Policy DIS1 Land north of Vince's Road** allocates the 1.18 Ha site for housing to accommodate approximately 35 dwellings. Developers are required to deliver access from Frenze Hall Lane through the adjacent housing development to the north of the site, provide appropriate landscaping along the boundary to Vince's Road employment area, contribute towards protection and enhancement of green infrastructure along Frenze Brook and confirm wastewater infrastructure capacity.
- 2.46 **Policy DIS2 Land off Park Road** allocates 4.6 Ha of land for open space, green space, a riverside walk and a small area of land for residential development of approximately 10 to 15 dwellings within Flood Zone 1. Policy DIS2 also sets out a range of requirements relating to the location of the dwellings in relation to each other and the existing built and environmental context, on-site and off-site green and open space requirements and the potential provision of a riverside walk.
- 2.47 **Policy DIS3 Land off Denmark Lane (Roydon Parish)** allocates the 1.6 Ha site for housing to accommodate approximately 42 dwellings. The developers of the site are required to:
- Make appropriate footway improvements and provide road access from Denmark Lane
  - Provide approximately a 10m landscape belt to its western boundary reflected to provide a soft edge to the development
  - Confirm wastewater infrastructure capacity prior to development taking place
  - Conform with the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 as the site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources
- 2.48 **Policy DIS4 Land north of Frenze Hall Lane** allocates the 4.7 Ha site for housing to accommodate approximately 125 dwellings.
- 2.49 **Policy DIS5 Former haulage depot, Victoria Road** allocates 0.6 Ha of land for housing to accommodate a maximum of 15 dwellings.
- 2.50 **Policy DIS6 Former Hamlins Factory site, Park Road** allocates 1.76 Ha of land for retail, leisure, offices and housing.
- 2.51 **Policy DIS7 Feather Mills Site, Park Road** allocates 2.21 Ha of land for retail (non-food goods), leisure, offices (Class A2 only) and housing, with any housing only constituting no more than 25% of the site by area. Policy DIS7 also highlights a list of requirements including the provision of public access through to DIS2, considerations of impacts on TPO trees along Park Road and adjacent Conservation Areas, contributions towards green infrastructure, confirmation of wastewater infrastructure capacity, as well as management of potential contamination and safeguarded mineral resources on site.

- 2.52 **Policy DIS8 Land at Station Road/Nelson Road** allocates approximately 2.89 Ha of land for employment uses (Class B1<sup>18</sup>).
- 2.53 **Policy DIS9 Land at Sandy Lane (north of Diss Business Park)** allocates 4.22 Ha of land for employment uses in Classes B2 and B8. Policy DIS9 also sets out a list of requirements for the site in relation to land uses, access, utilities, landscaping, green infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure capacity and mineral resources.
- 2.54 **Policy DIS10 Diss Business Park** allocates 3.7 Ha of land for employment uses in Classes B1, B2 and B8. The policy also sets out a list of requirements in relation to land uses, access, utilities, landscaping, green infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure capacity and mineral resources.

## Draft Greater Norwich Local Plan

- 2.55 Produced by the South Norfolk Council, Broadland District Council and Norwich City Council, the Greater Norwich Local Plan is a joint strategic plan which provides the strategy for growth for the Greater Norwich area to 2038. It was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in July 2021. When adopted, the GNLP will supersede the current JCS, development management policies document and the site allocations and policies documents in each of the three districts<sup>19</sup>.
- 2.56 **Draft Policy 1 The Sustainable Growth Strategy** states that sustainable development and inclusive growth are supported by delivery of the following between 2018 and 2038:
- to meet the need for around 40,550 new homes, provision is made for a minimum of 49,492 new homes;
  - to aid delivery of 33,000 additional jobs and support key economic sectors, around 360 hectares of employment land is allocated, and employment opportunities are promoted at the local level;
  - supporting infrastructure will be provided in line with policies 2 and 4;
  - environmental protection and enhancement measures including further improvements to the green infrastructure network will be delivered.
- 2.57 The draft policy defines the settlement hierarchy in Greater Norwich, with Diss (including parts of Roydon) identified as a main town, which is at the second tier followed by key services centre and village clusters<sup>20</sup>.
- 2.58 To provide choice and aid delivery of housing, the draft policy also states that proposals for additional 'windfall' housing growth will be considered acceptable in principle at appropriate scales and locations where they would not have a negative impact on the character and scale of the settlement, and subject to other local plan policies:

<sup>18</sup> Note that the current Use Classes were last updated in September 2020, where Class B was revoked and effectively replaced with the new Class E.

<sup>19</sup> Except for the smaller villages in South Norfolk that will be addressed through a new South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Local Plan (covered in the section below) and the Diss, Scole and Burston area, for which a Neighbourhood Plan is being produced which will allocate sites.

<sup>20</sup> All other parishes within the Neighbourhood Area in South Norfolk are identified as village clusters.

- Within settlement boundaries in accordance with the above settlement hierarchy;
  - Elsewhere in village clusters, subject to the requirements of Policy 7.4.
  - On sites of up to 3 to 5 dwellings in all parishes, subject to the requirements of Policy 7.5.
- 2.59 **Draft Policy 2 Sustainable Communities** states that development proposals are required as appropriate to respect, protect and enhance landscape character, taking account of landscape character assessments or equivalent documents, and maintain strategic gaps and landscape settings, including river valleys, undeveloped approaches and the character and setting of the Broads.
- 2.60 **Draft Policy 3 Environmental Protection and Enhancement** requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the built, historic and natural environment. Greater levels of protection will be provided according to the statutory status and quality of the built and historic asset.
- 2.61 **Draft Policy 5 Homes** requires residential development proposals to address the need for homes for all sectors of the community having regard to the latest housing evidence, including a variety of homes in terms of tenure and cost. New homes should provide for a good quality of life in mixed and inclusive communities and major development proposals should provide adaptable homes to meet varied and changing needs.
- 2.62 **Draft Policy 6 The Economy** states that development should seek to enhance the environment and economy of centres, and of villages with more dispersed services, to protect their function and avoid the loss of commercial premises or local services.
- 2.63 **Draft Policy 7.2 The Main Towns** states that the main towns identified (including Diss with part of Roydon) will continue to be developed to enhance their function as attractive places to live and providers of employment and services to serve the towns and their hinterlands, with substantial levels of development expected to take place. It identifies a total housing commitment of 763 dwellings for Diss (including parts of Roydon) in 2018-2038, including 400 dwellings to be delivered through new allocations. In terms of employment, the policy identifies a total of 10.8 Ha of existing undeveloped employment allocations to be delivered in Diss (with parts of Roydon).
- 2.64 **Draft Policy 7.2** also notes that residential development within settlement boundaries will be acceptable subject to meeting the criteria of other policies in the development plan. It also notes that small scale employment development will be acceptable in principle in main towns subject to meeting other policies. Enhancements to the multi-functional green infrastructure network will be sought to contribute to the strategic network as set out in the policy maps.
- 2.65 **Draft Policy 7.4 Village Clusters** supports the delivery of a range of sites within village centres, particularly through allocations through the South Norfolk Village Clusters Plan and the Greater Norwich Local Plan. Additional sites may be provided in village clusters by:
- Infill development within settlement boundaries;
  - Affordable housing led development, which may include an element of market housing(including self/custom build) if necessary, for viability, up to

a maximum of 15 dwellings in total. These sites should be adjacent or well related to settlement boundaries with good access to services, including safe routes to schools, subject to other policies of the Local Plan

2.66 The cumulative amount of windfall development permitted during the plan period should not have a negative impact on the character and scale of settlements in any village cluster. Employment development will be primarily delivered through allocations within the Greater Norwich Local Plan but other small-scale employment development will also be acceptable in principle elsewhere within village development boundaries, through the re-use of rural buildings or through the potential expansion of existing small and medium sized employment sites, subject to meeting other policies in the development plan.

2.67 **Draft Policy 7.5 Small Scale Windfall Housing Development** states that 'small scale residential development will be permitted adjacent to a development boundary or on sites within or adjacent to a recognisable group of dwellings where:

- Cumulative development permitted under this policy will be no more than 3 dwellings in small parishes or 5 dwellings in larger parishes (including Burston and Shimpling, Roydon and Scole) during the lifetime of the plan
- The proposal respects the form and character of the settlement
- The proposal would result in no adverse impact on the landscape and natural environment
- The proposal accords with other relevant Local Plan policies
- Positive consideration will be given to self and custom build

2.68 **Policy GNLP0102 Land at Frontier Agriculture Ltd, Sandy Lane, Diss** allocates the 3.61 Ha site for residential development to accommodate approximately 150 homes. All other site allocations proposed in the Regulation 18 version of the draft plan has not been proposed for allocations in the current version under Examination. Paragraph 4.20 of the draft Plan advises that decision on the allocation or reallocation of development land in Diss are devolved to the neighbourhood planning process.

2.69 In March 2022, Natural England issued guidance<sup>21</sup> to local planning authorities concerning nutrient neutrality and the LPA's role in preventing further adverse impacts to protected wetland habitats. Two additional habitat sites within South Norfolk are identified in unfavourable condition due to excessive nutrients which requires a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and where nutrient neutrality is a potential solution to enable development to proceed. The two habitats sites and their catchments affected within South Norfolk are the River Wensum SAC and the Broads SAC/Ramsar. The Neighbourhood Area (in both South Norfolk and Mid Suffolk) falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments defined in Annex B and attached detailed maps<sup>22</sup> of the advice letter.

<sup>21</sup> Available at <https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk/downloads/file/4481/ne-water-quality-and-nutrient-neutrality-advice-16-03-2022-issue-1-final>

<sup>22</sup> Available at: <https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk/downloads/file/4484/nutrient-neutrality-map-the-broads-sac> and <https://www.southnorfolkandbroadland.gov.uk/downloads/file/4483/nutrient-neutrality-map-river-wensum-sac>

- 2.70 Subsequently the Greater Norwich Planning Partnership has agreed<sup>23</sup> to appoint consultants to recommend precise wordings of the resulting main modifications to the GNLP for adoption by February 2023, potentially including policy amendments to tie the delivery of housing growth more tightly to nutrient levels impacting on internationally protected sites, including as appropriate, a county-wide mitigation strategy. It is also recognised that the availability of a mitigation strategy will affect the timing of the delivery of sites and the housing trajectory as opposed to the principle of their development.
- 2.71 The Greater Norwich Planning Partnership also highlighted in its response to the Inspectors that an alternative strategy to accommodate the growth needs within the unaffected areas around Diss, Harleston and the Waveney Valley, Loddon and Acle would be neither feasible nor credible having regard to the principles of sustainable development.

## Emerging South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

- 2.72 The emerging South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan seeks to allocate smaller sites (range of 12-50 homes) across 48 village clusters in South Norfolk and defines settlement limits for these villages within these clusters. Within the Neighbourhood Area, the village clusters in South Norfolk are Burston, Shimpling, Roydon and Scole.
- 2.73 A Regulation 18 draft Plan has been published for consultation in Summer 2021. It reiterates that the assessment and allocation of sites within the Diss and District Neighbourhood Area will be undertaken through the neighbourhood planning process.

## Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework

- 2.74 The adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework contains the Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2010-2026 (adopted September 2011), the Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (adopted October 2013 with amendments adopted December 2017), the Waste Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (adopted October 2013) and the associated policies map. The Framework guides planning decisions for mineral extraction, waste management facilities and their associated developments.
- 2.75 **Core Strategy Policy CS16 Safeguarding mineral and waste sites and mineral sources** seeks to safeguard existing, permitted and allocated minerals extraction and associated development with waste management facilities. The Mineral Planning Authority should also be consulted on all development proposals within Mineral Consultation Areas, except for the 12 excluded development types set out in Appendix 3 of the adopted Strategy.

<sup>23</sup> Available at [https://www.gnlp.org.uk/sites/gnlp/files/2022-05/Written%20Ministerial%20Statement%20Response%20Letter\\_0.pdf](https://www.gnlp.org.uk/sites/gnlp/files/2022-05/Written%20Ministerial%20Statement%20Response%20Letter_0.pdf)

2.76 Norfolk County Council is currently preparing a Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review which will consolidate the three adopted DPDs and extend the plan period to the end of 2036. It is expected that the Pre-Submission Regulation 19 Publication will take place in 2022.

## Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008) and Focused Review (2012)

- 2.77 As the key adopted Development Plan Document for the Mid Suffolk part of the Neighbourhood Area, the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy sets out the vision, objectives, spatial strategy and core policies that will guide development across the district until 2025, and beyond. It is to be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Focused Review (adopted December 2012).
- 2.78 **Policy CS1 Settlement Hierarchy** states that the majority of new development will be directed to towns and key service centres, but also with some provision for meeting local housing needs in primary and secondary villages, in particular affordable housing. Palgrave within the Neighbourhood Area is identified as a secondary village.
- 2.79 **Policy CS1** also states that the rest of Mid Suffolk, including settlements not listed in the strategy (this includes Stuston and Brome and Oakley), will be designated as countryside and countryside villages where development will be restricted to particular types of development to support the rural economy, meet affordable housing, community needs and provide renewable energy.
- 2.80 **Policy CS2 Development in the Countryside** restricts land uses in the countryside to the defined categories in accordance with other Core Strategy policies.
- 2.81 **Policy CS4 Adapting to Climate Change** requires all development proposals to contribute to the delivery of sustainable development and reflect the need to plan for climate change. In particular, the Council supports proposals that avoid areas of current and future flood risk. It also requires development to adapt to the anticipated negative impacts from climate change upon biodiversity by protecting the district's natural capital and applying an ecological network approach through reinforcing and creating links between core areas of biodiversity.
- 2.82 **Policy CS5 Mid Suffolk's Environment** requires all development to maintain and enhance the environment, including the historic environment, and retain the local distinctiveness of the area. The Council also seeks to protect and conserve landscape qualities of the District taking into account the natural environment and the historic dimension of the landscape as a whole.
- 2.83 **Policy CS7 Brownfield Target** proposes a target of 50% of dwellings being built on brownfields/previously developed land in Mid Suffolk.
- 2.84 **Policy CS8 Provision and Distribution of Housing Provision** allocates greenfield sites for at least 2,132 homes and associated infrastructure in Mid Suffolk to 2025.

- 2.85 **Policy CS9 Density and Mix** requires new housing development to provide a mix of house types, sizes and affordability to cater for different accommodation needs.
- 2.86 **Policy CS11 Supply of Employment Land** supports the provision of a range of good quality sites and premises for employment use in all towns and some of the key service centres. In rural areas, the Council supports economic development proposals including tourism and farm diversification proposals that cannot be sustainably located closer to existing settlements and where the proposal is restricted in size, scale and type appropriate to a rural setting.

## ‘Saved’ Policies from the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 (With Alterations in 2006)

- 2.87 The Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 (with alterations in 2006) guides planning decisions in Mid Suffolk. Most of the policies contained within the 1998 Local Plan has been superseded by policies from the Core Strategy and Focused Review and the Stowmarket Area Action Plan, but a number of policies remain ‘saved’ in 2006 and 2009.
- 2.88 **Policy SB2 Development Appropriate to Its Setting** supports development or change of use appropriate to their surroundings within settlement boundaries unless they adversely affect the character and appearance of the settlement, the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties, road safety, existing open spaces providing important facilities or amenities for the local community, existing wildlife areas, trees or other landscape features within or abutting settlement boundaries, as well as listed buildings, their setting or the appearance of a Conservation Area.
- 2.89 **Policy SB3 Retaining Visually Open Spaces** seeks to protect visually important open spaces (identified within the Proposals Maps of the Local Plan) within or abutting settlement boundaries for their contribution to the character and appearance of their surroundings and their amenity value to the local community.
- 2.90 **Policy HB1 Protection of Historic Buildings** places a high priority on protecting the character and appearance of all buildings of architectural or historic interest, particularly the setting of listed buildings.
- 2.91 **Policy HB8 Safeguarding the Character of Conservation Areas** seeks to protect the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.
- 2.92 **Policy HB14 Ensuring Archaeological Remains are not Destroyed** resists development that would affect an archaeological site or its setting where there is an overriding case for preservation.
- 2.93 **Policy H3 Housing Development in Villages** states that within settlement boundaries, residential development proposals will be considered in relation to the appearance and character of the village, the effect on nearby residential amenity and highway safety, the availability of services and facilities and policies for the protection of visually important open spaces and the surrounding countryside.

2.94 **Policy H3** also states that residential development within the settlement boundaries of village will normally take the form of:

- The infilling of small undeveloped sites, unless it is desirable to retain a site in undeveloped form as an important amenity or open space in the village scene
- A small group of dwellings up to 5 in number, well related to its surroundings and the character of the village
- In those villages where a range of services and facilities exist, groups of up to 9 dwellings well related to each other and their character of their surroundings
- Housing development in the form of estates of 10 dwellings or more in villages will be permitted only on sites allocated in the Local Plan

2.95 **Policy H15 Development to Reflect Local Characteristics** requires housing proposals to be consistent with the pattern and form of development in the neighbouring area, the character of its setting, particularly site constraints such as access, drainage and the configuration of the site including its natural features.

## Draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan

2.96 The Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan provides the strategy for development in Babergh and Mid Suffolk up to 2037. It was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in March 2021.

2.97 **Draft Policy SP01 Housing Needs** states that across the plan area, the mix, type and size of new housing development will be expected to reflect established needs in the most relevant district needs assessment.

2.98 **Policy SP02 Affordable Housing** seeks to retain and deliver a 35% requirement for affordable housing on relevant sites of ten or more dwellings or sites of 0.5 Ha or more.

2.99 **Draft Policy SP03 Settlement Hierarchy (proposed for significant modification to make clear where new housing development will be permitted)** defines the role of settlements within the District. Draft Policy SP03 states that in all cases the scale and location of development will depend upon the role of settlements within the settlement hierarchy defined in the policy table and the spatial distribution, the capacity of existing physical and social infrastructure or new/enhanced infrastructure, as well as having regard to the built and natural environment. Development which would lead to visual or physical coalescence of settlements will not be supported. Brome, Palgrave and Stuston are identified as Hinterland Villages while Oakley is identified as a Hamlet Village.

2.100 **Draft Policy SP04 Housing Spatial Distribution (proposed for deletion)** defines the broad distribution of new additional housing provision. The Diss and District Neighbourhood Area is required to deliver a total of 64 homes (including identified Outstanding Planning Permissions) within Mid Suffolk as the minimum housing requirement.

**2.101 Draft Policy LP01 Windfall Development in Hamlets and Dwelling Clusters (proposed for significant modification to make clear where new housing development will be permitted)** states that proposals for windfall development within dwelling clusters and/or a defined hamlet may be acceptable, subject to the following criteria applied:

- It would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the settlement, landscape (including the AONB), residential amenity or any heritage, environmental or community assets.
- It would not result in consolidating sporadic or ribbon development or result in loss of gaps between settlements resulting in coalescence. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the location, context and infrastructure is considered acceptable.
- The scale of development is infill only for a single dwelling and or pair of semi-detached dwellings.
- Special regard shall be given to development proposals preserving and enhancing the AONB and to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity affected by the proposal.
- All new development will be expected to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through implementation of sustainable construction practices and renewable energy technologies.

**2.102 Draft Policy LP17 Environmental Protection** seeks to prioritise development on previously developed land, where appropriate, to minimise the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where development needs to take place on greenfield land, avoidance of the best and most versatile agriculture land should be prioritised.

**2.103 Draft Policy LP18 Biodiversity and Geodiversity** requires all development to follow a hierarchy of seeking firstly to enhance habitats, avoid impacts, mitigate against harmful impacts, or as a last resort compensate for losses that cannot be avoided or mitigated for. In particular, development should:

- Protect designated land. Proposed development which is likely to have an adverse impact upon designated and potential designated sites, or that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable biodiversity or geological features or habitats (such as ancient woodland and veteran/ancient trees) will not be supported.
- Protect and improve sites of geological value and in particular geological sites of international, national and local significance
- Conserve, restore and contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity and geological conservation interests including priority habitats and species.
- Plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of local networks of biodiversity with wildlife corridors that connect areas.
- Identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains, equivalent of a minimum 10% increase, for biodiversity.
- Apply additional measures to assist with the recovery of species listed on S41 of the NERC Act 2006

2.104 **Draft Policy LP19 Landscape** seeks to protect and enhance the landscape character of Babergh and Mid Suffolk. Development must:

- Integrate positively with the existing landscape character of the area and reinforce the local distinctiveness and identity of individual settlements
- Proposals must be sensitive to their landscape and visual amenity impacts (including on dark skies and tranquil areas); subject to siting, design, lighting, use of materials and colour, along with the associated mitigation measures
- Enhance and protect landscape character and values and heritage assets
- Consider the topographical cumulative impact on landscape sensitivity

2.105 **Draft Policy LP22 Change in Land Use for Equestrian or Other Animal / Rural Land Base Uses** states that the change in use of land for equestrian uses or other animal/rural land based uses in the countryside may be permitted subject to criteria set out in the policy.

2.106 **Draft Policy LP24 New Agricultural / Rural Buildings in the Countryside** states that there must be appropriate justification and demonstrable evidence for any new proposals which are remote, isolated or detached within the countryside.

2.107 **Draft Policy LP29 Flood Risk and Vulnerability** sets out the requirements for new development proposals in relation to flood risk mitigation.

2.108 **Draft Policy JS01 (proposed for deletion)** identifies a number of hinterland and hamlets sites in Babergh and Mid Suffolk for housing. It requires the development of these sites to comply with the relevant policies of the Plan and have regard to the Council's latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan for infrastructure capacity and requirements. Two sites have been allocated for a total of 15 dwellings within the Neighbourhood Area, including:

- Oakley: Land south of B1118 – 5 dwellings
- Oakley: Land north of B1118 – 10 dwellings

2.109 In December 2021, correspondence between the Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils and the Inspectors (document G09<sup>24</sup> and G10<sup>25</sup>) indicate that the emerging Local Plan will be divided into two parts, in which the existing housing allocation policies would be deleted from the emerging Local Plan with the settlement boundaries in the adopted (as opposed to proposed) policies map to be retained (among other modifications including a review of the settlement hierarchy)<sup>26</sup>. These elements are considered to be unsound at present and would require further review upon up-to-date and robust evidence

<sup>24</sup> Available at: <https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/JLPExamination/CoreDocLibrary/G-ExaminationCorrespondence/G09-Letter-Inspectors-to-BMSDC.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> Available at: <https://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/JLPExamination/CoreDocLibrary/G-ExaminationCorrespondence/G10-Letter-BMSDC-to-Inspectors.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> Paragraph 9 of the Correspondence indicates the key areas of alteration including:

- Delete policies SP04, LP09, LP30 and the LS01 and LA housing allocation policies
- Retain the settlement boundaries in the current (as opposed to proposed) policies map
- Significantly modify policies SP03 and LP01 to make clear where new housing development will be permitted
- Retain the open space designations included in the current (as opposed to proposed) policies map and retain as "saved" the relevant open space policies in the extant plans
- Include in the plan a positively-worded policy, consistent with the PPTS, against which any applications for accommodation for gypsies, travellers and travelling show-people can be assessed
- Modify the remaining policies in line with the discussions held at the hearing sessions.

base. They would be considered in the preparation and adoption of a 'Part 2' Local Plan which is expected to start as soon as possible after the adoption of 'Part 1' of the emerging Local Plan.

## Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (Adopted July 2020)

2.110 The Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted July 2020) guides planning decisions for minerals and waste development and safeguards the same from other forms of competing development in Suffolk.

2.111 **Policy MP10 Minerals Consultation and Safeguarding Areas** seeks to safeguard Minerals Safeguarding Areas from proposed development in excess of 5 Ha. The County Council will in principle object to such development when consulted by the Local Planning Authority unless it can be shown that the sand and gravel present is not of economic value, or not practically or environmentally feasible to extract, or that the mineral will be worked before the development. A high proportion of land within the parishes of Brome and Oakley, Stuston and Palgrave falls within the Mineral Safeguarding Areas defined in the Proposals Map<sup>27</sup>, however none of the identified sites is larger than 5 Ha.

2.112 **Policy WP18 Safeguarding of Waste Management Facilities** seeks to safeguard existing sites and sites proposed for waste management use. Development proposals in close proximity to existing sites should demonstrate that they would not prejudice or be prejudiced by a waste management facility. Within the Neighbourhood Area, a water recycling centre is located in Oakley (AW142 Oakley-Dross Ln Stw).

<sup>27</sup> Available at: <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/planning-waste-and-environment/Minerals-and-Waste-Policy/Minerals-and-Waste-SMWLP-Adopted/Minerals-and-Waste-Safeguarding-and-Proposals-Map-reduced.pdf>

## 3. Methodology

3.1 The approach to site assessment is based on the Government's Planning Practice Guidance. The relevant sections are the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (March 2015)<sup>28</sup>, Neighbourhood Planning (updated February 2018)<sup>29</sup> and Locality's Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment Toolkit<sup>30</sup>. These all support assessing whether a site is appropriate for allocation in a Neighbourhood Plan based on whether it is suitable, available and achievable. In this context, the methodology for identifying, appraising and reviewing sites is presented below. This consolidates the assessment methodology of all three previous SOAs.

### Task 1: Site Identification

3.2 The first task is to identify which sites should be considered as part of the site assessment for the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. A total of 77 sites (excluding duplicated sites where it has been identified through multiple sources) have been identified through the 2019, 2020 and 2022 SOAs, including:

- Sites submitted for consideration by the Qualifying Body, a neighbourhood level Call for Sites and the Neighbourhood Plan's consultation
- Sites identified and assessed in local authority site assessments, including the GNLP Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA)
- Sites submitted as part of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (VCHAP) Call for Sites
- Sites allocated in the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015) to be considered for reallocation

### Task 2: Site Assessment and Review

3.3 For sites that have already been assessed in the local authority site assessments, a thorough review of the report conclusions is conducted to establish whether there is any new or additional evidence available that would change the findings; whether the conclusions that have been applied in the Local Plan context can also be applied to the Neighbourhood Plan; and whether the assessment conclusions are fully supported by evidence. All reviews forms are presented in **Appendix B** of this report.

3.4 All remaining new sites are assessed using a site appraisal proforma developed by AECOM for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is based on the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance and the Locality Site Assessment Toolkit. The purpose of the proforma is to enable a consistent

<sup>28</sup> Available at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment>

<sup>29</sup> Available at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

<sup>30</sup> Available at <https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/assess-allocate-sites-development/>

evaluation of each site against an objective set of criteria. All completed proformas are presented in **Appendix B** of this report.

3.5 The proforma used for the assessment enables a range of information to be recorded, including the following:

- General information:
  - Site location and use; and
  - Site context and planning history.
- Context:
  - Type of site (greenfield, brownfield etc.); and
- Suitability:
  - Site characteristics;
  - Environmental considerations;
  - Heritage considerations;
  - Community facilities and services; and
  - Other key considerations (e.g. flood risk, agricultural land, tree preservation orders).
- Availability

3.6 Completion of the site proformas was done through a combination of desktop assessment and site visits in 2019, 2020 and 2022. The desktop assessment involved a review of the conclusions of the existing evidence and using other sources including Google Maps/Streetview, MAGIC maps and Local Authority data in order to judge whether a site is suitable for the use proposed. The site visits allowed the team to consider aspects of the site assessment that could only be done visually. It was also an opportunity to gain a better understanding of the context and nature of the neighbourhood area.

3.7 All sites previously assessed have been reviewed as part of this updated report to investigate if any new or additional evidence available may have changed previous assessment findings.

3.8 **Table 2** summarises all sites identified and their respective assessment approach. A number of sites already have planning permissions and are excluded from further assessments as the planning consent means that development is permitted on the site and therefore does not need to be allocated. This includes:

- DIS4 Land north of Frenze Hall Lane
- DIS5 Former haulage depot, Victoria Road
- DIS6 Former Hamlins Factory site, Park Road
- DIS8 Land at Station Road/Nelson Road
- DIS10 Land at Diss Business Park
- Site 12d Brome (Ivy House Farm)

## Task3: Consolidation of Results

3.9 A ‘traffic light’ rating of all sites has been given based on whether the site is an appropriate candidate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The traffic light rating indicates ‘green’ for sites that show no or very few constraints and are thus appropriate as site allocations, ‘amber’ for sites which are potentially suitable if constraints can be resolved and ‘red’ for sites which are not considered currently to be suitable. The judgement on each site is based on the three ‘tests’ of whether a site is appropriate for allocation – i.e. whether or not the site is suitable, available and achievable for a proposed use.

## Task 4: Indicative Development Capacity

3.10 Where sites were previously included in the adopted Local Plan or local authority site assessments, the indicative development capacity shown in these documents has been used as a starting point, unless more updated information has been submitted. If site promoters have put forward an indicative development capacity, this has been used as appropriate.

3.11 Where a site was neither included in previous evidence base documents and the landowner or developer did not submit a capacity figure, the indicative density of 25dph has been used for housing sites as for the GNLP HELAA to make the assessment as consistent as possible<sup>31</sup>. This is also supported by the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan Design Code produced by AECOM in 2019, which states that development sites which are rural in nature should have a density not exceeding 25 dwellings. **Table 1** below shows how the net density is calculated for sites within different contexts.

3.12 The indicative densities and capacities stated for each site in this assessment should however be considered as a starting point only and are only relevant if the entire site was developed. Different densities than suggested in this report may be appropriate to apply to the sites in the Neighbourhood Area (resulting in different capacities) based on site specific circumstances (such as for example the characteristics of the individual site location).

**Table 1 AECOM Indicative Housing Density Calculation**

Site Area	Gross to net ratio standards	Net housing density (dph)
Up to 0.4 Ha	90%	25
0.4 to 2 Ha	80%	25
2 Ha to 10 Ha	75%	25
Over 10 Ha	50%	25

<sup>31</sup> Development capacity contained in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan are estimated on a site-by-site basis.

**Table 2 Sites identified for assessment**

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
<b>South Norfolk: Burston and Shimpling</b>					
GNLPS0005 (GNLPSL00005)	Land south east of Diss Road	0.1	Identified by the Qualifying Body	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
GNLP0349	Land west of Gissing Road	1.54	GNLP HELAA (2018 Addendum)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP0386	Land at Rectory Road	2.44	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP0560	Land at Diss Road (north of Willow End)	1.51	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP0561	Land at Diss Road (West of Willow End)	0.88	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP0562	Land at Diss Road (East of Hill Farmhouse and Hill Farm Barn)	0.75	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP1028	Land east of Mill Road, Crown Farm Barn	0.3	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
<b>South Norfolk : Diss</b>					
DISS0001	Mavery House (Fitzwalter Road, IP22 4EX)	0.67	Identified by the Qualifying Body	No recent or relevant planning applications. A planning application ( <a href="#">2007/0584</a> ) for school extensions has been approved in May 2007.	Appendix A
DISS0002	'The Entry'	1.75	Identified by the Qualifying Body	No recent or relevant planning applications. Multiple planning applications (2017/1500; 2015/1126; 2004/2097; 2001/2067) related to school extensions and temporary classrooms were approved previously.	Appendix A
DISS0003	The Old School, Causeway Close	0.18	Identified by the Qualifying Body	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
DIS1 / GNLP0185	Land North of Vince's Road	1.18	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)	No recent or relevant planning applications  The site is also submitted for consideration in the GNLP HELAA 2017 as GNLP0185 Prince William Way (1.01 Ha).	Appendix A
DIS2	Land off Park Road	4.6	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
			Policies Document (October 2015)		
DIS4	Land north of Frenze Hall Lane	1.76	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)	June 2017, Planning Application ( <a href="#">2016/1566</a> ) approved for a residential development comprising 136 no. dwelling houses with associated access, car parking, refuse and recycling provision and landscaping The site is now built out and does not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. Further assessment in this SOA is not required.	Further assessment in this SOA is not required
DIS5	Former haulage depot, Victoria Road	2.21	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)	June 2014, Planning Application ( <a href="#">2014/0699</a> ) approved for the construction of a care home and ancillary works including the demolition of existing buildings (amendments to the original planning permission 2013/0385/F including the relocation of refuse storage and conservatories under balconies). The site is now built out and does not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. Further assessment in this SOA is not required.	Further assessment in this SOA is not required
DIS6	Former Hamlins Factory site, Park Road	2.89	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and	December 2021, Appeal allowed and planning application approved ( <a href="#">2021/0307</a> ) for the redevelopment of the site to form 58 no. retirement apartments and 15 no. retirement	Further assessment in this SOA is not required

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
			Policies Document (October 2015)	cottages including communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping. As the planning permission has been granted, the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan (although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation). Further assessment in this SOA is not required.	
DIS7	Feather Mills site, Park Road	4.22	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
DIS8	Land at Station Road/Nelson Road	3.7	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)	February 2021, Planning Application ( <a href="#">2020/0478</a> ) approved for the demolition of existing bungalow and erection of an extra care building containing 77 apartments and communal facilities. As the planning permission has been granted, the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan (although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation). Further assessment in this SOA is not required.	Further assessment in this SOA is not required

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
DIS9	Land at Sandy Lane (north of Diss Business Park)	1.76	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
DIS10	Land at Diss Business Park	2.21	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)	September 2004, Planning Application ( <a href="#">2004/1590</a> ) approved for the proposed section of Unit 21 (B1 Use) and Unit 22-30 (B8) with associated parking and service area. The site is now built out and does not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although the site could be potentially allocated to safeguard its continued use as employment land.	Further assessment in this SOA is not required
Site 1	Current Leisure Centre (Diss Leisure Centre)	0.31	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
Site 2	Travis Perkins Site, Shelfanger Road	0.3	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	January 2018, Planning Application approved ( <a href="#">2017/2577</a> ) for the erection of new store building to replace former irreparable building.	Appendix A
GMLP0102	Land at Frontier Agriculture on Sandy Lane	3.61	GMLP HELAA (2017)	October 2016, Planning Application ( <a href="#">2015/2816</a> ) withdrawn for the demolition of existing buildings on site and outline planning application for up to 90 dwellings.	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
GNLP0112	Frenze Hall Lane (Land to the south side of Frenze Road)	0.23	GNLP HELAA (2017)	August 2021, Outline Planning Application ( <a href="#">2021/1562</a> ) withdrawn for residential development (9 dwellings).	Appendix B
GNLP0250	Heywood Road, Diss	3.00	GNLP HELAA (2017)	December 2021, Planning Application validated* ( <a href="#">2021/2782</a> ) for the erection of up to 179 dwellings, 0.64 ha of land for the future extension of Diss Cemetery, a new road linking Shelfanger Road and Heywood Road/Burston Road, public open space and associated infrastructure and landscaping. Pending Consideration as of April 2022. *Site proposed includes GNLP0250, GNLP0342 and GNLP0291 (Roydon).	Appendix B
GNLP0341	Land between Shelfanger Road and Mount Street	3.21	GNLP HELAA (2017)	January 2004, Planning Application withdrawn (2001/0509) for the erection of 5no dwellings with access, drainage and designated public open space.	Appendix B
GNLP0342	Land east of Shelfanger Road	4.76	GNLP HELAA (2017)	December 2021, Planning Application Validated* ( <a href="#">2021/2782</a> ) for the erection of up to 179 dwellings, 0.64 ha of land for the future extension of Diss Cemetery, a new road linking Shelfanger Road and Heywood Road/Burston	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
				Road, public open space and associated infrastructure and landscaping. Pending Consideration as of April 2022. *Site proposed includes GNLP0250, GNLP0342 and GNLP0291 (Roydon).	
GNLP0599	Walcot Road and Walcot Green	3.29	GNLP HELAA (2017)	July 2019, Planning Application ( <a href="#">2019/1555</a> ) validated for the outline application including access, with all other matters reserved, for up to 80 (maximum) residential dwellings (based on revised descriptions in October 2021). Pending consideration as of April 2022. Comments submitted by South Norfolk and Broadland Council Senior Heritage and Design Officers highlights the existing separation and difference in character between the hamlet of Walcott Green and the suburban settlement expansion of Diss. In particular, the strong edge of landscaping to the south of Walcott combined with open fields assists in maintaining the separation between the two settlements and preserving the character of the more rural settlement of Walcott Green to the north.	Appendix B
GNLP1003	Frenze Hall Lane	2.02	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
GNLP1044	Walcot Green	11.0	GNLP HELAA Addendum III December 2020	<p>No recent or relevant planning applications on the site but a number of recent planning applications should be considered as part of the site context:</p> <p><b><u>To the west of the site:</u></b></p> <p><b>Land north of Walcot Rise</b> –July 2019, Planning Application (<a href="#">2019/1555</a>) validated for the outline application including access, with all other matters reserved for up to 80 (maximum) residential dwellings. Pending consideration as of April 2022. Comments submitted by South Norfolk and Broadland Council Senior Heritage and Design Officers highlights the existing separation and difference in character between the hamlet of Walcott Green and the suburban settlement expansion of Diss. In particular, the strong edge of landscaping to the south of Walcott combined with open fields assists in maintaining the separation between the two settlements and preserving the character of the more rural settlement of Walcott Green to the north.</p> <p><b><u>To the south of the site:</u></b></p> <p><b>Land North of Frenze Hall Lane</b> – June 2017, Planning Application (<a href="#">2016/1566</a>) approved for a residential development comprising 136 no. dwelling houses with associated access, car</p>	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
				parking, refuse and recycling provision and landscaping.	
GNLP1045	Land west of Nelson Road and East of Station Road	0.94	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP2067	Victoria Road	0.42	GNLP HELAA (2017)	<p>The site is subject to the now lapsed planning permission <a href="#">2012/0940</a> for the proposed repair and retail warehouse.</p> <p>The site was shortlisted though considered unreasonable for allocation in the draft GNLP for employment use (repair and retail warehouse, business and offices), as the site is subject to flood risk constraints and that there is already sufficient employment land allocated in Diss still to be developed in the adopted Local Plan.</p>	Appendix B
GNLP4049	Land south of Burston Road	20.49	GNLP HELAA Addendum III December 2020	<p>No recent or relevant planning applications on the site but a recent planning application should be considered as part of the site context:</p> <p><b><u>To the southeast of the site:</u></b>  <b>Land north of Walcot Rise</b> –July 2019, Planning Application (<a href="#">2019/1555</a>) validated for the outline application including access, with all other matters reserved for up to 80 (maximum)</p>	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
				residential dwellings. Pending consideration as of April 2022. Comments submitted by South Norfolk and Broadland Council Senior Heritage and Design Officers highlights the existing separation and difference in character between the hamlet of Walcott Green and the suburban settlement expansion of Diss. In particular, the strong edge of landscaping to the south of Walcott combined with open fields assists in maintaining the separation between the two settlements and preserving the character of the more rural settlement of Walcott Green to the north.	
<b>South Norfolk: Roydon</b>					
735	Land north of Old High Road	1.49	Put forward in October 2021 as part of the GNLP consultation	No recent or relevant planning applications. Planning application approved for a new vehicular access ( <a href="#">2017/2055</a> ) in November 2017.	Appendix A
DIS3	Land off Denmark Lane (Roydon parish)	1.6	Allocations from the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (October 2015)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
Site 3	Land opposite White House Farm, Snow Street	0.4	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	<p>January 2022, Planning Application refused (<a href="#">2021/1276</a>) for the change of use of agricultural land for standing of 1 caravan for residential use in connection with caring for family members (retrospective). The key reasons for refusal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is located outside the development boundary and the development has demonstrated no overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development to justify the retention of the caravan and its intended use</li> <li>• The development and its use are detrimental to the rural character of the area by not relating satisfactorily with its surroundings. The caravan is visible from the public vantage point as approached from south east of the village and its sitting within the context of a rural setting is considered to cause harm to the rural character and settings.</li> <li>• The existing access to the site is located on Snow Road with visibility restrictions and the retention of the development is therefore detrimental to public road users and pedestrian safety</li> </ul>	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
Site 4	The Old Sewerage Works	1.81	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
Site 5 – Option A & B	Land at Manor Farm House	0.12 / 0.33	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	February 2022, Planning Application validated ( <a href="#">2022/0459</a> ) for the erection of timber shed. Pending consideration as of April 2022.	Appendix A
Site 6	South of the A1066	1.15	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
Site 7	Land opposite the school with access onto the Old High Road	1.2	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
Site 8	Brewers Green Lane	1.5	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	<p>July 2006, Planning Application refused (<a href="#">2006/1156</a>) for the erection of new Catholic Church with Priest Flat over, detached garage, car parking and access. The reasons for refusal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development does not provide off-site facilities for pedestrians to link with existing provision</li> <li>• The unclassified road serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development</li> </ul>	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harmful impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the rural setting of Diss and Roydon, and that the building has an unacceptable design and inadequate justification and supporting information for the building has been submitted</li> </ul>	
Site 14	Diss Rugby Club	2.49	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications. Multiple approved planning applications for club extension and floodlighting replacements (2008/0330; 2010/1328; 2017/0862).	Appendix A
GNLP0526 / SN0526REV	South of High Road, Roydon	3.66	GNLP HELAA (2017)	<p>No recent or relevant planning applications</p> <p>A reduced form of the site (1.0 Ha) has been submitted to the VCHAP Call for Sites as SN0526REV Land South of High Road.</p>	Appendix A
GNLP0104	Sandstone Way	0.48	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP0119	Shelfanger Road	0.68	GNLP HELAA (2017)	February 2015, Planning Application refused ( <a href="#">2014/2295</a> ) for the proposed development of 35 houses comprising 25 market houses and 10 affordable units based on a range of reasons including: outside development limit; unsustainable development; design and density; highway safety; insufficient archaeological information; and, insufficient ecological information.	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
GNLP0291	Land north of Shelfanger Road	0.93	GNLP HELAA (2017)	December 2021, Planning Application validated* ( <a href="#">2021/2782</a> ) for the erection of up to 179 dwellings, 0.64 ha of land for the future extension of Diss Cemetery, a new road linking Shelfanger Road and Heywood Road/Burston Road, public open space and associated infrastructure and landscaping. Pending consideration as of April 2022. *Site proposed includes GNLP0250, GNLP0342 and GNLP0291 (Roydon).	Appendix B
GNLP0362	Sturgeons Farm, off Farm Close, Louie's Lane, Shelfanger Road	13.81	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning application	Appendix B
GNLP0606	Boundary Farm on Shelfanger Road	3.08	GNLP HELAA (2017)	October 2018, Planning Application ( <a href="#">2018/1892</a> ) approved for the retrospective change of permission granted for use of mobile home as granny annexe, to allow long term let of annexe as separate dwelling.  Note that only a small part of the site falls within Neighbourhood Area.	Appendix B
GNLP1038	Brewers Green	1.06	GNLP HELAA (2017)	November 2014, Planning Application approved ( <a href="#">2014/1872</a> ) for the erection of small storage building.	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
GNLP2104	West of Shelfanger Road	50.51	GNLP HELAA (2018 Addendum)	No recent or relevant planning applications  Note that part of the site falls outside of the Neighbourhood Area.	Appendix B
GNLP4010	Tottington Lane	1.07	GNLP HELAA Addendum III December 2020	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
<b>South Norfolk: Scole</b>					
251	The Laurels, Diss Road	0.17	Put forward in October 2021 as part of the GNLP consultation	No recent or relevant planning applications but a recent planning application should be considered as part of the site context: <b><u>Land directly to the south of the site (Scole Engineering):</u></b> October 2020, Planning Application ( <a href="#">2020/1236</a> ) approved for the change of use from the commercial use to residential use to create 6 dwellings including demolition of existing garage workshop buildings.	Appendix A
SN4022 / DDNP11	Land east of Norwich Road	5.2	VCHAP Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications  The southern part of the site is put forward as DDNP11 (2.7 Ha) as part the DDNP's consultation.	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
SN4023 / GNLP0338/ GNLP0338R	South of Bungay Road / Land at Rose Farm off Bungay Road	8.22	VCHAP Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications  A reduced form of the site focused at the northwestern corner is considered as GNLP0338 (1.45 Ha) and GNLP0338R (0.59 Ha) as part of the HELAA 2017 and 2018 Addendum.	Appendix A
GNLP0339	Land at Street Farm, west of Low Road	0.34	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP0511	Land to the east of Norwich Road, South of Ransom Avenue	1.02	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP0527	Land to the south of Bungay Road	1.75	GNLP HELAA (2017)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
GNLP2066	1 Bridge Road	0.5	GNLP HELAA (2018 Addendum)	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
<b>Mid Suffolk: Brome and Oakley</b>					
SS1011 / Site 9 / DDNP14	Lower Oakley, Plot A / Land north of B1118	1.00	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation	No recent or relevant planning applications  A reduced form part of the site is put forward for assessment (0.41 Ha) as SS1011 in the	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
				<p>Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment October 2020 and as DDNP14 as part of the DDNP's consultation. The Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan SHELAA assessment concludes that the site is potentially suitable (with further assessments regarding access, footpaths, infrastructure required and potential impacts on heritage assets required), available and achievable.</p> <p>The site has been allocated for 10 dwellings (Policy LS01) in the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan currently under examination. However, correspondence between the Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils and the Inspectors in December 2021 has agreed that the proposed housing allocation policies (including Policy LS01) will be deleted from the emerging Local Plan moving forward as it is found unsound at present.</p>	
SS0542 & SS1012 / Site 10 / DDNP15	Lower Oakley, Plot B (western part) / Land south of the B1118	0.69	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation	<p>No recent or relevant planning applications</p> <p>The western part of Site 10 (0.20 Ha) is put forward for assessment as SS0542 in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment October 2020. The</p>	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
				<p>assessment concludes that site is potentially suitable (with further assessments regarding access, footpaths, infrastructure required and potential impacts on heritage assets required), available and achievable. This reduced form of the site is also submitted for consideration as part of the DDNP's consultation as DDNP15.</p> <p>The site has been allocated for 5 dwellings (Policy LS01) in the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan currently under examination. However, correspondence between the Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils and the Inspectors in December 2021 has agreed that the proposed housing allocation policies (including Policy LS01) will be deleted from the emerging Local Plan moving forward as it is found unsound at present.</p>	
Site 11a	Brome (Land south of Tanglewood)	0.13	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
Site 11b	Brome (Land north of the Old Post Office)	1.24	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
Site 11c	Brome (Land north of Rose Farm)	0.25	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
Site 12a	Brome (Land north of Tanglewood)	0.52	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
Site 12b	Brome (Land at Upper Oakley adjacent to 12 High Street)	1.34	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
Site 12c	Brome (Land north of Ivy House)	1.70	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications but a recent planning permission at Site 12d should be considered as part of the site context.	Appendix A
Site 12d	Brome (Ivy House Farm)	0.61	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	April 2021, Full Planning Permission Granted ( <a href="#">DC/21/01192</a> ) for the conversion of and extension to single storey barn to create 1 no. dwelling house with associated landscaping and sewage package treatment plant.	Further assessment in this SOA is not required
Site 13	Brickle Meadow	3.64	Put forward as part of the DDNP's Call for Sites	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix A
SS0827	Land south of Rectory Road	1.28	BMSJLP SHELAA	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
<b>Mid Suffolk: Palgrave</b>					
PAL01	Land to the east of Priory Road	0.67	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation	No recent or relevant planning applications but a recent planning application should be considered as part of the site context: <b><u>Land to the north of the site:</u></b> January 2018, Outline planning application (DC/17/03178) granted for the erection of 9 dwellings.	Appendix A
PAL02	Land to the south of Priory Road	0.51	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation	No recent or relevant planning applications but a number of recent planning applications should be considered as part of the site context: <b><u>Land to the east of the site (opposite Priory Road):</u></b> June 2017, Outline planning application (4010/16) granted for the erection of 5 no. dwellings and garages and construction of a new vehicular access. May 2019, Application for reserved matters (DC/19/02225) granted for approved outline planning permission 4010/16. The site is now under construction.	Appendix A
PAL03	Land to the south of Lion Road (adjacent to Clarke Close)	1	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation	No recent or relevant planning applications but a recent planning application should be considered as part of the site context:	Appendix A

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Source	Relevant Planning History	Detailed Proforma / Review Form
				<b><u>Land to the northeast of the site:</u></b> November 2016, Full planning application (4195/15) approved for the erection of 21 dwellings , 3 no. new highways accesses, associated parking turning & on-site open space. The site has now been built out.	
PAL04	Land to the south of Lion Road	1	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation	June 2021, Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion request (DC/21/02867) for a proposed Solar Farm on the site has been decided (EIA not required).	Appendix A
PAL05	Land to the north of Lion Road	1	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation	June 2021, Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion request (DC/21/02867) for a proposed Solar Farm on the site has been decided (EIA not required).	Appendix A
PAL06 (SS0734)	Land north of Lion Road	4	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation / BMSJLP SHELAA	No recent or relevant planning applications.	Appendix A
SS0068	Land north of Upper Rose Lane	2.9	BMSJLP SHELAA	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B
SS0412	Land south of Upper Rose Lane	4.17	BMSJLP SHELAA	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Area (Ha)</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Relevant Planning History</b>	<b>Detailed Proforma / Review Form</b>
SS0693	Land east of Crossing Road	1.32	BMSJLP SHELAA	No recent or relevant planning applications	Appendix B

## 4. Conclusions

### Site Assessment Summary

- 4.1 Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan intends to allocate sites for housing that accord with the adopted respective Local Plan strategic policies and take into account the emerging local plan policies, relevant evidence base documents and the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.2 This report follows on from three previous Site Options and Assessment (SOA) reports undertaken in January 2019, December 2020 and April 2022 by AECOM on behalf of the Qualifying Body which assessed a total of 77 sites within the Neighbourhood Area. This consolidated report provides a comprehensive review of all sites previously considered in light of updates to the adopted and emerging national and local policy, as well as other new or updated information made available.
- 4.3 **Table 3** provides the assessment results of all sites excluding sites that already have planning permissions or built out. The final column within the table is a ‘traffic light’ rating for each site, indicating whether the site is appropriate for allocation. Red indicates the site is not appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan and Green indicates the site is appropriate for allocation. Amber indicates the site is less suitable or may be appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan if certain issues can be resolved or constraints mitigated. The summary table should be read alongside the completed proformas and review forms presented in **Appendix A** and **Appendix B**.
- 4.4 Of the 71 sites assessed, this site assessment found that 4 sites are suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. These sites are:

#### Diss

- DIS1 / GNLP0185 Land North of Vince’s Road
- Site 1 Current Leisure Centre, Diss
- DIS3 Land off Denmark Lane (Roydon parish)

#### Scole

- GNLP0511 Land to the east of Norwich Road, South of Ransom Avenue

- 4.5 A further 34 sites are considered potentially suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to identified constraints being addressed. These sites are:

#### Burston and Shimpling

- GNLP0005 Land south east of Diss Road
- GNLP0349 Land west of Gissing Road
- GNLP0386 Land at Rectory Road
- GNLP1028 Land east of Mill Road, Crown Farm Barn

#### Diss

- DIS2 Land off Park Road
- DIS7 Feather Mills site, Park Road
- DIS9 Land at Sandy Lane (north of Diss Business Park)
- GNLP0112 Frenze Hall Lane (Land to the south side of Frenze Road)
- GNLP0250 Heywood Road, Diss
- GNLP0342 Land east of Shelfanger Road
- GNLP0599 Walcot Road and Walcot Green
- GNLP1044 Walcot Green
- GNLP1045 Land west of Nelson Road and East of Station Road
- GNLP2067 Victoria Road
- GNLP4049 Land south of Burston Road

### Roydon

- Site 5 Land at Manor Farm House
- Site 6 South of the A1066
- Site 7 Land opposite the school with access onto the Old High Road
- Site 8 Brewers Green Lane
- Site 14 Diss Rugby Club
- GNLP0526 / SN0526REV South of High Road, Roydon
- GNLP0104 Sandstone Way
- GNLP0119 Shelfanger Road
- GNLP0291 Land north of Shelfanger Road
- GNLP0362 Sturgeons Farm, off Farm Close, Louie's Lane, Shelfanger Road
- GNLP4010 Tottington Lane

### Scole

- 251 The Laurels, Diss Road
- SN4022 / DDNP11 Land east of Norwich Road
- SN4023 / GNLP0338 / GNLP0338R South of Bungay Road / Land at Rose Farm off Bungay Road
- GNLP0339 Land at Street Farm, west of Low Road
- GNLP0527 Land to the south of Bungay Road
- GNLP2066 1 Bridge Road


### Brome and Oakley

- SS0542 & SS1012 / Site 10 / DDNP15 Lower Oakley, Plot B (western part)

### Palgrave

- PAL01 Land to the east of Priory Road
- 4.6 The remaining sites were found to be unsuitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present.
- 4.7 A plan showing all sites assessed and their traffic light rating is shown in **Figure 2 and Appendix C.**

**Figure 2 Site Assessment Conclusions (2022 Consolidated Report)**



### Table 3 Summary of Site Assessment

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
GNLPS0005 (GNLPSL00005)	Land south east of Diss Road	0.1	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This narrow residential garden site is located outside of the settlement boundary of Burston but adjacent to the existing built up area. Development of the site may lead to a slight elongation of the Burston settlement form but its impacts on the settlement pattern and character would be limited.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>Policy 16 of the adopted JCS states that Burston could only accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings within development boundaries subject to form and character considerations. If the settlement boundary of Burston was extended to include this site through the Neighbourhood Plan following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to the provision of safe pedestrian access, visual sensitivity and the protection of existing trees. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.5.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 2 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	
GNLP0349	Land west of Gissing Road	1.54	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent and well-related to the settlement boundary of Burston.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Burston was extended to include this site through the Neighbourhood Plan following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site would be potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to settlement character, access, footpath provision, the potential impact on listed buildings and the Conservation Area, as well as adequate provision of sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>Full development of the site may potentially change the rural settlement character and size of Burston. Therefore, partial allocation well related to the existing settlement form, character and service levels is recommended unless larger scale development proposals could bring local facilities up to the level of those in a Service Village. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.5.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 15-20 dwellings although partial allocation is recommended</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	
GNLP0386	Land at Rectory Road	2.44	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a large greenfield partially outside of and partially (on the northern edge) adjacent to the settlement boundary of Burston. Policy 16 of the adopted JCS states that significant expansion of 'Other Villages', including Burston, is generally sustainable due to limited local service levels. Development of the whole site would extend considerably into the open countryside and would change the character of the settlement. Therefore, partial allocation of the north western end of the site for a reduced capacity is recommended.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Burston was extended to include this site through the Neighbourhood Plan following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to settlement character, visual sensitivity, flood risk, access, suitable footpath provision, potential impact on listed buildings and the Conservation Area as well as adequate provision of sewerage infrastructure. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>Partial allocation is recommended</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.5.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	
GNLP0560	Land at Diss Road (north of Willow End)	1.51	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is in a remote location outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary and built-up area of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside and have significant impacts on the character and form of the settlement. The site is unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, the site is also constrained in terms of access, landscape sensitivities, biodiversity, potential loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, potential impacts on the Conservation Area and sewerage infrastructure. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>
GNLP0561	Land at Diss Road (West of Willow End)	0.88	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is in a remote location outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside and have significant impacts on the character and form of the settlement. The site is unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in principle, but it may be acceptable as a Rural Exception Site, subject to discussion with the South Norfolk Council. In addition, the site is also constrained in terms of access, landscape sensitivities, biodiversity, potential loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, potential impacts on the Conservation Area and sewerage infrastructure. The site was confirmed</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.	
GNLP0562	Land at Diss Road (East of Hill Farmhouse and Hill Farm Barn)	0.75	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is in a remote location outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside and have significant impacts on the character and form of the settlement. The site is unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in principle. It is recognised that the site is promoted for one dwelling. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF seeks to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the exceptions apply. No evidence has been received in relation the exception criteria. In addition, the site is also constrained in terms of access, landscape sensitivities, biodiversity, potential impacts on listed buildings and the Conservation Area, potential loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and sewerage infrastructure. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>
GNLP1028	Land east of Mill Road, Crown Farm Barn	0.3	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is outside of the settlement boundary but is adjacent to and well related to the built-up area of Burston.</p> <p>The site contains remains of a moat of potential historic and archaeological value which would need to be further investigated. Development of the site would need to protect and enhance the character and setting of the heritage asset and the Conservation Area.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 5 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Burston was extended to include this site through the Neighbourhood Plan following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to access, potential impacts on the archaeological site, potential impacts on listed buildings and the Conservation Area, noise, biodiversity and sewerage infrastructure. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, the development capacity of the site would be limited in line with draft GNLP 7.5.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	
DISS0001	Mavery House (Fitzwalter Road, IP22 4EX)	0.67	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is currently used as an infant / nursery school at capacity. No evidence is made available at present which indicates that the site is available for residential development. The site is unsuitable for residential development in principle, unless it can be demonstrated that adequate similar facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or that there is no reasonable prospect of continued use of the existing infant / nursery school in accordance</p>	<b>Not currently suitable and unavailable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>with Policy DM3.16 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Plan.</p> <p>If the current infant / nursery school is to be relocated within a reasonable distance, the site may be potentially suitable for residential development. The site is largely a brownfield site at a sustainable location within the settlement boundary of Diss subject to limited constraints.</p>	
DISS0002	'The Entry'	1.75	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is currently used as a primary school confirmed to be available for development. The site is unsuitable for residential development in principle, unless it can be demonstrated that adequate similar facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or that there is no reasonable prospect of continued use of the existing primary school in accordance with Policy DM3.16 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Plan.</p> <p>If the existing primary school is to be relocated within a reasonable distance, the site may be potentially suitable for residential development subject to mitigation of constraints in relation to visual sensitivity (potentially through the use of natural screening), surface water flooding and potential impacts on designated heritage assets and their setting. The site is a partially previously developed land located at a sustainable location within the settlement boundary of Diss.</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>
DISS0003	The Old School, Causeway Close	0.18	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a derelict education facility available for development. The site is unsuitable for residential development in principle, unless it can be demonstrated that adequate similar facilities exist within a reasonable distance</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>to meet local needs or that there is no reasonable prospect of continued use of the facility in accordance with Policy DM3.16 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Plan. If it is demonstrated that the site is no longer required for educational use, the site may be potentially suitable for residential development subject to mitigation of constraints in relation to vehicular access and potential impacts on designated heritage assets and their setting. The site is a previously developed land located at a sustainable location within the settlement boundary of Diss.</p>	
DIS1 / GNLP0185	Land North of Vince's Road	1.18	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This is a greenfield site located to the north east of the town, adjacent to the railway line. The south eastern part of the site has dense tree cover and would not be appropriate to develop, this would therefore reduce the potential development area on the site. The proximity to the railway line may also be a constraint; however, due to tree coverage along the railway and the development to the north which has been built up to the edge of the railway, this is unlikely to reduce the developable area further. This site meets both emerging and adopted Local Plan policy. Vehicular access could be provided via Prince William Way subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. Off-site mains reinforcement and sewerage infrastructure upgrades would be required to serve growth in this location.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural</p>	<p><b>Suitable</b></p> <p>Estimated capacity for the site is 14 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>The previous Local Plan allocation for housing is appropriate to carry forward for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan; however, the development potential is likely to be reduced to around 14 dwellings to allow for retention of the trees.</p>	
DIS2	Land off Park Road	4.6	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This is a greenfield site located to the south of the town, it straddles the settlement boundary and the majority of the site is outside of it. This site is in the same ownership as DIS7 and they are proposed to be developed as one scheme. Access to the site would need to be provided through DIS7, as there is no direct access to the site. Therefore, this site would not be suitable if these sites did not come forward together.</p> <p>The site has medium to high flood risk, there are areas of Flood Zone 3 on the southern boundary and areas of Flood Zone 2 in the centre of the site. Therefore, these areas should be excluded from any housing development. There is also risk of surface water flooding which would need to be considered in the design of a scheme. In addition, it is likely to have high landscape value given its periphery location and relationship to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The site is crossed by electricity transmission lines at present which may have implications to the site's developable area, viability and design. Development of the site would need to be consulted with the National Grid and the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	<p><b>DIS 2 &amp; DIS 7:                  Potentially suitable for 20-30 dwellings</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>Therefore, the northern part of the site, located within the settlement boundary, is suitable for allocation together with DIS7 subject to confirmation of availability. Subject to redrawing the settlement boundary to include the southern part of the site, this would make the area potentially suitable. However, due to considerable areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 further design work is required to understand whether housing would be possible in the small area of Flood Zone 1. However, the Qualifying Body may wish to carry forward the southern part of this site as a designated Green Space, as it was designated as this in the previous Local Plan.</p>	
DIS7	Feather Mills site, Park Road	4.22	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This is a partially previously developed site located to the south of the town. It is in the same ownership as site DIS2 and they are planned to be developed as one scheme. The site has a medium risk of surface water flooding and is adjacent to the Conservation Area, both of which would need to be a consideration in the design of a development scheme.</p> <p>This site meets both emerging and adopted Local Plan policy. The previous Local Plan allocation includes this as a mixed use allocation for employment, leisure and some housing. This site is appropriate for this allocation to be carried forward in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to confirmation of availability.</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
Site 1	Current Leisure Centre (Diss Leisure Centre)	0.31	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>South Norfolk Council is currently looking at 3 alternative sites for a new Leisure Centre, with a provisional starting date of 2023 for development. The current Leisure Centre site, which includes a surface level car park is therefore available for development. If the site was to be redeveloped for housing then it is expected that the Leisure Centre would need to be re-provided on another site accessible to residents. Policy DM 3.16 and draft GNLP policy 6 resists the loss of local services unless it can be demonstrated that adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs. Current evidence suggests that the sports hall will be re-provided.</p> <p>The site is located within the settlement boundary and built-up area of Diss and is adjacent to other commercial and residential uses. It is in a residential area and is favourably located in relation to services and facilities, within walking distance to public transport and Diss town centre, as well as being in close proximity to the National Cycle Network Route 30. The site is adjacent to the walk-cycle network priorities route which is part of the Diss Improvement Strategy April 2020 produced by Norfolk County Council. A key improvement which would benefit future residents should the site be redeveloped is the continuation of the existing shared-use cycleway from Diss Leisure Centre to connect with the pedestrian crossing opposite Diss Methodist Church. There are two existing access points from the A1066 which could serve as vehicular and pedestrian access to a residential development.</p> <p>There are no environmental or heritage designations within or adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated through appropriate water management strategy such as the use of SuDS.</p>	<b>Suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>Overall, due to its favourable location and low level of constraints, the site is suitable for redevelopment for housing and is therefore appropriate as a candidate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to flood risk issues being mitigated and the current Diss Leisure Centre being re-provided in another appropriate location.</p>	
Site 2	Travis Perkins Site, Shelfanger Road	0.3	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>While this brownfield site (current use is Travis Perkins) was originally submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan consultation, the owners have now confirmed their decision that the site is currently no longer available for development. However, any site that is not currently known to be available but may be a future prospect can still be included in the NP (possibly as an 'aspiration') and a development brief or set of development principles including design can be included to guide development in the future, should the site become available.</p> <p>The site is within the settlement boundary and built-up area of Diss. The site is flat and is largely a yard with storage and office facilities. The site is favourably located to services and facilities and is within walking distance to public transport and the town centre. The wider context of the site is residential.</p> <p>There is access to the site from Shelfanger Road (B1077). The site contains no identifiable landscape features and is contained from views. There is one tree protection order (TPO; reference: SN034, category number:1, species: oak) on site which does not necessarily preclude development but would need to be considered at detailed design stage. Travis Perkins is a commercial site and GNLP draft policy 6 states that development should avoid loss of commercial premises.</p>	<p><b>Suitable for development but unavailable.</b></p> <p><b>It is therefore unsuitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>Due to its favourable location and low level of constraints, this site is suitable for redevelopment as housing, subject to mitigation of minor constraints and subject to the commercial premises being re-provided elsewhere. However, as the site is not currently available, it is not currently appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
GNLP0102	<p>Land at Frontier Agriculture on Sandy Lane</p>	3.61	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a proposed allocation included in the Examination version of the GNLP. Therefore it is not necessary to allocate the site in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>If the site is excluded from the draft policy prior to adoption, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to assessment and mitigation of potential contamination, potential impacts on surrounding heritage assets, potential adverse impacts from the surrounding railway and neighbouring employment uses, surface water flood risk and access . Residential development on the site would be in line with the draft GNLP Policy 7.2 as the site is located within the settlement boundary and well-related to services. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Allocated in the draft Local Plan</b></p>
GNLP0112	<p>Frenze Hall Lane (Land to the south side of Frenze Road)</p>	0.23	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints in relation to sewerage, noise impacts, biodiversity and achieving appropriate access. The site was</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for 4-8 dwellings.</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.	
GNLP0250	Heywood Road, Diss	3.00	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include the site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to biodiversity, landscape sensitivity, achieving appropriate access, impacts on the wider road network and the sewerage and water supply network. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and is currently subject to a pending planning application for 179 dwellings (along with GNLP0342 and GNLP0291. If permission is granted the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is subject to a pending planning application for 179 dwellings along with GNLP0342 and GNLP0291</p>
GNLP0341	Land between Shelfanger Road and Mount Street	3.21	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is currently identified as an Important Local Open Space in the South Norfolk Local Plan and the proposed residential use is likely to adversely affect the openness of the area, contrary to the adopted Local Plan Policy DM4.4. In addition, the site is identified for Norfolk County Council as a Historic Environment Site (NHER33463) with its development likely to negatively impact the historic character and context of the Conservation Area. The site is therefore assessed as unsuitable for housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other significant constraints identified include access, surface water flooding, sewerage capacity and biodiversity.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
GNLP0342	Land east of Shelfanger Road	4.76	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include the site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to biodiversity, landscape sensitivity, impacts on heritage assets, surface water flooding, achieving appropriate access and the sewerage and water supply network. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and is currently subject to a pending planning application for 179 dwellings a(along with GNLP0342 and GNLP0291. If permission is granted the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is subject to a pending planning application for 179 dwellings along with GNLP0250 and GNLP0291</p>
GNLP0599	Walcot Road and Walcot Green	3.29	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss at the southern end although remote from existing services. It contributes to the settlement gap between Walcott Green and Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to the potential impacts on the historic, settlement and landscape character / assets, sewerage, local road network capacity, access, ecology and surface water flooding. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since. The site is currently considered for an outline planning application for up to 80 residential dwellings including access. If permission is granted the site</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is subject to a pending outline planning application for 80 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation.	
GNLP1003	Frenze Hall Lane	2.02	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site consists of garden land wrapped around an existing dwelling located outside and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside and have significant impacts on the character and form of the settlement. Development of the site will directly contribute to the coalescence between the hamlet of Walcott Green and Diss, however a strategic gap has not been identified in the adopted or emerging Local Plan. The site is unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in principle.</p> <p>Recent evidence suggests that constraints relating to the existing highways and pedestrian network may be potentially improved through potential upgrades proposed as part of the development proposals of GNLP1044, however it is not known whether the relevant highways improvement may accommodate traffic from the site's development to provide for appropriate access. Other constraints identified includes surface water flooding, sewerage, biodiversity and impacts on designated heritage assets and their setting.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
GNLP1044	Walcot Green	11.0	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss on the western side and the rest is outside of the settlement boundary. Development of the site will contribute to coalescence between the hamlet of Walcott Green and Diss, however a strategic gap has not been identified in the adopted or emerging</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for 120 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>Local Plan. Development of the site is likely to impact the form and rural character of Walcott Green which would need to be mitigated.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft Policy 7.2 of the GNLP, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to highways, noise, wastewater, heritage, ecology, flood risk, landscape and the form and character of the settlement. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	and 10 self-build plots.
GNLP1045	Land west of Nelson Road and East of Station Road	0.94	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a previously developed land formerly of industrial and railway uses. The site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan for employment use but South Norfolk Council has agreed for it to be considered for residential use. The site is located within the settlement boundary of Diss. The site is potentially suitable for residential development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.2, subject to appropriate demonstration that the possibility of re-using or redeveloping the site for a range of alternative business purposes has been fully explored and that the site is no longer economically viable or practical to retain for employment use in line with adopted Policy DM2.2, as well as mitigation of constraints relating to the biodiversity, potential impacts of the employment and railway context on residential amenity, potential contamination, risks of surface water flooding, sewerage and surface water upgrades and provision of appropriate highways access.</p>	<b>Potentially suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
GNLP2067	Victoria Road	0.42	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Diss. It is however wholly within Flood Zone 2 and therefore a sequential approach should be adopted to identify if alternative sites with lower risk of flooding may be available in line with Paragraph 161 of the NPPF. The site selection process implies that there are reasonable alternative employment sites available in Diss. If detailed sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test is applied and indicates otherwise, the site is potentially suitable for employment development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to flooding, potential impacts on surrounding uses and environmental considerations identified. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	Potentially suitable
GNLP4049	Land south of Burston Road	20.49	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site would be potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to access and highways, heritage, surface water flood risk, townscape, landscape, utilities capacity and the form and character of settlements. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	Potentially suitable
735	Land north of Old High Road	1.49	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This is a greenfield site located to the west of the town, between Diss and Roydon, and is outside the settlement boundary. Development of the site will</p>	Not currently suitable

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			lead to coalescence of Diss and Roydon and have significant impacts on their settlement character. The site is otherwise relatively unconstrained, but does not meet adopted or emerging Local Plan policy; therefore the site is not appropriate for housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.	
DIS3	Land off Denmark Lane (Roydon parish)	1.6	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This is a greenfield site located to the west of the town. The site has a medium risk of surface water flooding which would need to be a consideration in the design of a development scheme. This site meets both emerging and adopted Local Plan policy.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>This previous Local Plan allocation for 42 dwellings is appropriate to carry forward for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p><b>Suitable</b></p> <p>The site is previously allocated for 42 dwellings</p>
Site 3	Land opposite White House Farm, Snow Street	0.4	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This greenfield site is available for development. The site is not within or adjacent to settlement boundary and not well related to the settlement. There is currently no access onto the site, However, access could be created onto Snow Street. Similarly, the site lacks a pedestrian footpath linking the site with the community facilities. The site is located reasonably close to services and</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>facilities and the village centre of Roydon. White House Farmhouse opposite the site is Grade II listed and therefore mitigation would be required to reduce the impact of the development of the site on the designated heritage asset. The site is located in open countryside and there are intermittent views through gaps in the hedgerows across fields towards the built-up area of Roydon. The cumulative effect of the proposed size of development, especially if allocated together with another site in or adjacent to Roydon, would be negative on the character and scale of the settlement and cluster. Overall, due to its location disconnected and remote from the settlement, limited sustainable access to local services and potential inappropriate cumulative effect on the scale and character of the settlement, the site is inappropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
Site 4	The Old Sewerage Works	1.81	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This brownfield site is available for development. The site is removed from the built-up area of Roydon and located in open countryside. The site was a former Sewage Station, with infrastructure visible on site. The site potentially has contamination issues which could impact the viability of the site. The site is not located in close proximity to services and facilities nor the town centre and therefore is not easily accessible. The site is at risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation may be required. Access to the site is through a County Wildlife Site, with the main site removed from Brewers Green Lane. Although the site is contained and screened on its eastern and southern boundary, the site is open to views of large agricultural fields to the north and west. The cumulative effect of the proposed size of development, especially if allocated together with another site in or adjacent to Roydon, would be negative on the character and scale of the settlement and cluster.</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>Overall, due to its location disconnected and remote from the settlement, lack of sustainable access to local services and potential inappropriate cumulative effect on the scale and character of the settlement, the site is inappropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Site 5 – Option A & B	Land at Manor Farm House	0.12 / 0.33	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This site is a mixed green and brownfield site available for development.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. The site is also adjacent to an area of common land. There are two access points to the farm, one at the end of the residential Crick's Walk and one along a track through the area of common land off Manor Road. The site is in close proximity to Roydon Garage and a shop, the village hall, a public house with restaurant and a bus stop.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore mitigation must take place if the site was developed, to prevent surface water flooding. Although the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat Network, which is a potential constraint in terms of potential for harmful effects from development, the designation can also be a potential benefit as the development could contribute to the habitat corridor through incorporating open space, planted screening etc. The site is Manor Farm, which includes the Grade II thatched Manor Farmhouse. This is another key constraint to development.</p> <p>Mature trees are also located on site and therefore development may need to avoid the trees.</p> <p>It is important to be aware that the site is located within the River Valleys Extents, where proposed development must have regard to adopted Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys and GNLP draft policy 2</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for 10 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>(Sustainable Communities) which stipulates that development is required to "respect, protect and enhance landscape character ... and maintain strategic gaps and landscape settings, including river valleys".</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Roydon was extended to include this site following discussion with South Norfolk Council, taking into account emerging draft policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to flood risk, heritage, biodiversity, trees and landscape. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>	
Site 6	South of the A1066	1.15	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This greenfield site is currently a field but is adjacent to housing and is available for development.</p> <p>The site does not have access onto High Road but has a road frontage and potential to create access. As the site is located on a long bend on the A1066 that includes a junction with Old High Road (to Roydon Primary School), the potential to create access onto High Road would be subject to consultation with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to Roydon Primary School, Roydon Garage and a shop, the village hall, a public house with restaurant.</p> <p>Although the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat Network, which is a potential constraint in terms of the potential for harmful effects from development, this designation can also be a potential benefit as the development could contribute to the habitat corridor through incorporating open space, planted screening etc. As Roydon is on higher ground, there are views</p>	<b>Potentially suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>from the site of the built-up area of Diss and Wind Turbines further to the southeast. This is an issue as there is a hard boundary (no landscaping) between the built-up area of Roydon and the site. The wider site slopes from north- west to south-east towards the river valley, with site 6 having a gentler slope than the lower ground of the southern part of the wider site and field. Apart from the sloping river valley nature of the land, there are no identifiable landscape features of value in the site. The site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys and draft policy 2.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>Development of the site has potential to be in keeping with the urban form of Roydon, however development of the site would further reduce the gap between Roydon and Diss, leading to a threat of coalescence. To mitigate this risk, development will need to respect the landscape setting, form and character of the settlement and should not close the settlement gap. The issue of coalescence should be discussed with the LPA to understand whether the site would be seen as acceptable, possibly in conjunction with Site 7.</p> <p>This site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon.</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
Site 7	Land opposite the school with access onto the Old High Road	1.2	<p>If the settlement boundary of Roydon was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account emerging draft policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to habitat, views, landscape and the threat of coalescence. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p> <p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield site available for development.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to Roydon Primary School, Roydon Garage and a shop, the village hall, a public house with restaurant and a bus stop.</p> <p>The north-eastern part of the site is closer to Diss' services. The site is opposite Roydon Primary School but removed from the linear form of Roydon, whereby the development of Site 6 may be considered sequentially preferable. There is currently no access to the site. However, the site has road frontage on two sides and potential to create access onto the Old High Road, which has a footpath that connects the urban edge of Diss to Roydon Primary School.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore mitigation is required if developed.</p> <p>Site 7 forms part of a wider field and does not have a defensible boundary to the east. There are views of the hard urban edge of Diss from the site and therefore the site has high sensitivity to visual amenity. The site is on lower ground than the primary school as the landform gently slopes from the Old High Road to Denmark Lane and the A1066. There are views across the site from the Old High Road across River Waveney Valley and to the southeast of large wind</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for 25 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>turbines over the built area of Diss. Furthermore, the site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys. The site has no identifiable landscape features other than the sloping valley land form located within open countryside between the two built-up areas of Diss and Roydon. The site can be seen through breaks in the hedgerow on approach to both settlements due largely to the sloping nature of the land form.</p> <p>Development of the site would further reduce the gap between Roydon and Diss therefore lead to a threat of coalescence. A recently completed housing scheme can be seen at the end of the wider field which site 7 forms part of. Development will need to respect the landscape setting, form and character of the settlement and should not close the settlement gap. The issue of coalescence should be discussed with the LPA to understand whether the site would be seen as acceptable, particularly in conjunction with Site 6.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. If the settlement boundary was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account emerging draft policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to habitat, landscape, character, views and the LPAs view on coalescence of</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>Roydon and Diss. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>	
Site 8	Brewers Green Lane	1.5	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is currently being used as agricultural land and an agricultural paddock.</p> <p>The site is available for development. The site is in walking/cycling distance to Diss town centre and is in close proximity to Diss Football Club and Roydon Primary School. The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Diss.</p> <p>It is important to note that in 2006 a proposal for a church with car parking and access was refused. One point of refusal was that the road serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed and therefore the same issue might arise if the site was to be developed for housing as Brewers Green is a single lane road.</p> <p>Furthermore, a public right of way runs along the eastern boundary of the site which would need to be accommodated for if the site was to be developed.</p> <p>The site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys. The site contains no identifiable landscape features and is largely contained, with neighbouring properties having views into the field. The site is largely flat with a gentle slope from northwest to south east, so development would be slightly higher than adjacent homes to the south.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for 25 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>Development of the site would further reduce the gap between Roydon and Diss which would lead to a threat of coalescence. To mitigate this risk, development will need to respect the landscape setting, form and character of the settlement and should not close the settlement gap. The issue of coalescence should be discussed with the LPA to understand whether the site would be seen as acceptable.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. If the settlement boundary was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account emerging draft policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to access, form and character of the settlement, landscape and local environment. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>	
Site 14	Diss Rugby Club	2.49	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>Diss Rugby Club and Club Pavilion is available for development. It is a mix of greenfield and previously developed land. The two major constraints with the site are access and the potential loss of a community facility. The site is currently being used as a Rugby Club with associated pitches and therefore development on this site would result in some loss of this community facility.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
GNLP0526 / SN0526REV	South of High Road, Roydon	3.66	<p>However, information received from the Qualifying Body indicates that sufficient facilities would be left at the club so no relocation would be necessary. Furthermore, it is clear from the site visit that Bellrope Lane forms a clear boundary to the existing urban area of Roydon (clear that the village has ended and it is the start of the countryside).</p> <p>Access onto the site is problematic as only a single carriageway which is already serving approx. 12 properties. However, as the whole site would not be developed it could be suitable for development, if appropriate access can be achieved. The site is in close proximity to Roydon Primary School, Roydon Garage and a shop, the village hall, a public house with restaurant and a bus stop.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. If the settlement boundary of Roydon was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to establishing appropriate access, habitats, the Rugby Club continuing to function as a community facility, and ensuring the development is in keeping with the form, size and character of the settlement. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is currently</p>
<b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b>			<p>The site is an agricultural land adjacent to the settlement boundary of Roydon. It is relatively well related to the settlement pattern of Roydon although full development of the site as GNLP0526 is likely to have significant impacts on its</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>liner pattern and semi-rural character. The site is in close proximity to a range of services.</p> <p>The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone. Residential development of 50 or more dwellings (GNLP0526) outside existing settlements would need to be consulted with Natural England.</p> <p>Evidence submitted by the site promoter in 2021 indicates that vehicular access to the site can be potentially achieved from High Road (A1066) to provide a type 3 access road with the required visibility splays without the need for third party land to support a reduced form of development as SN0526REV. The preferred access is likely to be suitable to support the proposed development subject to further highways assessment and consultation with Norfolk County Council. The site is adjacent to the Norfolk Trail which would need to be protected and enhanced as appropriate.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to Roydon Fen Local Nature Reserve and is within the Network Enhancement Zone 2. Further habitats assessment may be required to ensure that development of the site will not harm the ecological network in the area and wherever possible promote habitats recreation.</p> <p>The site has some intervisibility with existing properties and the converted water tower to the north as well as partial views to the east and southwest with Roydon Fen and the built-up area. This could be potentially mitigated through the use of boundary planting and careful siting the proposed development. Development of the site may have some mitigatable impact on the significance and setting of the Tower House if it were to be recognised as a non-designated heritage asset within the DDNP.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality</p>	<p>promoted for 25 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
GNLPO104	Sandstone Way	0.48	<p>Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Roydon was extended to include this site, taking into account emerging draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan as its reduced form, subject to mitigation of constraints related to establishing appropriate access, habitats, ecological network, views, landscape, heritage, ground stability, sewerage and water supply network, as well as the form and character of the settlement. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for 6-10 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>as an allocation, development may be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5 of the GNLP once adopted. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	
GNLP0119	Shelfanger Road	0.68	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a residential garden adjacent but not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site without GNLP0291 immediately to the south would not be supported by a safe and appropriate pedestrian access. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2 and the settlement character of Diss following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site may be potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints relating to achieving appropriate access (including pedestrian access potentially through a comprehensive development along with GNLP0291), traffic pressures, wildlife, landscape, heritage and the sewerage and water supply network. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 75 once adopted. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for 15-20 dwellings</p>
GNLP0291	Land north of Shelfanger Road	0.93	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include the site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to access and local highways</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is subject to a pending planning</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>network, biodiversity, landscape sensitivity, impacts on heritage assets, landscape, ecology and the sewerage and water supply network. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5 once adopted.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and is currently subject to a pending planning application for 179 dwellings (along with GNLP0342 and GNLP0250). If permission is granted the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation.</p>	<p>application for 179 dwellings along with GNLP0250 and GNLP0291</p>
GNLP0362	<p>Sturgeons Farm, off Farm Close, Louie's Lane, Shelfanger Road</p>	13.81	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a large greenfield adjacent and connected to the settlement boundary of Diss at the northwestern edge. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to settlement and landscape character, visual sensitivity, ecology, biodiversity, access and local road network capacity, surface water flooding and sewerage and water supply network. As full development of the site is likely to negatively impact the settlement character encroaching into the open countryside, partial allocation adjacent to the existing dwellings in the south/east of the site, complemented with the provision of soft settlement edge, is recommended. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for 413 dwellings but partial development is recommended</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
GNLP0606	Boundary Farm on Shelfanger Road	3.08	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is predominantly greenfield in agricultural use outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site will represent an illogical extension of the settlement to the north, encroaching into the open countryside. A small part of the site is previously developed with two residential dwellings formed through subdivision, and is unlikely to be capable of accommodating additional dwellings. The site is therefore unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other constraints identified includes ecology, biodiversity, visual sensitivity, landscape, local road network capacity, risk of surface water flooding and sewerage and water supply upgrades.</p> <p>The majority of the site falls outside of the Neighbourhood Area, which cannot be allocated in the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. If the Qualifying Body wish to allocate this site, it will need to be discussed with the relevant plan-making bodies (including South Norfolk Council and potentially Heywood Parish Council), who may wish to allocate it in their plan.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
GNLP1038	Brewers Green	1.06	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site will lead to coalescence of Diss and Roydon, and have significant impacts on their settlement character. The site is therefore unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other constraints identified includes access, potential noise and light impacts from surrounding uses on residential amenity, the presence of overhead power lines,</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>heritage, risk of surface water flooding and the sewerage and water supply network. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	
GNLP2104	<p>West of Shelfanger Road</p>	50.51	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. It crosses the soft eastern settlement edge of Diss encroaching into the open countryside. Full development of the site will significantly change the size and character of the settlement, and lead to perceived coalescence of Diss and Roydon. The site is therefore unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present. Other constraints identified includes access, local road network capacity, risk of fluvial and surface water flooding, landscape and visual sensitivity, ecology and impacts on designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Part of the site falls outside of the Neighbourhood Area and cannot be allocated in the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. If the Qualifying Body wish to allocate this site, it will need to be discussed with the relevant plan-making bodies (including South Norfolk Council and potentially Heywood Parish Council), who may wish to allocate it in their plan.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
GNLP4010	Tottington Lane	1.07	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary but in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development at present. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site would</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is proposed for a</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			be potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to access and highways, heritage, biodiversity, townscape, landscape, utilities infrastructure and the form and character of settlements.	minimum of 10 homes
251	The Laurels, Diss Road	0.17	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a previously developed garage adjacent to the committed development at Scole Engineering under the same land ownership. It is adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Scole.</p> <p>The site is within Scole Conservation Area and may contain heritage assets of archaeological interest. Further heritage and archaeological assessments would be required.</p> <p>Development of the site may lead to the loss of employment space and would need to comply with Policy DM2.2 of the Local Plan in demonstrating that the site is no longer viable or practical to retain as employment space.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Scole was extended to include this site taking into account draft Local Plan policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints in relation to heritage, archaeology, remediation and the loss of employment space.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 4 dwellings</p>
SN4022 / DDNP11	Land east of Norwich Road	5.2	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This large flat agricultural field is available. The site is in close proximity to Scole Primary School and is located on the edge of the built-up area of Scole.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 130 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>Traffic noise is clearly audible from the A140 dual carriageway, whereby development would potentially require additional noise attenuation.</p> <p>The site is served by footpath along Norwich Road. There is currently no access to the site although access could be gained from Norwich Road.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk to surface water flooding and therefore mitigation is required if the site is developed. In addition, a Public Right of Way runs through the site and therefore needs to be considered at detailed design stage.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the remarkable timber-frame Grade II listed High House on Norwich Road. Development of the whole site would significantly extend the village to the north along Norwich Road, however the site is screened from view from Norwich Road. The site contains no identifiable landscape features within the field. The site is adjacent to an unbuilt Local Plan residential allocation.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Scole. If the settlement boundary was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to establishing appropriate access, noise attenuation, heritage assets, surface water flooding and a Public Right of Way which runs through the site. If the full site was allocated, this would impact on the character of the settlement. Therefore, partial allocation is recommended. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p> <p>An alternative boundary has been put forward as part of the DDNP's Regulation 14 consultation which proposes partial development of the site concentrated on the southern part of the development. This is in line with the recommendations of this assessment for partial allocation to limit impact on the character of the</p>	<p>but partial development is recommended</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>settlement. Considering the site's location at the fringe of settlement, the provision of appropriate landscape buffers to the northern and eastern boundary might be required to provide a soft edge to the development.</p>	
<p>SN4023 / GNLP0338/ GNLP0338R</p>	<p>South of Bungay Road / Land at Rose Farm off Bungay Road</p>	<p>8.22</p>	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site contains a farmhouse and barns adjacent to the built-up area of Scole with two fields that extend from the village to Bungay Road. The site is available.</p> <p>The site currently has no access although the site has the potential to be accessed from the A143 or Bungay Road.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys.</p> <p>Development of the whole site would significantly extend the village to the southeast towards Bungay Road. There is potential to develop the previously development land (PDL) part of the site and smaller paddock to the rear to continue and round off the built- up form of the village. Development of the whole site would significantly extend the village to the A143 and would require noise attenuation along Bungay Road due to proximity to the highway.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Scole. If the settlement boundary was extended to include this site, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to establishing appropriate access, landscape, environment, scale, form and character of the settlement. As full allocation of the site would significantly alter the character of the settlement, partial allocation in keeping with the settlement form is recommended. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation,</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for a range of sizes up to 206 dwellings but partial allocation as GNLP0338 is recommended</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.	
GNLP0339	Land at Street Farm, west of Low Road	0.34	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is partly adjacent to the settlement boundary of Scole and relates well with the existing settlement form. If the settlement boundary of Scole was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to achieving appropriate access, heritage and archaeology, landscape and potential noise impacts from the A140. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 10 to 15 dwellings</p>
GNLP0511	Land to the east of Norwich Road, South of Ransom Avenue	1.02	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>This is a large greenfield site within the settlement boundary of Scole. It is currently allocated in the adopted local plan for housing but the allocation has not been carried forward in the draft GNLP. It is well related to services and character of the village and is relatively free from constraints other than utilities capacity and potential impacts on the local road networks. The site is therefore suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 35 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
GNLP0527	Land to the south of Bungay Road	1.75	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a paddock partially within and adjacent to the settlement boundary of Scole. If the settlement boundary of Scole was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to achieving appropriate access and proximity to sewerage works. The site boundary as proposed does not fronts the street network and may negatively impact the townscape character which would need to be mitigated. The site is adjacent to the Scole Conservation Area. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 53 dwellings</p>
GNLP2066	1 Bridge Road	0.5	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Scole. The site relies on a narrow access of Bridge Road which may not be suitable to support the proposed capacity. It is likely that development of the site would only be possible in combination with GNLP0527 or if the boundary is revised to provide suitable access.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Scole was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is potentially suitable for development allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to access, impacts on the significance and character of designated heritage assets and the Conservation Area, risk of surface water flooding, archaeology, ecology and biodiversity. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	
<p>SS1011 / Site 9 / DDNP14</p>	<p>Lower Oakley, Plot A / Land north of B1118</p>	<p>1.00</p>	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a flat agricultural field available adjacent to the built-up area of Oakley. It is not in close proximity to services and facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole.</p> <p>The site entirely comprises of priority habitats (Coastal and Flood Plain Grazing Marsh) where its loss is unavoidable if developed. Development of the site would be in contrary to Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that Local Planning Authorities should refuse planning permission if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for. This Site Assessment shows that alternative sites with less harmful impacts are potentially suitable and available within the Diss and District Neighbourhood Planning Area. Allocation of the site for residential use in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan may also be contrary to Paragraph 179 of the NPPF which states that plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats.</p> <p>The site is located on the valley floor in a Special Landscape Area. Policy CL2 of the saved Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that particular care will be taken to safeguard landscape quality within special landscape areas, and where development does occur it should be sensitively designed, with high standards of layout, materials and landscaping. The site is considered to be of medium landscape sensitivity and highly visual sensitivity due to its prominence on</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>approach to Oakley. Development of the site would reduce the sense of separation between Oakley to the west and more dispersed and isolated residential properties to the east along the B1118 including Low Farm, however it would not need to significant coalescence.</p> <p>The site is subject to medium risk of surface water flooding.</p>	
SS0542 & SS1012 / Site 10 / DDNP15	Lower Oakley, Plot B (western part) / Land south of the B1118	0.69	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>Both greenfield parcels are available for development.</p> <p>The western parcel is adjacent to the built-up area of Oakley and is within the existing settlement boundary. The eastern parcel is adjacent to the settlement boundary. The site is not in close proximity to any services nor town centre and therefore is not the most suitable site in terms of accessibility. There is currently no access onto the site although access could be gained from the B118 (Lower Oakley).</p> <p>The site is located in open countryside and split into two separate parcels either side of the Grade II listed Weaver’s Cottage.</p> <p>The sites are gently sloping and part of a larger steeply sloping valley land form. The sites form part of the rolling valley landscape, where development of the whole site would impact on landscape and character of the village and the setting of the listed building. The eastern parcel is not contained and is sited in open countryside. The village of Oakley is largely ribbon development on the valley floor on the north side of the B118.</p> <p>Both parcels could be brought into the settlement boundary through allocation, subject to agreement from the local authority.</p>	<p><b>Western parcel: Potentially suitable</b></p> <p><b>Eastern parcel: Unsuitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is in close proximity to a water recycling centre (AW142 Oakley - Dross Ln Stw). It would need to be demonstrated that development of the site would not prejudice or be prejudiced by the waste management facility in accordance with Policy WP18 of the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</p> <p>Due to its location and constraints, the western parcel is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to making appropriate access, subject to meeting relevant Plan policies, subject to sympathetic design minimising the impact on the setting of the heritage asset and village in the Waveney valley landscape, and subject to mitigation of impacts on habitats.</p> <p>Development of the eastern parcel of the site is not suitable due to its likely landscape impact (location of development on bottom of rolling valley land form); impact of development on valley views and setting of village along the valley floor; extension of ribbon development of the village to the east encroaching into the open countryside; and impact on the setting of a grade II listed building on approach to the village.</p>	
Site 11a	Brome (Land south of Tanglewood)	0.13	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This greenfield site is available for development. The site is located in open countryside.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p> <p>The site currently has no access. However, access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is not in close proximity to any services or facilities.</p> <p>The site is located at an agricultural access point to a wider arable agricultural field, at a gap where expansive views can be seen in a special landscape area towards woodland of the River Dove valley to the south-east. The site is adjacent to a number of listed buildings in a Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome and also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway. Overall, due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services and constraints relating to the visual and landscape sensitivity of this site, it is not appropriate for development and therefore should not be considered as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
Site 11b	Brome (Land north of the Old Post Office)	1.24	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The greenfield site is available for development. The site is flat arable agricultural land with agricultural access located in open countryside. The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. There is currently no access to the site but access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Although the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat Network which is a potential constraint in terms of the potential for harmful effects from development, this could also be a potential benefit as the development could contribute to the habitat corridor through incorporating open space, planted screening etc.</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is within a Special Landscape Area and is part of a wider field with expansive views towards woodland to the south.</p> <p>The site is a gap in tree cover that is characteristic of the area, with expansive views of agricultural fields and adjacent deciduous woodland due to the field having no hedgerow along the road frontage. The site has medium to high landscape sensitivity and visual amenity due to its rural setting among clusters of woodland and gently sloping river valley landscape of the River Dove.</p> <p>Development of the site would impact on the setting of Upper Oakley in an area of medium to high landscape value.</p> <p>The site is outside of and remote from the settlement boundary and also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway.</p> <p>To conclude, due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services, as well as the high visual and landscape sensitivity of this site, it is not appropriate for development and therefore should not be considered as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
Site 11c	Brome (Land north of Rose Farm)	0.25	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The greenfield site is available for development. The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. There is currently no access to the site but access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is located adjacent and in close proximity to three Grade II listed buildings and is located at the beginning of Church Lane, which leads to the Grade II* listed Church of St Nicholas.</p> <p>The site is located in a gap in open countryside. The site is open on approach and is part of a wider field with views across the field due to a lack of hedgerows on the eastern and southern boundaries.</p> <p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome. It is also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway. Due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services, as well as due to the high visual sensitivity of this site, it is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Site 12a	Brome (Land north of Tanglewood)	0.52	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The greenfield site is available for development.</p> <p>The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. There is currently no access to the site, but access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to three residential properties, one of which is Grade II listed, and is a vacant paddock.</p> <p>The site is located in a special landscape area. The site is contained and does not contain any identifiable landscape features.</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome. It is also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway.</p> <p>Due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services, as well as due to the high landscape sensitivity of this site, it is not appropriate for development and therefore is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Site 12b	Brome (Land at Upper Oakley adjacent to 12 High Street)	1.34	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The greenfield site is available for development. The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. The site is part of a wider arable agricultural field and has agricultural access. There is currently no access to the site but access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to a number of listed buildings in a special landscape area.</p> <p>The site is located in open countryside. The site does not contain any identifiable landscape features and is screened from view along the road frontage of Upper Oakley.</p> <p>Development of the site would constitute ribbon development along Upper Oakley. Policy LP01 states that proposals which would consolidate sporadic or ribbon development or the infilling of large gaps or extending edges, will be resisted.</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome. It is also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway.</p> <p>Due to its location in open countryside, disconnected from the settlement and local services and due to development of the site constituting ribbon development, the site is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Site 12c	Brome (Land north of Ivy House)	1.70	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is greenfield, arable agricultural land in close proximity to a farmhouse and barns but removed from the built-up area of Brome. The site is available for development.</p> <p>The site could not be visited as it doesn't have a road frontage and is private land accessed through the farmyard. The site does not have direct access to the road.</p> <p>The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore mitigation would be required if developed.</p> <p>Development of the whole site would be of a scale that has potential to impact on the character and setting of the settlement of Brome.</p> <p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome. It is also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway.</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>Due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services, lack of access and potential impact on the character and setting of the settlement, this site is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Site 13	Brickle Meadow	3.64	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>This meadow /paddock is available for development. The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. There is currently no access to the site, but access could be gained from Upper Oakley. The site is in close proximity to the built-up area of The Street in Brome. However, the site is removed and screened from the built-up area of the hamlet by woodland along The Avenue and The Street.</p> <p>The wider field contains the Grade II listed Estate lodge cottage, with the site being part of the wider estate of Brome Hall. There is a single tree in the centre of the site, with the site being largely contained and screened by mature trees on three sides.</p> <p>Development of the site would be a scale that could be considered large enough to physically change the size and character of the existing settlement of Brome.</p> <p>Development of the site has potential to impact on the character and setting of the heritage asset, planned layout of the wider estate and the settlement of Brome. The site owner has provided AECOM with a drawing of what the potential development could look like and the number of dwellings proposed for the site.</p> <p>As the site is adjacent to the settlement boundary, it could be brought into the settlement boundary through allocation, subject to agreement from the local authority. However, due to its location removed and screened from the built-up area and remote from services, the potential impact on the size and character of</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			the existing settlement and on the character and setting of a heritage asset, the site is assessed as not appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.	
SS0827	Land south of Rectory Road	1.28	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield in the open countryside, outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Brome. Development of the site will reinforce ribbon development along Brome Street, contrary to Policy LP01 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy CS1 and SB2 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan. Therefore the site is unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other constraints identified includes access, the presence of overhead power lines, visual and landscape sensitivity, potential impacts on designated heritage assets and ecology. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<b>Not currently suitable</b>
PAL01	Land to the east of Priory Road	0.67	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area. Although the site is well related to the existing settlement pattern, it is outside of and not connected to the adopted settlement boundary as its surrounding development have not been built at the time. The site is adjacent to the proposed settlement boundary contained in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan but this is expected to be withdrawn. The site is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities, though in close proximity to local bus stops with services to and from Diss.</p> <p>A suitable access could be facilitated through Gassock Drive subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. The private drive appears to</p>	<p><b>Potentially suitable</b></p> <p>The site is promoted for 8 dwellings</p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>be under the same land ownership and available to be used as the key access to the site, although this would need to be confirmed. This access is opposite to a Grade II listed building, the Priory, but it is unlikely that any modifications that might potentially harm the designated heritage asset would be required. Given the site's location at the edge of the historic settlement, there might be a possibility that heritage assets of potential archaeological interest might be encountered. Further heritage and archaeological assessments might be required.</p> <p>The site is excellently screened by a thick hedgerow to the rear which provides a soft settlement edge. Development of the site is not likely to negatively impact the landscape character of the area but instead presents an opportunity to integrate and improve the existing townscape.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is identified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (including Grade 1, Grade 2 and Grade 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification). Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>The site falls within the Network Enhancement Zone 1 identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Development of the site should not harm its potential biodiversity value and should where possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CP5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is available for development and promoted by an agent on behalf of the landowner for 8 dwellings. If the settlement boundary of Palgrave is extended to include the site through the Neighbourhood Plan and that the proposed development is capable of meeting local needs as defined in Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to confirmation of access (including land ownership), mitigation of constraints and further investigation related to biodiversity, agricultural land quality, as well as heritage and archaeology.</p>	
PAL02	Land to the south of Priory Road	0.51	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield adjacent, though not connected, to the existing built-up area and settlement boundary of Palgrave. Palgrave is a secondary village that is defined as generally unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs according to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities.</p> <p>The site is served by an existing access however it is at an acute blind turn from the narrow Priory Road. There is also limited potential to create an alternative access further south of Priory Road which has limited capacity to accommodate further increase in traffic. It is unlikely that a safe and suitable access could be created to support the development although this would need to be further consulted with the relevant Highways Authority.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
PAL03	Land to the south of Lion Road (adjacent to Clarke Close)	1	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield adjacent, though not connected, to the existing built-up area. It is outside of the settlement boundary of Palgrave. Palgrave is a secondary village that is defined as generally unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs according to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities.</p> <p>Development of the site would have a poor relationship with the existing settlement form, crossing the soft settlement edge formed by existing tree belts and encroaching into the open countryside. It represents an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west with no defensible boundaries in the vicinity. It would also amount to backland development.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
			<p>The submitted site boundary is along a triangular corner of a wider field located at a commanding position above a valley to the south east. Development of the site would represent an illogical extension of the settlement downslope, encroaching into the open countryside. Due to its visual prominence, development of the site will also adversely impact the rural and tranquil character and views from the public footpath along the northern boundary of the site.</p> <p>The site is available for development. However, it is not suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present due to significant constraints in relation to access and impacts on settlement, landscape and visual character of Palgrave.</p>	


Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site is exposed to a broad area of open countryside, where its undeveloped character contributes to the existing view quality. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from nearby public rights of way and the wider landscape, although it is acknowledged that existing overhead power lines forms a prominent feature at present.</p> <p>The site is served by an existing field access which might not have adequate visibility splays to support the proposed development. Further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority would be required.</p> <p>The site is available for development. However, it is not suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present due to significant constraints in relation to settlement form, landscape and visual sensitivity.</p>	
PAL04	Land to the south of Lion Road	1	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield outside of the existing built-up area and settlement boundary of Palgrave. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities. The site is removed from the existing settlement form with no defensible boundaries in the vicinity. Its development would represent an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west encroaching into the open countryside. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs.</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
PAL05	Land to the north of Lion Road	1	<p>The site also sits at the highest point of the plateau exposed to a broad area of the open countryside. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from public rights of way in the immediate vicinity and from the wider landscape.</p> <p>The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present which would have implications to the site's developable area, viability, access, safety and design, which would need to be consulted with the National Grid and the Local Planning Authority. It is noted that the landowner is exploring the option to place this underground.</p> <p>The site is put forward for residential development as part of the DDNP's consultation in 2019 but has been recently proposed for a solar farm. It is unclear as to whether the site is still available for residential development.</p> <p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield outside of the existing built-up area and settlement boundary of Palgrave. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities. The site is removed from the existing settlement form with no defensible boundaries in the vicinity. Its development would represent an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west encroaching into the open countryside. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>The site also sits at the highest point of the plateau with surrounding land dipping away to 45m altitude rapidly to the north. It is exposed to a broad area of the open countryside. Development of the site will dominate views southwards from public rights of ways and Millway Lane and adversely impact the tranquillity and rural character of the wider landscape.</p> <p>The site is put forward for residential development as part of the DDNP's consultation in 2019 but has been recently proposed for a solar farm. It is unclear as to whether the site is still available for residential development.</p>	
PAL06	Land north of Lion Road	4	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix A</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield adjacent and connected to the existing built-up area. However it is outside and not connected to the adopted settlement boundary, with the majority of the site also not connected to the proposed settlement boundary of Palgrave. Development of the site would represent a significant backland development that poorly relate to the existing settlement. Palgrave is a secondary village that is defined as generally unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs according to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities.</p> <p>The site sits at a flat plateau and is visually open. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from public rights of way in the immediate vicinity to the east of the site and from the wider landscape. In particular, views to and from designated heritage assets and existing public rights of way will be completely blocked with limited mitigation possible. Development of the site is likely to negatively impact the character of setting in which the existing designated heritage assets are experienced and observed, particularly when at</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>the approach of Palgrave with the two Grade II listed buildings from Millway Lane which remains rural and tranquil in character.</p> <p>A suitable access could be potentially facilitated from Lion Road however it is likely to completely erase part of a public footpath leading to the north west. If the diversion of the existing public rights of way is essential, an alternative route would need to be identified and consulted with the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present which would have implications to the site's developable area, viability, access, safety and design, which would need to be consulted with the National Grid and the Local Planning Authority. It is noted that the landowner is exploring the option to place this underground.</p> <p>The site is available for development and is promoted for 45 dwellings and a new primary school. It is acknowledged that the proposal could potentially deliver an important social infrastructure as representations from Suffolk County Council to multiple recent planning permissions has highlighted that schools within the local catchments have no available capacity at present and that it is not currently possible to expand the schools at their current locations. However, the site is currently unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan due to significant constraints in relation to settlement pattern, landscape and visual sensitivity, heritage and public rights of way.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
SS0068	Land north of Upper Rose Lane	2.9	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield adjacent though not connected to the settlement boundary of Palgrave. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary</p>	

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs. The site is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities. The site is located within the designated Special Landscape Area and is visually open. The site is also crossed by overhead power lines at the access point. It is not clear how suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access could be provided at present. The site is therefore unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	
SS0412	Land south of Upper Rose Lane	4.17	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield adjacent to and connected to the settlement boundary of Palgrave. However, development is likely to extend the settlement form of Palgrave towards the east and south, negatively impacting the settlement character and reducing the gap between Diss and Palgrave. The site is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs. The site is therefore unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>
SS0693	Land east of Crossing Road	1.32	<p><b>To be read in conjunction with Appendix B</b></p> <p>The site is a greenfield outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Palgrave. Development of the site will adversely change the settlement</p>	<p><b>Not currently suitable</b></p>

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (Ha)	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Summary	Assessment of suitability for allocation
			<p>pattern of Palgrave by crossing over the existing railway which borders the southern boundary of the settlement. The site forms part of a wider field and is highly visible. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs. The site is therefore unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>	

## Affordable Housing

- 4.8 36 sites considered in this assessment are suitable or potentially suitable for allocation for housing or mixed-use development. 29 of these have the potential to accommodate 10 or more homes and could be required to include a proportion of affordable housing depending on the thresholds for provision of affordable housing in your area<sup>32</sup>. They are therefore potentially suitable for Discounted Market Housing (e.g. First Homes<sup>33</sup>), affordable housing for rent, or other affordable housing types (see NPPF Annex 2). The proportion of affordable housing is usually set by the Local Plan but is expected to be above 10%, unless the proposed development meets the exemptions set out in NPPF para 65.
- 4.9 The requirement for Affordable Housing provision on sites proposed for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan should be discussed with the Local Planning Authority (usually your neighbourhood planning officer) to understand the specific requirements for the sites proposed for allocation.

## Next Steps

- 4.10 Based on the findings of the consolidated report, Diss and District Neighbourhood Group, in conjunction with the relevant Parish and Town Councils, should engage with Mid Suffolk District Council, South Norfolk Council and the community to select sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan which best meet community needs and plan objectives from the shortlist of suitable and potentially suitable sites.
- 4.11 The site selection process should be based on the following:
- The findings of this site assessment;
  - Discussions with the planning authority;
  - The extent to which the sites support the vision and objectives for the NP;
  - The potential for the sites to meet the identified infrastructure needs of the community;
  - Engagement with key stakeholders; and
  - General conformity with strategic Local Plan policy
- 4.12 The Qualifying Body should be able to demonstrate that the sites are viable for development, i.e. that they provide an adequate financial return for the developer. It is recommended that the Qualifying Body discusses site viability with Mid Suffolk District Council and South Norfolk Council. It is further suggested that any landowner or developer promoting a site for development should be contacted to request evidence of viability, e.g. a site financial viability appraisal.

<sup>32</sup> see NPPF para 63-65

<sup>33</sup> The Government recently consulted on the First Homes Policy and a minimum of 25% of all affordable housing units secured through developer contributions will need to be first homes. You can find out more here: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/first-homes>

# Appendix A Site Assessment Proforma

***Amendments made in 2022 following the review of new or additional information submitted are highlighted in bold italics.***

## Burston and Shimpling

### GNLPS0005

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	GNLPS0005 ( <i>also referred to as GNLPSL00005</i> )
Site Address / Location	Land south east of Diss Road
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.1
HELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Covered in trees ( <i>Residential Garden</i> )
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	2 dwellings
Site identification method / source	<i>Identified by the Qualifying Body and submitted to the GNLP's Call for Sites</i>
Planning history	No recent or relevant planning applications
Neighbouring uses	<i>The site forms the residential garden of an existing dwelling to its east and faces the open countryside in all other directions.</i>



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. <b><i>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes, the existing vehicular access may be potentially upgraded subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b><i>No. A suitable pedestrian access could be potentially created but the site is not connected to a safe walking network (i.e. no pavement) and is located on a bend in the road.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes. A suitable cycle access could be potentially created subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority although there are limited segregated cycleways in Neighbourhood Area.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Within</i></p>

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p><i>Unknown. Further assessments would be required. However, it is unlikely that the site is affected by ground contamination as an undeveloped greenfield.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

#### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	3,961m (Diss town centre)	513m	5702m	560m	398m	Adjacent to open space	N/A

#### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Overall low likelihood of sensitivity but western side of site has higher likelihood of sensitivity. However no detailed / specialist landscape assessment evidence available. <i>The site is located within the Waveney Tributary Farmland Landscape Character Area. The South Norfolk Landscape Assessment seeks to conserve the distinctive small-scale historic field pattern around villages as at Burston.</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>The eastern side of the site has low overall likelihood of visual sensitivity. The western side of the site is visually open and projects outside of the settlement boundary into the open countryside with higher visual sensitivity. However no detailed / specialist landscape assessment evidence available.</i></p>

#### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	No
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	No
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<i>The site forms the residential garden of an existing dwelling adjacent to the existing built up area</i>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Outside and not connected to the settlement boundary
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<b>3. Assessment of Availability</b>	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	Unknown

#### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
---	----------------

#### 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site?</b> (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</p>	<p>2 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development</b> (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available</i></p> <p>No</p>

<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p><i><b>This narrow residential garden site is located outside of the settlement boundary of Burston but adjacent to the existing built up area. Development of the site may lead to a slight elongation of the Burston's settlement form but its impacts on the settlement pattern and character would be limited.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>Policy 16 of the adopted JCS states that Burston could only accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings within development boundaries subject to form and character considerations. If the settlement boundary of Burston was extended to include this site through the Neighbourhood Plan following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to footpath provision, visual sensitivity and the protection of existing trees. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.5.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</b></i></p>
---	--

# Diss

## DISS0001

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	DIS0001
Site Address / Location	Mavery House, Fitzwalter Road, Diss IP22 4EX
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.67
HELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Infant / Nursery School
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	13 dwellings
Site identification method / source	Identified by the Qualifying Body
Planning history	<b><i>No recent or relevant planning applications. A planning application (2007/0584) for school extensions has been approved in May 2007.</i></b>
Neighbouring uses	Residential



## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is identified as Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land in the 2019 SOA Assessment however as the site is largely previously developed, its development would not lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Data provided by DEFRA (Provisional Agricultural Land Classification) indicates that the site is of urban nature.</i></p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown. An assessment would need to be undertaken.
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes – development of the site would result in the loss of the nursery school and its associated playing fields which serve as a key social infrastructure in Diss (if not relocated).</i></p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	729m to town centre	85m	1587m	523m	1250m	247m ( to Cricket Club)	N/A

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is within the built up area surrounded by development therefore likelihood of low impact. However no detailed / specialist landscape assessment evidence available.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Likelihood of low impact as the site is within the built up area surrounded by development. However no detailed / specialist landscape assessment evidence available.</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	No
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<b>Yes, Policy DM 3.16 Improving the level of community facilities states that the change of use of existing community facilities will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or there is no reasonable prospect of continued viable use.</b>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<b>A mix of greenfield and previously developed land (including previously developed land and playing fields)</b>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
<p>Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site was identified as unavailable for development in 2019. No further evidence is available since which suggests that the site has become available for residential development.</i></p>
<p>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Is there a known time frame for availability? Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
4. Assessment of Viability	
<p>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes, development of the site for residential use may require demolition and/or relocation of the existing education facility.</i></p>
5. Conclusions	
<p>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</p>	<p>13 dwellings</p>
<p>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Other key information</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available</b>. The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available</b>.  Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>The site is not currently suitable, and unavailable</i></p> <p><i>Potential viability issues as development of the site may require demolition and/or relocation of the existing education facility.</i></p>
<p>Summary of justification for rating</p>	<p><i>The site is currently used as an infant / nursery school at capacity. No evidence is made available at present which indicates that the site is available for residential development. The site is unsuitable for residential development in principle, unless it can be demonstrated that adequate similar facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or that there is no reasonable prospect of continued use of the existing infant / nursery school in accordance with Policy DM3.16 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Plan.</i></p> <p><i>If the current infant / nursery school is to be relocated within a reasonable distance, the site may be potentially suitable for residential development. The site is largely a brownfield site at a sustainable location within the settlement boundary of Diss subject to limited constraints.</i></p>

## DISS002

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	DIS0002
Site Address / Location	The Entry, Diss, IP22 4NT
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1.75
HELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	School and Playing Fields
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	35 dwellings
Site identification method / source	Identified by the Qualifying Body
Planning history	<b><i>No recent or relevant planning applications. Multiple planning applications (2017/1500; 2015/1126; 2004/2097; 2001/2067) related to school extensions and temporary classrooms were approved previously.</i></b>
Neighbouring uses	<b><i>Housing and Playing Pitches (Diss Cricket Club and Bowling Green)</i></b>



## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk (Less than 15% of the site concentrated at the northern part of the site is subject to surface water flooding)</i></p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is identified as Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land in the 2019 SOA Assessment however as the site is largely previously developed, its development would not lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Data provided by DEFRA (Provisional Agricultural Land Classification) indicates that the site is of urban nature.</i></p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No. ProW adjacent to the west of the site (Diss FP34)</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No. <i>However, trees adjacent to the site are preserved under the Tree Preservation Order (SN280 TPO).</i></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown. An assessment would need to be undertaken.
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<b>Yes – development of the site would result in the loss of the school and its associated playing fields which serve as a key social infrastructure in Diss (if not relocated).</b>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	263m	380m	1738m	The site is currently used as a primary school. If the site is to be developed, the nearest primary school would be Roydon Primary School >1km away.	842m	50m (to Cricket Club)	N/A

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</li> <li>• <b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</li> <li>• <b>High sensitivity:</b> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</li> </ul>	<p>The site is within the built up area surrounded by development therefore likelihood of low impact. However no detailed / specialist landscape assessment evidence available.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li>• <b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li>• <b>High sensitivity:</b> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding</li> </ul>	<p>Likelihood of low to medium impact. While the site is in the built up area of Diss, it is adjacent to open space and not fully enclosed with some intervisibility with the surrounding area. However no detailed / specialist landscape assessment evidence available.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<i>landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i>	
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><i>The site is located within the Diss Conservation Area and is adjacent to two Grade II Listed Buildings (the Entry and Franwin). Development of the site is likely to have some impacts on the setting of the designated heritage assets but mitigation may be possible through sensitive design.</i></p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	No
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, Policy DM 3.16 Improving the level of community facilities states that the change of use of existing community facilities will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or there is no reasonable prospect of continued viable use.</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p><i>A mix of greenfield and previously developed land (including previously developed land and playing fields)</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

## 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is confirmed to be available for development in 2020.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment of Viability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes, development of the site for residential use may require demolition and/or relocation of the existing education facility.</i></p>
<p><b>5. Conclusions</b></p>	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site?</b> (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</p>	<p>35 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development</b> (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available</i></p> <p><i>Potential viability issues as development of the site may require demolition and/or relocation of the existing education facility.</i></p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p><i>The site is currently used as a primary school confirmed to be available for development. The site is unsuitable for residential development in principle, unless it can be demonstrated that adequate similar facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or that there is no reasonable prospect of continued use of the existing primary school in accordance with Policy DM3.16 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Plan.</i></p> <p><i>If the existing primary school is to be relocated within a reasonable distance, the site may be potentially suitable for residential development subject to mitigation of constraints in relation to visual sensitivity (potentially through the use of natural screening), surface water flooding and potential impacts on designated heritage assets and their setting. The site is a partially previously developed land located at a sustainable location within the settlement boundary of Diss.</i></p>

## DISS003

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	DIS0003
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	The Old School, Causeway Close
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.18
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Vacant School Site
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Community Use (not specified) / Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	4 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Identified by the Qualifying Body
<b>Planning history</b>	No recent or relevant planning applications
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Church, open space, residential



## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium Risk</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is identified as Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land in the 2019 SOA Assessment however as the site is largely previously developed, its development would not lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Data provided by DEFRA (Provisional Agricultural Land Classification) indicates that the site is of urban nature.</i></p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>There is no existing vehicular access to the site although it is adjacent to a car park. It is not clear whether a suitable access could be potentially created. Further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority may be required.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No. ProW adjacent to the west of the site (Diss FP34)</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No. <i>However, trees adjacent to the site are preserved under the Tree Preservation Order (SN280 TPO).</i></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown. An assessment would need to be undertaken.
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<b>No. The site is currently a derelict educational building.</b>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	309m	217m	1274m	690m	1373m	753m (to Cricket Club)	N/A

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</li> <li>• <b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</li> <li>• <b>High sensitivity:</b> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</li> </ul>	<p style="color: green;">The site is within the built up area surrounded by development therefore likelihood of low impact. However no detailed / specialist landscape assessment evidence available.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li>• <b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li>• <b>High sensitivity:</b> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</li> </ul>	<p style="color: green;">Likelihood of low visual impact. However no detailed / specialist landscape assessment evidence available.</p>

### Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>  <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /                      Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /                      Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><i>The site is located within the Diss Conservation Area and is adjacent to a number of Grade II listed buildings. Development of the site is likely to have some impacts on the setting of the designated heritage assets but mitigation may be possible through sensitive design.</i></p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>  <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /                      Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /                      Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>Yes, Policy DM 3.16 Improving the level of community facilities (including buildings last used as primary schools) states that the change of use of existing community facilities will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or there is no reasonable prospect of continued viable use.</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b>  <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p><i>Previously developed land</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /                      Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /                      Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
<b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	<i>The site is confirmed to be available for development in 2020.</i>
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b>	Unknown
4. Assessment of Viability	
<b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	<i>Yes, development of the site for residential use may require demolition of the existing facilities.</i>
5. Conclusions	
<b>What is the expected development capacity of the site?</b> (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	4 dwellings
<b>What is the likely timeframe for development</b> (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	Unknown
<b>Other key information</b>	N/A
<b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i>	<i>The site is not currently suitable, and available</i>  <i>Potential viability issues as development of the site may require demolition of the existing education facility.</i>
<b>Summary of justification for rating</b>	<i>The site is a derelict education facility available for development. The site is unsuitable for residential development in principle, unless it can be demonstrated that adequate similar facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or that there is no reasonable prospect of continued use of the facility in accordance with Policy DM3.16 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Plan. If it is demonstrated that the site is no longer required for educational use, the site may be potentially suitable for residential development subject to mitigation of constraints in relation to vehicular access and potential impacts on designated heritage assets and their setting. The site is a previously developed land located at a sustainable location within the settlement boundary of Diss.</i>

## DIS1 / GNLP0185

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	DIS1 / <b>GNLP0185</b>
Site Address / Location	Land north of Vince's Road / <b>Prince William Way</b>
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1.18 / <b>1.01</b>
HELAA Reference (if applicable)	<b>GNLP0185</b>
Existing land use	Greenfield
Land use being considered	Residential
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Adopted Local Plan allocated this site for 35 dwellings. <b><i>The eastern part of the site submitted for assessment in the 2017 HELAA (no identified capacity). The site is considered suitable for the land availability assessment but as it was subject to an existing housing allocation it will not contribute any additional development capacity for the purposes of the HELAA analysis.</i></b>
Site identification method / source	Allocations carried forward from adopted Local Plan and HELAA 2017
Planning history	None recent or relevant
Neighbouring uses	Employment and residential. <b><i>The site borders the main Norwich-London railway immediately to the east.</i></b>



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>The site is in close proximity to the locally designated River Waveney Valley Protection Zone and a County Wildlife Site.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk. Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding.</i></p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes, access could be created from Prince William Way <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. Initial highways evidence for the 2017 HELAA also supports that any access constraints to the site could be overcome through development and that impact on the local road network could be mitigated.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes, access could be created from Prince William Way <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes there is access. There are no designated cycle routes but bikes can use the road network</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes on the eastern part of the site.</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200	400-800	400-1200	400-1200	1600-3900	<400 to open space	<400m to road network

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is located within the Waveney Rural River Landscape Character area and is likely to have medium landscape sensitivity given the predominantly developed surrounding land use.</p>
--	---

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is likely to have low visual sensitivity as it is largely enclosed by existing development or trees/hedgerows.</p>
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No impact</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown - no map of non-designated assets available.</p>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>In the adopted Local Plan this site is allocated for housing - this has been removed from the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Adopted Policy DM 1.3 The sustainable location of new development and emerging Policy 1 The Sustainable Growth Strategy</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
3. Assessment of Availability	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p><i>Yes, the site is promoted for development through the 2017 HELAA and no further evidence is available to suggest otherwise.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>                      Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p><i>The proposer suggests that the site is available and developable in 1 to 5 years (by April 2021).</i></p>
4. Assessment of Viability	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
5. Conclusions	

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<b>What is the expected development capacity of the site?</b> (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	<b><i>The site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan for 35 dwellings. However, considering the need to retain existing tree coverage for its ecological value and function as a noise buffer, the developable area of the site is reduced to approximately 0.7 Ha. The estimated capacity for the site is 0.7 x 80% x 25 = 14 dwellings (AECOM calculation based on 25 dph), subject to further capacity analysis.</i></b>
<b>What is the likely timeframe for development</b> (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	<b><i>0-5 years</i></b>
<b>Other key information</b>	This site conforms with both adopted and emerging Local Plan policy.
<b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> Yes / No	<b><i>The site is suitable and available</i></b>  Unknown
<b>Summary of justification for rating</b>	<p>This is a greenfield site located to the north east of the town, adjacent to the railway line. The south eastern part of the site has dense tree cover and would not be appropriate to develop, this would therefore reduce the potential development area on the site. The proximity to the railway line may also be a constraint; however, due to tree coverage along the railway and the development to the north which has been built up to the edge of the railway, this is unlikely to reduce the developable area further. This site meets both emerging and adopted Local Plan policy. Vehicular access could be provided <i>via</i> Prince William Way <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. Off-site mains reinforcement and sewerage infrastructure upgrades would be required to serve growth in this location.</b></p> <p><b><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</i></b></p> <p>The previous Local Plan allocation for housing is appropriate to carry forward for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan; however, the development potential is likely to be reduced to around <b>14</b> dwellings to allow for retention of the trees.</p>

## DIS2

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	DIS2
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land off Park Road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	4.60
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Greenfield
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Mixed Use
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Adopted Local Plan allocates this site for open space and a small area of housing to provide 10-15 dwellings.
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Allocations carried forward from adopted Local Plan
<b>Planning history</b>	None recent or relevant
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Greenfield, employment and housing



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium to high risk, there are areas of Flood Zone 3 on the southern boundary and areas of Flood Zone 2 in the centre of the site.</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium Risk</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No existing access but access could be created through Site 7 (which is in the same ownership).</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No existing access but access could be created through Site 7 (which is in the same ownership). There is potential to facilitate the provision of a riverside walk to join the existing pedestrian network.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No, there is no access but access could be created through Site 7 (which is in the same ownership). There are no designated cycle routes but bikes can use the road network</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes on boundary</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes, the site is crossed by electricity transmission lines at present which would have implications to the site's developable area, viability and design. Further discussions with the National Grid and the Local Planning Authority would be required. There are also telegraph poles on site..</i></p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	<400	<400	>1200	400-1200	1600-3900	<400 to open space	<400m to road network

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is located with Waveney Rural River Landscape Character area and is likely to have high landscape sensitivity given its periphery location and relationship to the wider landscape.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is likely to have low visual sensitivity as it is largely enclosed by existing development or trees/hedgerows.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

Heritage Constraints	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>  <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact - the site is adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>  <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown - no map of non-designated assets available.</p>
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b>  <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>In the adopted Local Plan the northern part of the site is allocated for housing, while the southern half is designated as Open Space Amenity. Both have been removed in the <b>emerging</b> Greater Norwich Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Adopted Policy DM 1.3 The sustainable location of new development and emerging Policy 1 The Sustainable Growth Strategy</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b>  <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i>  <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i>  <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>The site straddles the settlement boundary, leaving some of the site within and majority of it adjacent.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b><i>The site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan. No updated information available suggests that the site is no longer available. However, the Qualifying Body should confirm availability of the site for the proposed development at present prior to allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></b></p>
---	---

<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown - in same ownership as Site 7.</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

**4. Assessment of Viability**

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b><i>Yes. The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present, which is likely to impact the viability of the site due to reduced developable area and the potential need to relocate utilities.</i></b></p>
---	---

**5. Conclusions**

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site?</b> (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</p>	<p>The northern part of the site <u>together with DIS7</u> may be suitable for approximately 20-30 dwellings.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development</b> (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Only the northern part of this site conforms with adopted and emerging policy.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <b>Yes / No</b></p>	<p><i>The site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to confirmation of availability</i></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This is a greenfield site located to the south of the town, it straddles the settlement boundary and the majority of the site is outside of it. This site is in the same ownership as DIS7 and they are proposed to be developed as one scheme. Access to the site would need to be provided through DIS7, as there is no direct access to the site. Therefore, this site would not be suitable if these sites did not come forward together.</p> <p>The site has medium to high flood risk, there are areas of Flood Zone 3 on the southern boundary and areas of Flood Zone 2 in the centre of the site. Therefore, these areas should be excluded from any housing development. There is also risk of surface water flooding which would need to be considered in the design of a scheme. In addition, it is likely to have high landscape value given its periphery location and relationship to the wider landscape.</p> <p><i>The site is crossed by electricity transmission lines at present which may have implications to the site's developable area, viability and design. Development of the site would need to be consulted with the National Grid and the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</i></p> <p>Therefore, the northern part of the site, located within the settlement boundary, is suitable for allocation together with DIS7 <b>subject to confirmation of availability</b>. Subject to redrawing the settlement boundary to include the southern part of the site, this would make the area potentially suitable. However, due to considerable areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 further design work is required to understand whether housing would be possible in the small area of Flood Zone 1. However, <b>the Qualifying Body</b> may wish to carry forward the southern part of this site as a designated Green Space, as it was designated as this in the previous Local Plan.</p>

## DIS7

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	DIS7
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Feather Mills site, Park Road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	2.21
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Employment
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Mixed Use
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Adopted Local Plan allocates this site for retail, leisure, offices with housing only constituting a small proportion of the site.
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Allocations carried forward from adopted Local Plan
<b>Planning history</b>	None recent or relevant
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Greenfield and housing



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium Risk</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. As the site is mostly previously developed, development of the site is unlikely to lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</i></p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes there is existing access.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes there is existing access.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes there is access. There are no designated cycle routes but bikes can use the road network</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No - but there are a number of TPOs along the northern boundary.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes within
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes there are telegraph poles on site.
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	<400	<400	>1200	400-1200	1600-3900	<400 to open space	<400m to road network

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is located with Waveney Rural River Landscape Character area and is likely to have low landscape sensitivity as there is already development on the site.</p>
--	---

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is likely to have low visual sensitivity as it is largely enclosed by existing development or trees/hedgerows.</p>
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact - the site is adjacent to the Conservation Area.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown - no map of non-designated assets available.</p>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>In the adopted Local Plan this site is allocated for mixed use- this has been removed from the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Adopted Policy DM 1.3 The sustainable location of new development and emerging Policy 1 The Sustainable Growth Strategy</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Partially PDL</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
3. Assessment of Availability	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan. No updated information available suggests that the site is no longer available. However, the Qualifying Body should confirm availability of the site for the proposed development at present prior to allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown - in same ownership as Site 2.</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
4. Assessment of Viability	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Potential viability issues in redeveloping/demolishing existing buildings.</p>
5. Conclusions	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site?</b> (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</p>	<p>Together with Site DIS2 this site could deliver 20-30 dwellings.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development</b> (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>This site conforms with both adopted and emerging Local Plan policy.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available</b>. The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available</b>.</p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>The site is potentially suitable for development subject to confirmation of availability</i></p> <p>Potential viability issues in redeveloping/demolishing existing buildings.</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This is a partially previously developed site located to the south of the town. It is in the same ownership as site DIS2 and they are planned to be developed as one scheme. The site has a medium risk of surface water flooding and is adjacent to the Conservation Area, both of which would need to be a consideration in the design of a development scheme.</p> <p>This site meets both emerging and adopted Local Plan policy. The previous Local Plan allocation includes this as a mixed use allocation for employment, leisure and some housing. This site is appropriate for this allocation to be carried forward in the Neighbourhood Plan <b>subject to confirmation of availability</b>.</p>

## DIS9

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	DIS9
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land at Sandy Lane (north of Diss Business Park)
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	4.22
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Greenfield
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Employment
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Adopted Local Plan allocates this site for use classes B2 and B8.
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Allocations carried forward from adopted Local Plan
<b>Planning history</b>	None recent or relevant
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Greenfield, employment and housing



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes, access could be created <i>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes, access could be created <i>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes there is access. There are no designated cycle routes but bikes can use the road network</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes on boundary</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes - Telegraph poles on site.
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200	400-800	400-1200	400-1200	1600-3900	<400 to open space	<400m to road network

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</li> <li><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</li> <li><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</li> </ul>	<p>The site is located with Waveney Rural River Landscape Character area and is likely to have high landscape sensitivity given its periphery location and relationship to the wider landscape.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</li> </ul>	<p>The site is likely to have medium visual sensitivity as the site is mostly well enclosed although has some longer ranging views to the north east of the site.</p>

## Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	No impact
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown - no map of non-designated assets available.
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	In the adopted Local Plan this site is allocated for employment- this has been removed from the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan.
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	Adopted Policy DM 1.3 The sustainable location of new development, DM 2.1 Employment and business development and emerging Policy 1 The Sustainable Growth Strategy and Policy 7.2 The Main Towns
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan. No updated information available suggests that the site is no longer available. However, the Qualifying Body should confirm availability of the site for the proposed development at present prior to allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
4. Assessment of Viability	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
5. Conclusions	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>This site conforms with both adopted and emerging Local Plan policy.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available</b>. The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available</b>.</p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>The site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to confirmation of availability</i></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This is a greenfield site located to the east of the town and was proposed for allocation for employment uses in the <b>adopted</b> Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is relatively unconstrained, but is likely to have high landscape value given its periphery location and relationship to the wider landscape. Therefore, this would need to be mitigated in the design of a development scheme.</p> <p>This site meets both emerging and adopted Local Plan policy.</p> <p>The previous Local Plan allocation for employment is appropriate to carry forward for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## Site 1

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 1
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Current Leisure Centre, Diss
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.31
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Leisure Centre with parking
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation (submitted by South Norfolk Council - the Landowner)
<b>Planning history</b>	None recent or relevant
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern site boundary is adjacent to the A1066. The eastern boundary is adjacent to the garden centre and car park, as well as one house. The southern boundary is adjacent to a field and the River Waveney. The western boundary is adjacent to housing.



## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p style="color: #00AEEF;"><b>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p style="color: #00AEEF;">No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p style="color: #00AEEF;"><b>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p style="color: #00AEEF;">Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p style="color: #00AEEF;">Low Risk</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	Flat or relatively flat
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes - access from Shelfanger Road (B1077)
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes - access from Shelfanger Road (B1077)
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes - access from Shelfanger Road (B1077)
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes - TPO reference: SN034, category number:1, species: oak.
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
<b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
<b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No

**Accessibility**  
 Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	<400m	<400m	>1200m	400-1200m	<1600m	400-800m	400-800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
 This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p style="color: green;">Low sensitivity - no identifiable landscape features in the site</p>
<b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p style="color: green;">Low sensitivity - site is contained from views</p>

### Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>The site is located in the Diss and Roydon built up area classed as Main Town under Draft Policy 7.2 of the draft Greater Norwich Local Plan which supports residential development within the settlement boundary and expects substantial levels of development to take place within Main Towns. Draft Policy 6 of the GNLP seeks to avoid the loss of commercial premises.</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Previously developed land</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within the existing built up area (infill)</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within the existing settlement boundary</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
3. Assessment of Availability	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b>	Not currently available

## 4. Assessment of Viability

<b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
--	---------

## 5. Conclusions

<b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b>	0.31x25=7.75 = 8 dwellings (AECOM calculation based on 25 dph)
<b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b>	Not available for development
<b>Other key information</b>	N/A

<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is suitable and available provided that the existing sports hall is reprovided within a reasonable distance</b></p> <p>Yes - development of the site would involve demolition of the existing leisure centre</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>South Norfolk Council is currently looking at 3 alternative sites for a new Leisure Centre, with a provisional starting date of 2023 for development. The current Leisure Centre site, which includes a surface level car park is therefore available for development. If the site was to be redeveloped for housing then it is expected that the Leisure Centre would need to be re-provided on another site accessible to residents. <b>Policy DM 3.16 and draft GNLP policy 6 resists the loss of local services unless it can be demonstrated that adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs. Current evidence suggests that the sports hall will be re-provided.</b></p> <p>The site is located within the settlement boundary and built-up area of Diss and is adjacent to other commercial and residential uses. It is in a residential area and is favourably located in relation to services and facilities, within walking distance to public transport and Diss town centre, as well as being in close proximity to the National Cycle Network Route 30. The site is adjacent to the walk-cycle network priorities route which is part of the Diss Improvement Strategy April 2020 produced by Norfolk County Council. A key improvement which would benefit future residents should the site be redeveloped is the continuation of the existing shared-use cycleway from Diss Leisure Centre to connect with the pedestrian crossing opposite Diss Methodist Church. There are two existing access points from the A1066 which could serve as vehicular and pedestrian access to a residential development.</p> <p>There are no environmental or heritage designations within or adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding <b>but this could be mitigated through appropriate water management strategy such as the use of SuDS.</b> Overall, due to its favourable location and low level of constraints, the site is suitable for redevelopment for housing and is therefore appropriate as a candidate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to flood risk issues being mitigated and the current Diss Leisure Centre being re-provided in another appropriate location.</p>

## Site 2

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 2
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Travis Perkins Site, Shelfanger Road, Diss
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.30
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Travis Perkins site - largely a yard with storage and office facilities.
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Allocations carried forward from adopted Local Plan
<b>Planning history</b>	None recent or relevant
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern site boundary is adjacent to the A1066. The eastern boundary is adjacent to the garden centre and car park, as well as one house. The southern boundary is adjacent to a field and the River Waveney. The western boundary is adjacent to housing.



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium Risk</p>
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access from the A1066 (two access points)</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access from the A1066 (two access points)</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access from the A1066 (two access points)</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> - loss of the existing leisure centre however the Council have 3 possible sites for the new Leisure Centre.</p>
---	---

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	400-1200m	<400m	400-1200m	400-1200m	<1600m	400-800m	<400m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low sensitivity</i> - no identifiable landscape features in the site</p>
--	--

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low sensitivity</i> - site is contained from views</p>
--	--

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>
---	---

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>
---	---

### Planning Policy Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	No
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>The site is located in the Diss and Roydon built up area classed as Main Town under Draft Policy 7.2 of the draft Greater Norwich Local Plan which supports residential development within the settlement boundary and expects substantial levels of development to take place within Main Towns.</i></p> <p><i>Policy DM 3.16 Improving the level of community facilities states that the change of use of existing community facilities will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs or there is no reasonable prospect of continued viable use. Similarly, draft Policy 6 of the GNLP also seeks to avoid the loss of local services.</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Previously developed land
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within the existing built up area (infill)
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within the existing settlement boundary
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
3. Assessment of Availability	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	Not currently available

4. Assessment of Viability	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
5. Conclusions	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>0.3x25=7.75 = 8 dwellings (AECOM calculation based on 25 dph)</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>N/A as not available</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included/allocated in the GNLP Diss and Roydon site allocations document.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                      The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                      The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available</b>.                      The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available</b>.</p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><b><i>The site is suitable for development, but unavailable. It is therefore unsuitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>While this brownfield site (current use is Travis Perkins) was originally submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan consultation, the owners have now confirmed their decision that the site is currently no longer available for development. However, any site that is not currently known to be available but may be a future prospect can still be included in the NP (possibly as an 'aspiration') and a development brief or set of development principles including design can be included to guide development in the future, should the site become available.</p> <p>The site is within the settlement boundary and built-up area of Diss. The site is flat and is largely a yard with storage and office facilities. The site is favourably located to services and facilities and is within walking distance to public transport and the town centre. The wider context of the site is residential.</p> <p>There is access to the site from Shelfanger Road (B1077). The site contains no identifiable landscape features and is contained from views. There is one tree protection order (TPO; reference: SN034, category number:1, species: oak) on site which does not necessarily preclude development but would need to be considered at detailed design stage. Travis Perkins is a commercial site and GNLP draft policy 6 states that development should avoid loss of commercial premises.</p> <p>Due to its favourable location and low level of constraints, this site is suitable for redevelopment as housing, subject to mitigation of minor constraints and subject to the commercial premises being re-provided elsewhere. However, as the site is not currently available, it is not currently appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

# Roydon

## 735

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	735
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land north of old high road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.49
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Amenity/Garden Land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	The site could accommodate anywhere between 10 - 25 residential dwellings. It is expected that a mix of housing will be provided with market dwellings of 2, 3, and 4 bedrooms and affordable housing of 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms. It is anticipated that the market housing will be an average of 93sqm and the affordable housing to be an average of 60sqm. This puts the overall development of anywhere between a total of 930sqm to 2,094sqm.
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Put forward in October 21 as part of the district council's LP consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None recent or relevant
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Residential and School



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes, there is a current access point onto Old High Road which is used by Middle Manor Barn. It is anticipated that this access by improved by creating a larger bell mouth. This will keep access points onto the road to a minimum whilst preserving visibility splays.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes there is existing access.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes there is access. There are no designated cycle routes but bikes can use the road network</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes on boundary</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	>1200	<400	>1200	<400	1600-3900	<400 to open space	<400m to road network

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is located with Waveney Rural River Landscape Character area and is likely to have medium landscape sensitivity given the context of the site being located between the two villages and roads separating it from the wider landscape.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is likely to have medium visual sensitivity as there are some longer ranging views from and to the site from the wider countryside to the south.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

Heritage Constraints	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>  <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited impact - Grade II North House and The Pheasantry are located to the north of the site; however, there is limited intervisibility between the assets and site.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>  <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown - no map of non-designated assets available.</p>
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b>  <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Adopted Policy DM 1.3 The sustainable location of new development and emerging Policy 1 The Sustainable Growth Strategy</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b>  <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i>  <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i>  <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside <b>and not connected to</b></p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Development of this site would contribute to further merging of Diss and Roydon</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>If the site were to achieve an allocation, planning permission could immediately be submitted with development starting in the next year or two.</p>
4. Assessment of Viability	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
5. Conclusions	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p><b>10-25 dwellings</b></p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>1-2 years</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>This site does not conform with either adopted nor emerging Local Plan Policy; however, subject to consultation with SNDC the NP group may be able to redrawn the boundary to include the site. <b><i>This is likely to have significant impacts on the settlement character of Roydon and Diss.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><b><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available</i></b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This is a greenfield site located to the west of the town, between Diss and Roydon, and is outside the settlement boundary. <b><i>Development of the site will lead to coalescence of Diss and Roydon and have significant impacts on their settlement character.</i></b> The site is <b><i>otherwise</i></b> relatively unconstrained, but does not meet adopted or emerging Local Plan policy; therefore the site is not appropriate for housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## DIS3

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	DIS3
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land off Denmark Lane
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.60
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Greenfield
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Adopted Local Plan allocates this site for 42 dwellings.
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Allocations carried forward from adopted Local Plan
<b>Planning history</b>	None recent or relevant
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Greenfield and housing



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium Risk</p>
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes, access could be created from Denmark Lane.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes, access could be created from Denmark Lane. There are currently no pavements along the western part of Denmark Lane and therefore appropriate footway improvements would be required.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes there is access. There are no designated cycle routes but bikes can use the road network</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes on boundary</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	400-1200	<400	>1200	400-1200	1600-3900	<400 to open space	<400m to road network

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is located with Waveney Rural River Landscape Character area and is likely to have medium landscape sensitivity given its periphery location and relationship to the wider landscape.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The site is likely to have low visual sensitivity as the views into the site from the open landscape to the west are viewed in the context of the existing housing behind the site.</p>

**Heritage Constraints**

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	No impact
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown - no map of non-designated assets available.
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	In the adopted Local Plan this site is allocated for housing - this has been removed from the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan.
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	Adopted Policy DM 1.3 The sustainable location of new development and emerging Policy 1 The Sustainable Growth Strategy
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan. No updated information available suggests that the site is no longer available. However, the Qualifying Body should confirm availability of the site for the proposed development at present prior to allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
--	----------------

### 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p><b>42 dwellings</b></p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>This site conforms with both adopted and emerging Local Plan policy.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>The site is suitable for development and allocation in the neighbourhood subject to confirmation of availability</i></p> <p>Unknown</p>

<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This is a greenfield site located to the west of the town. The site has a medium risk of surface water flooding which would need to be a consideration in the design of a development scheme. This site meets both emerging and adopted Local Plan policy.</p> <p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</i></p> <p>This previous Local Plan allocation for 42 dwellings is appropriate to carry forward for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
---	--

## Site 3

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 3
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land opposite White House Farm, Snow Street, Roydon.
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.40
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	6-8 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to Snow Street. The eastern, southern and western boundaries are adjacent to fields.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

Low Risk

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

Low Risk

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - access could be made from Snow Street <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authorities.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - access could be made from Snow Street <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authorities.</b> However, there is currently no pedestrian footpath connecting the site to nearby community facilities.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - access could be made from Snow Street <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authorities.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
---	---------

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Tow n / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	400-1200m	400-800m	>1200m	400-1200m	1600-3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Low sensitivity</b> - no identifiable landscape features in the site</p>
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>High sensitivity</b> - the site is located in open countryside. There are intermittent views through gaps in the hedgerow across fields towards the built-up area of Roydon.</p>

<p><i>landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></p>	
<p><b>Heritage Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</b> - Grade II Listed building opposite the site (White House Farmhouse)</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b></p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>The site is located in Roydon but outside the main build up area – which is classed as a “village cluster” in the draft GNLP, therefore draft policy 7.4 applies. Draft Policy 7.4 of the GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 units max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies; also negative cumulative impact should be avoided on character and scale of settlements in cluster. GNLP draft Policy 7.5 Small Scale Windfall Housing Development states that: Development of up to a maximum total of 3 dwellings within each parish during the lifetime of the plan will, in principle, be permitted on sites adjacent to a development boundary or on infill sites within a recognisable group of dwellings. Proposals will respect the form and character of the settlement and have no detrimental impact on the landscape and natural environment.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p>

<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>3. Assessment of Availability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability? Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment of Viability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>5. Conclusions</b></p>	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p><math>0.4 \times 0.85 = 0.34</math>. <math>0.34 \times 25 = 8.5 = 9</math> dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included/allocated in the GNLP Diss and Roydon site allocations document.</p>

<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b><i>The site is not currently suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan</i></b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This greenfield site is available for development. The site is not within or adjacent to settlement boundary and not well related to the settlement. There is currently no access onto the site, However, access could be created onto Snow Street. Similarly, the site lacks a pedestrian footpath linking the site with the community facilities. The site is located reasonably close to services and facilities and the village centre of Roydon. White House Farmhouse opposite the site is Grade II listed and therefore mitigation would be required to reduce the impact of the development of the site on the designated heritage asset. The site is located in open countryside and there are intermittent views through gaps in the hedgerows across fields towards the built-up area of Roydon. The cumulative effect of the proposed size of development, especially if allocated together with another site in or adjacent to Roydon, would be negative on the character and scale of the settlement and cluster. Overall, due to its location disconnected and remote from the settlement, limited sustainable access to local services and potential inappropriate cumulative effect on the scale and character of the settlement, the site is inappropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## Site 4

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 4
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	The old Sewerage Works, Roydon
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.81
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Former sewerage site
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	25-30 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern, eastern, southern and some of the western boundary are adjacent to open fields. A very small edge of the western boundary is adjacent to Snow Street.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

Low Risk

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

Medium Risk

**Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?**

*The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be*

<p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</b></p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - a small part of the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><b>Flat or relatively flat</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b> - access to the site is through a County Wildlife Site, with the main site removed from Brewers Green road.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b> - access to the site is through a County Wildlife Site, with the main site removed from Brewers Green road.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b> - access to the site is through a County Wildlife Site, with the main site removed from Brewers Green road.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Unknown - the site potentially has contamination issues
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Unknown
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	400-1200m	>800m	>1200m	400-1200m	1600-3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</li> <li><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</li> <li><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</li> </ul>	Low sensitivity
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</li> </ul>	Medium sensitivity - The site is contained and screened on its eastern and southern boundary, but open to views of large agricultural fields to the north and west.

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>The site is located in Roydon but outside the main built up area – which is classed as a “village cluster” in the draft GNLP, therefore draft policy 7.4 applies. Policy 7.4 of the GNLP 18 states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 units max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies; also negative cumulative impact should be avoided on character and scale of settlements in cluster. GNLP draft Policy 7.5 Small Scale Windfall Housing Development: Development of up to a maximum total of 3 dwellings within each parish during the lifetime of the plan will, in principle, be permitted on sites adjacent to a development boundary or on infill sites within a recognisable group of dwellings. Proposals will respect the form and character of the settlement and have no detrimental impact on the landscape and natural environment.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Previously developed land</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary</p>

<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>3. Assessment of Availability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment of Viability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

**5. Conclusions**

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>1.81 x 0.85 = 1.5385. 1.5385 x 25 = 38.4625 = 38 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included/allocated in the GNLP Diss and Roydon site allocations document. The Neighbourhood Group states that the site is "brownfield land" with "services already available onsite". The site was a former Sew age works.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <b>Yes / No</b></p>	<p><b><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available</i></b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This brownfield site is available for development. The site is removed from the built-up area of Roydon and located in open countryside. The site was a former Sew age Station, with infrastructure visible on site. The site potentially has contamination issues which could impact the viability of the site. The site is not located in close proximity to services and facilities nor the town centre and therefore is not easily accessible. The site is at risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation may be required. Access to the site is through a County Wildlife Site, with the main site removed from Brewers Green Lane. Although the site is contained and screened on its eastern and southern boundary, the site is open to views of large agricultural fields to the north and west. The cumulative effect of the proposed size of development, especially if allocated together with another site in or adjacent to Roydon, would be negative on the character and scale of the settlement and cluster. Overall, due to its location disconnected and remote from the settlement, lack of sustainable access to local services and potential inappropriate cumulative effect on the scale and character of the settlement, the site is inappropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## Site 5 - Options A & B

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 5 - Options A & B
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land at Manor Farm House, Roydon
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	Total gross site area approx. 0.45 (excluding farmhouse)  Development option A: approx. 0.12; Development option B: approx.: 0.33;
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Manor Farmhouse and grounds
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Up to 10 dwellings (as per submission to Neighbourhood Group)
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to a house and private garden. The eastern and western boundaries are adjacent to fields. The southern boundary is adjacent to Crick's Walk.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*Unknown. The site might potentially form part of a green infrastructure corridor connecting adjacent priority habitats (deciduous woodland).*

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Medium Risk*

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. The site might potentially form part of a green infrastructure corridor connecting adjacent priority habitats (deciduous woodland). Further habitats assessment may be required.</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - two access points to the farm, one at the end of the residential Crick's Walk and one along a track through the area of common land off Manor Road.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - two access points to the farm, one at the end of the residential Crick's Walk and one along a track through the area of common land off Manor Road.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - two access points to the farm, one at the end of the residential Crick's Walk and one along a track through the area of common land off Manor Road.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes, within - there are a number of mature trees on site.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
<b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
<b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No

**Accessibility**  
 Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	<400m	<400m	>1200m	400-1200m	1600-3900m	<400m	>800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
 This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	Low sensitivity
--	-----------------

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

**Low sensitivity** - the site is contained and well screened by trees.

### Heritage Constraints

#### Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?

**Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible** /  
**Some impact, and/or mitigation possible** /  
**Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation**

**Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible** - Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse located within the site boundary. Development of the site is likely to impact the setting of the designated heritage asset.

#### Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?

**Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible** /  
**Some impact, and/or mitigation possible** /  
**Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation**

**Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation**

### Planning Policy Constraints

#### Is the site in the Green Belt?

**Yes** / **No** / **Unknown**

**No**

#### Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?

**Yes** / **No** / **Unknown**

**No**

#### Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?

Character and River Valleys & draft GNLP policy 2 on Sustainable Communities (re. protection of river valleys); Site is adjacent and connected to Diss and Roydon built up area – classed as “Main Town”; However it is not within the settlement boundary and therefore draft policy 7.2 of the GNLP does not apply, Policy 7.4 of the GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 units max. in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies and no cumulative negative impact on character and scale of settlements in cluster. GNLP draft Policy 7.5 Small Scale Windfall Housing Development: Development of up to a maximum total of 3 dwellings within each parish during the lifetime of the plan will, in principle, be permitted on sites adjacent to a

	development boundary or on infill sites within a recognisable group of dwellings. Proposals will respect the form and character of the settlement and have no detrimental impact on the landscape and natural environment.
<b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i>	A mix of greenfield and previously developed land
<b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary
<b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>3. Assessment of Availability</b>	
<b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b>	Available now / 0-5 years
<b>4. Assessment of Viability</b>	
<b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown

## 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>0.65x0.85=0.5525. 0.5525x25=13.8125 = 14 dwellings (assuming option A and B are allocated). If option A is allocated then it is 0.12x25=3 dwellings and if just option B is allocated then it is 0.33x25=8 dwellings; However, as the site only meets draft policy 7.5 on Windfall, only development up to a max. of 3 dwellings should be allocated.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included/allocated in the GNLP Diss and Roydon site allocations document. The Landowner has split the site in two - option A and option B (see map). If option A is allocated then access would be from the land running parallel to Brewers Green and then to travel east to west onto Cricks Walk. If option A and B were allocated then access would be from Cricks Walk turning left by the pond (the pond was filled years ago and therefore does not exist). There is another access from Brewers Green but this is not the landowners preferred option.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <b>Yes / No</b></p>	<p><b>The site is potentially suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>

<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This site is a mixed green and brownfield site available for development. The site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. The site is also adjacent to an area of common land. There are two access points to the farm, one at the end of the residential Crick's Walk and one along a track through the area of common land off Manor Road. The site is in close proximity to Roydon Garage and a shop, the village hall, a public house with restaurant and a bus stop.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore mitigation must take place if the site was developed, to prevent surface water flooding. Although the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat Network, which is a potential constraint in terms of potential for harmful effects from development, the designation can also be a potential benefit as the development could contribute to the habitat corridor through incorporating open space, planted screening etc. The site is Manor Farm, which includes the Grade II thatched Manor Farmhouse. This is another key constraint to development.</p> <p>Mature trees are also located on site and therefore development may need to avoid the trees. It is important to be aware that the site is located within the River Valleys Extents, where proposed development must have regard to adopted Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys and GNLP draft policy 2 (Sustainable Communities) which stipulates that development is required to "respect, protect and enhance landscape character ... and maintain strategic gaps and landscape settings, including river valleys".</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Roydon was extended to include this site <b>following discussions with South Norfolk Council</b>, taking into account emerging draft policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to flood risk, heritage, biodiversity, trees and landscape. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>
---	--

## Site 6

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 6
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	South of the A1066, Roydon
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.15
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to High Road (A1066). The eastern boundary is adjacent to Tottington Lane. The southern boundary is adjacent to an open field. The western boundary is adjacent to a private garden.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

Low Risk

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

Low Risk

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes - site access could be gained from A1066 <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority</b></i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes - site access could be gained from A1066 <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority</b></i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes - site access could be gained from A1066 <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority</b></i></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Yes - A powerline crosses the eastern part of the site from north to south.
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	<400m	<400m	>1200m	<400m	1600-3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</li> <li><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</li> <li><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Low sensitivity</b> - The wider site slopes from north-west to south-east towards the river valley, with site 6 having a gentle slope than the lower ground of the southern part of the wider site and field. Apart from the sloping river valley nature of the land, there are no identifiable landscape features of value in the site.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</li> </ul>	<p><b>High sensitivity</b> - As Roydon is on higher ground, there are views from the site of the built-up area of Diss and Wind Turbines further to the southeast. There is a hard boundary (no landscaping) between the built-up area of Roydon and the site.</p>

### Heritage Constraints


<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys &amp; draft GNLP policy 2 on Sustainable Communities (re. protection of river valleys); Site is located adjacent to Diss and Roydon built up area – classed as “Main Town”, therefore draft policy 7.2 of the GNLP R does not apply as it stipulates development should within the settlement boundary; Policy 7.4 of the GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies and no negative cumulative impact on character and scale of settlements in cluster. Draft policy 7.5 states that development is acceptable if maximum of 3 dwellings within each parish during lifetime of plan is on sites adjacent to development boundary or infill sites within recognisable group of dwellings to respect form and character of the settlement as well as no detrimental impact on landscape / environment.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary</p>

<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - risk of coalescence between Roydon and Diss</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>3. Assessment of Availability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment of Viability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>5. Conclusions</b></p>	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p><math>1.15 \times 0.85 = 0.9775</math>. <math>0.9775 \times 25 = 24.4375 = 24</math> dwellings However, as the site only meets draft policy 7.5 on Windfall, only development up to a max. of 3 dwellings should be allocated.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development</b> <b>(0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included/allocated in the GNLP Diss and Roydon site allocations document. The site does not have access onto High Road, but has road frontage and potential to create access. As the site is located on a long bend on the A1066 that includes a junction with Old High Road (to Roydon Primary School), the potential to create access onto High Road would be subject to consultation with the Highways Authority.</p>

<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <b>Yes / No</b></p>	<p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available</i></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This greenfield site is currently a field but is adjacent to housing and is available for development.</p> <p>The site does not have access onto High Road but has a road frontage and potential to create access. As the site is located on a long bend on the A1066 that includes a junction with Old High Road (to Roydon Primary School), the potential to create access onto High Road would be subject to consultation with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to Roydon Primary School, Roydon Garage and a shop, the village hall, a public house with restaurant.</p> <p>Although the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat Network, which is a potential constraint in terms of the potential for harmful effects from development, this designation can also be a potential benefit as the development could contribute to the habitat corridor through incorporating open space, planted screening etc. As Roydon is on higher ground, there are views from the site of the built-up area of Diss and Wind Turbines further to the southeast. This is an issue as there is a hard boundary (no landscaping) between the built-up area of Roydon and the site. The wider site slopes from north- west to south-east towards the river valley, with site 6 having a gentler slope than the lower ground of the southern part of the wider site and field. Apart from the sloping river valley nature of the land, there are no identifiable landscape features of value in the site. The site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys and draft policy 2.</p> <p><b><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</i></b></p> <p>Development of the site has potential to be in keeping with the urban form of Roydon, however development of the site would further reduce the gap between Roydon and Diss, leading to a threat of coalescence. To mitigate this risk, development will need to respect the landscape setting, form and character of the settlement and should not close the settlement gap. The issue of coalescence should be discussed with the LPA to understand whether the site would be seen as acceptable, possibly in conjunction with Site 7.</p> <p>This site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. If the settlement boundary of Roydon was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account emerging draft policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to habitat, views, landscape and the threat of coalescence. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>

## Site 7

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 7
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land opposite the school with access onto the Old High Road, maintaining a separation from Long Meadow properties, Roydon
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.20
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	25 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to Old High Road. The eastern boundary is adjacent to a field. The southern and western boundary is adjacent to High Road (A1066).



## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development capacity does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*No*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Medium Risk*

**Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

*The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.*

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - there is no access to the site <b>at present</b> <b>however</b> the site has road frontage on two sides and potential to create access onto the Old High Road <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - there is no access to the site <b>at present</b> <b>however</b> the site has road frontage on two sides and potential to create access onto the Old High Road, which has a footpath that connects the urban edge of Diss to Roydon Primary School.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - there is no access to the site <b>at present</b> <b>however</b> the site has road frontage on two sides and potential to create access onto the Old High Road <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Tow n / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	400-1200m	<400m	>1200m	<400m	1600-3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Low sensitivity</b> - The site has no identifiable landscape features other than the sloping valley land form located within open countryside between the two built-up areas of Diss and Rodon.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>High sensitivity</b> - The site is on low er ground than the primary school as the landform gently slopes from the Old High Road to Denmark Lane and the A1066. There are views across the site from the Old High Road across River Waveney Valley and to the southeast of large wind turbines over the built area of Diss. The site can be seen through breaks in the hedgerow on approach to both settlements due largely to the sloping nature of the landform.</p>

<i>landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i>	
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	No
<b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b>	
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>The site is located in Roydon but outside/adjacent the main built up area – which is classed as a “village cluster” in the draft GNLP, therefore draft policy 7.4 applies. Policy 7.4 of the GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 units max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies; also negative cumulative impact should be avoided on character and scale of settlements in cluster. GNLP draft Policy 7.5 Small Scale Windfall Housing Development: Development of up to a maximum total of 3 dwellings within each parish during the lifetime of the plan will, in principle, be permitted on sites adjacent to a development boundary or on infill sites within a recognisable group of dwellings. Proposals will respect the form and character of the settlement and have no detrimental impact on the landscape and natural environment.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area

<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - risk of coalescence between Roydon and Diss</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>3. Assessment of Availability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment of Viability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>5. Conclusions</b></p>	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>As the site only meets draft policy 7.4 or 7.5, only development up to a max. of 15 (if affordable housing development) or 3 dwellings should be allocated.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included/allocated in the GNLP Diss and Roydon site allocations document.</p>

<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b></p> <p>The site is <b>suitable and available</b></p> <p>The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available</b>.</p> <p>The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available</b>.</p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <b>Yes / No</b></p>	<p><b>The site is potentially suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The site is a greenfield site available for development.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to Roydon Primary School, Roydon Garage and a shop, the village hall, a public house with restaurant and a bus stop.</p> <p>The north-eastern part of the site is closer to Diss' services. The site is opposite Roydon Primary School but removed from the linear form of Roydon, whereby the development of Site 6 may be considered sequentially preferable. There is currently no access to the site. However, the site has road frontage on two sides and potential to create access onto the Old High Road, which has a footpath that connects the urban edge of Diss to Roydon Primary School.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore mitigation is required if developed.</p> <p>Site 7 forms part of a wider field and does not have a defensible boundary to the east. There are views of the hard urban edge of Diss from the site and therefore the site has high sensitivity to visual amenity. The site is on lower ground than the primary school as the landform gently slopes from the Old High Road to Denmark Lane and the A1066. There are views across the site from the Old High Road across River Waveney Valley and to the southeast of large wind turbines over the built area of Diss. Furthermore, the site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys. The site has no identifiable landscape features other than the sloping valley land form located within open countryside between the two built-up areas of Diss and Roydon. The site can be seen through breaks in the hedgerow on approach to both settlements due largely to the sloping nature of the land form.</p> <p>Development of the site would further reduce the gap between Roydon and Diss therefore lead to a threat of coalescence. A recently completed housing scheme can be seen at the end of the wider field which site 7 forms part of. Development will need to respect the landscape setting, form and character of the settlement and should not close the settlement gap. The issue of coalescence should be discussed with the LPA to understand whether the site would be seen as acceptable, particularly in conjunction with Site 6.</p> <p><b><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</i></b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. If the settlement boundary was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account emerging draft policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to habitat, landscape, character, views and the LPAs view on coalescence of Roydon and Diss. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>

## Site 8

### 1. Site Details

<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 8
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Brewers Green Lane, opposite the main entrance to the football club. Roydon
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.50
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural paddock with agricultural access onto Brewers Green Lane
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	25 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	Reference: 2006/1156. Address: Vacant Land at Brewers Green Lane Roydon. Proposal: Erection of new Catholic Church with Priest Flat over, detached garage, car parking and access. Status: Ref used (July 2006). Reason for refusal: the proposed development does not provide off-site facilities for pedestrians to link with existing provision. The unclassified road serving the site is also considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed. The application is also contrary to certain policies in the Norfolk Local Plan 2003.
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern and western boundaries are adjacent to fields. The eastern and southern boundaries are adjacent to residential properties.



## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

Ancient Woodland  
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)  
Biosphere Reserve  
Local Nature Reserve (LNR)  
National Nature Reserve (NNR)  
National Park  
Ramsar Site  
Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*  
Special Area of Conservation (SAC)  
Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

Green Infrastructure Corridor  
Local Wildlife Site (LWS)  
Public Open Space  
Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)  
Nature Improvement Area  
Regionally Important Geological Site  
Other

*No*

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

*Flood Zone 1: Low Risk*

*Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk*

*Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk*

*Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

*Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*

*>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Low Risk*

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b> UK BAP Priority Habitat; a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity); wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><i>Flat or relatively flat</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No - only agricultural access onto Brewers Green Lane; Access could be made from Brewers Green Lane but as only single lane road, could only accommodate access for limited development</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No - only agricultural access onto Brewers Green Lane; Access could be made from Brewers Green Lane but as only single lane road, could only accommodate access for limited development</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No - only agricultural access onto Brewers Green Lane; Access could be made from Brewers Green Lane but as only single lane road, could only accommodate access for limited development</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Public Rights of Way on the eastern boundary of the site.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Unknown</i></p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>Unknown</i></p>

<i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i>	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
<b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes - power-lines cross the northern part of the site from east to west, and the western part of the site from north to south (2 sets of powerlines)
<b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	400-1200m	<400m	>1200m	<400m	1600-3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></p>	<p>Low sensitivity - the site has no identifiable landscape features.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <p><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></p> <p><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></p>	<p>Medium sensitivity - the site is largely contained with neighbouring properties having views into the field. The site is largely flat with a gentle slope from northwest to south east, so development would be slightly higher than adjacent homes to the south.</p>

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>  <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>  <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b>  <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>The site is located in Roydon but outside/adjacent the main built up area – which is classed as a “village cluster” in the draft GNLP, therefore draft policy 7.4 applies. Policy 7.4 of the GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 units max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies; also negative cumulative impact should be avoided on character and scale of settlements in cluster.</p> <p>GNLP draft Policy 7.5 Small Scale Windfall Housing Development: Development of up to a maximum total of 3 dwellings within each parish during the lifetime of the plan will, in principle, be permitted on sites adjacent to a development boundary or on infill sites within a recognisable group of dwellings.</p> <p>Proposals will respect the form and character of the settlement and have no detrimental impact on the landscape and natural environment. The site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys and GNLP Draft Policy 2.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b>  <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>

<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
--	----------------

### 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p><math>1.5 \times 0.85 = 1.275</math>. <math>1.275 \times 25 = 31.875 = 32</math> dwellings However, as the site only meets draft policy 7.4 or 7.5, only development up to a max. of 15 (if affordable housing development) or 3 dwellings should be allocated.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>

<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included/allocated in the GNLP Diss and Roydon site allocations document. Neighbourhood Group states that: this site might not be considered to be in the village as on the edge of Diss settlement boundary. The site is located on the built up edge of Diss, and in close proximity to Diss Football Club and Roydon Primary School. The site is an agricultural paddock, with agricultural access onto Brewers Green Lane.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b></p> <p>The site is <b>suitable and available</b></p> <p>The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b></p> <p>The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <b>Yes / No</b></p>	<p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available</i></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The site is currently being used as agricultural land and an agricultural paddock.</p> <p>The site is available for development. The site is in walking/cycling distance to Diss town centre and is in close proximity to Diss Football Club and Roydon Primary School. The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Diss.</p> <p>It is important to note that in 2006 a proposal for a church with car parking and access was refused. One point of refusal was that the road serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed and therefore the same issue might arise if the site was to be developed for housing as Brewers Green is a single lane road.</p> <p>Furthermore, a public right of way runs <b>along the eastern boundary of the site</b> which would need to be accommodated for if the site was to be developed.</p> <p>The site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys. The site contains no identifiable landscape features and is largely contained, with neighbouring properties having views into the field. The site is largely flat with a gentle slope from northwest to south east, so development would be slightly higher than adjacent homes to the south.</p> <p><b><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</i></b></p> <p>Development of the site would further reduce the gap between Roydon and Diss which would lead to a threat of coalescence. To mitigate this risk, development will need to respect the landscape setting, form and character of the settlement and should not close the settlement gap. The issue of coalescence should be discussed with the LPA to understand whether the site would be seen as acceptable.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. If the settlement boundary was extended to include this site <b>following discussions with South Norfolk Council</b>, taking into account emerging draft policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to access, form and character of the settlement, landscape and local environment. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>

## Site 14

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 14
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Diss Rugby Club. Roydon
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	2.49
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Diss Rugby Club and Club Pavilion
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern and southern boundaries are adjacent to an area of trees. The eastern boundary is adjacent to Bellrope Lane. The western boundary is adjacent to more playing fields.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed development does not trigger the need to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*No*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

*The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.*

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Expansion Zone which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access from Bellrope Lane. However, this road is only a single carriageway and already serves approx. 12 properties.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access from Bellrope Lane. However, this road is only a single carriageway and already serves approx. 12 properties. There is currently no footpath to the south of the site.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access from Bellrope Lane. However, this road is only a single carriageway and already serves approx. 12 properties.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes - loss of rugby field.

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	400-1200m	<400m	>1200m	400-1200m	>3900m	400-800m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	Low sensitivity
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Medium sensitivity</b> - the site is well screened by woodland to its north, west and south. However, the visual impacts on Bellrope Lane and the properties opposite would potentially be adverse. The properties on Bellrope Lane currently have a view across a parkland style landscape, with rows of tall mature trees and a woodland backdrop further beyond the playing fields. Bellrope Lane has a rural character and acts as a clear demarcation between the suburban development to the east, and the former Manor House estate to the west which has a much more rural character. Any facilitation of access would likely require modifications to Bellrope Lane which would impact on heritage assets and the rural quality of the lane.</p>

<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /                      Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /                      Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</b> - Grade II listed building named the old post office is in close proximity to the site. The Church of St Remigius is Grade 1 listed and prominent opposite Bellrope Lane without screening, and therefore vulnerable to any impacts.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /                      Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /                      Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b></p>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>The site is adjacent to but not within Diss and Roydon built up area – classed as “Main Town”. Draft Policy 7.4 of the GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies and cumulative impact shouldn't be negative on character and scale of settlements in cluster. GNLP draft Policy 7.5 Small Scale Windfall Housing Development: Development of up to a maximum total of 3 dwellings within each parish during the lifetime of the plan will, in principle, be permitted on sites adjacent to a development boundary or on infill sites within a recognisable group of dwellings. Self/custom build will be supported. Proposals will respect the form and character of the settlement and have no detrimental impact on the landscape and natural environment.</p> <p><b><i>Policy DM 3.16 and draft GNLP policy 6 resists the loss of local services unless it can be demonstrated that adequate other facilities exist within a reasonable distance to meet local needs. Information received from the group states that development on the site would not displace the rugby club as the site constitutes only part of club site, so there would be no need to relocate.</i></b></p>

<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	A mix of greenfield and previously developed land
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes - risk of coalescence with Snow Street <b>although no settlement gap has been identified.</b>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	Available now / 0-5 years

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
--	---------

**5. Conclusions**

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>2.49x0.75=1.8675x25=46.68 75=47 dwellings (AECOM calculation based on 25 dph)</p> <p><b>Note that residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements on the site would need to be consulted with Natural England.</b></p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not mentioned/allocated in the GNLP Diss and Roydon site allocations document. Information received from the group states that development on the site would not displace the rugby club as the site constitutes only part of club site, so there would be no need to relocate.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is potentially suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>Diss Rugby Club and Club Pavilion is available for development. It is a mix of greenfield and previously developed land. The two major constraints with the site are access and the potential loss of a community facility. The site is currently being used as a Rugby Club with associated pitches and therefore development on this site would result in some loss of this community facility. However, information received from the <b>Qualifying Body</b> indicates that sufficient facilities would be left at the club so no relocation would be necessary. Furthermore, it is clear from the site visit that Bellrope Lane forms a clear boundary to the existing urban area of Roydon (clear that the village has ended and it is the start of the countryside).</p> <p>Access onto the site is problematic as only a single carriageway which is already serving approx. 12 properties. However, as the whole site would not be developed it could be suitable for development, if appropriate access can be achieved. The site is in close proximity to Roydon Primary School, Roydon Garage and a shop, the village hall, a public house with restaurant and a bus stop.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to and connected to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Roydon. If the settlement boundary of Roydon was extended to include this site <b>following discussions with South Norfolk Council</b>, taking into account draft <b>GNLP</b> policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to establishing appropriate access, habitats, the Rugby Club continuing to function as a community facility, and ensuring the development is in keeping with the form, size and character of the settlement. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft <b>GNLP</b> Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>

## GNLP0526 / SN0526REV

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	GNLP0526 / SN0526REV
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land south of High Road, Roydon
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	<b>3.66 Ha. A reduced form of the site (1.0 Ha) is also considered as SN0526REV Land South of High Road submitted to the VCHAP.</b>
<b>HELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	GNLP0526
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land recently harvested
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	<b>89 dwellings. The reduced form of the stie (SN0526REV) is proposed for 25 dwellings.</b>
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	<b>Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017 and VHAP</b>
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to private gardens. The eastern, western and southern boundaries are all adjacent to fields.
	

2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone. Residential development of 50 or more dwellings (GNLP0526) outside existing settlements would need to be consulted with Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p><i>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Enhancement Zone 2 identified by which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation. In addition, the site is within 200m of Roydon Fen Local Nature Reserve and may be subject of risks of adverse impact on ecological networks in the area.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p><i>Yes – Evidence submitted by the site promoter in 2021 indicates that vehicular access to the site can be potentially achieved from High Road (A1066) to provide a type 3 access road with the required visibility splays without the need for third party land to support a reduced form of development as SN0526REV. The representation confirmed that the narrowest part of the access is 8.8m wide. The representation also identifies an alternative access to the east of the site involving a 6m wide carriageway with 1.8m wide footways on either side of the road, however, this option would require the removal of trees, hedges and fence. The preferred access is likely to be suitable to support the proposed development subject to further highways assessment and consultation with Norfolk County Council.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p><i>Yes – A suitable pedestrian access could be potentially created as an extension from the existing pavements on High Road, subject to further highways assessment and consultation with Norfolk County Council.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p><i>Yes – A suitable cycle access could be potentially created subject to further highways assessment and consultation with Norfolk County Council.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - Right of Way/Norfolk Trail adjacent to the site</p>

<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No. <i>However as the site is a former sand quarry, further investigation on ground stability may be required.</i>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	<400m	<400m	>1200m	<400m	1600-3900m	<400m	>800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	Low sensitivity
---	-----------------

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

**Medium sensitivity** - The site is contained to the north, with residences looking onto the site. A converted residential water tower looks directly onto the site. The church tower can be seen from the site to the west. The site is in open countryside with partial views to the east and south-west into Roydon Fen and towards the built-up area of Diss.

**A Landscape Statement submitted by the site promoter in 2021 acknowledges that the most sensitive receptors to development on the site are people in the existing residential properties directly north of the site and from the converted water tower which has an elevated view of the site. The statement suggests that there is potential to mitigate effects on views from the north of the site through careful siting of the proposed housing and the use of boundary planting.**

**The statement also states that the existing dense woodland buffer would screen the majority of views to residences and public footpath (FP15) with the exception of a 20m long gap at the northern end of the woodland belt which provides an open view into the site. The assessment concludes that while the use of boundary planting could mitigate some visual effects, this would represent a landscape character effect that cannot be fully mitigated due to the loss of the existing rural view.**

## Heritage Constraints

### Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?

*Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /  
Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /  
Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation*

Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation

### Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?

*Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /  
Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /  
Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation*

**Some impact if the Tower House were to be recognised as a non-designated heritage asset, and mitigation possible**

**A Heritage Assessment submitted by the site promoter in 2021 assesses the potential impacts of the proposed residential development on the significance and setting of the Tower House if it were to be recognised as a non-designated heritage asset within the DDNP (note that the representation objects to the identification of Tower House as a non-designated heritage asset quoting a recent appeal decision at the Heights, Haslemere were Inspector and Historic England have commented on the significance of the asset). In particular, the report highlights:**

- **The original intended residential context for the Tower House as part of a 100-dwelling development**
- **The Tower House is currently appreciated alongside suburban development**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>Development on the site could be sensitively designed in keeping with the character of the surrounding context</i></li> <li>– <i>Existing views towards Tower House could be maintained through the management of building heights and positioning of development away from identified site lines</i></li> </ul>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b>	No
<b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b>	
<b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b>	<p><i>The site is adjacent to but not within Diss and Roydon built up area – classed as “Main Town”. Draft Policy 7.4 of the GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies and cumulative impact shouldn’t be negative on character and scale of settlements in cluster. GNLP draft Policy 7.5 Small Scale Windfall Housing Development: Development of up to a maximum total of 3 dwellings within each parish during the lifetime of the plan will, in principle, be permitted on sites adjacent to a development boundary or on infill sites within a recognisable group of dwellings. Self/custom build will be supported. Proposals will respect the form and character of the settlement and have no detrimental impact on the landscape and natural environment.</i></p>
<b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i>	Greenfield
<b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary

<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Full development of the site as GNLP0526 is likely to alter the liner settlement character of Roydon</i></p>
<p><b>3. Assessment of Availability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b></p> <p>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment of Viability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p> <p><i>Representation from the site promoter indicates that there are no known existing utilities apparatus within the site with the exception of a high voltage overhead electricity pole which is unlikely to be affected by the proposed development.</i></p>
<p><b>5. Conclusions</b></p>	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p><i>The site is proposed for 25 dwellings in the latest proposal as SN0526REV. However, development volume would have to be limited to maximum 15 units in line with draft policy 7.4</i></p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>

<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>This site was put forward to the LA as part of VCHAP; HELAA states: This is a greenfield site south of existing residential development along High Road, which is a former sand quarry. This may need some further investigation in terms of ground stability. Two potential highways access points between existing dwellings to get to High Road are shown, but both are narrow and it is questionable if they would be of sufficient width to support both a road and a footway and the necessary visibility splay (some third-party land may be required which has not yet been secured). Although it would have an impact on the A1066 through Diss, the potential impacts on local roads may be possible to mitigate.</p> <p>Enhancements to the sewerage and water supply network would be needed, perhaps including the closest Water Recycling Centre. Whilst the site would not affect any heritage assets, there could be townscape and design concerns: the relationship to the existing linear frontage development could be uncomfortable (accessed through the narrow links) and would need very careful design consideration to be acceptable. The site is within close proximity to Roydon Fen Local Nature Reserve and so there is some risk of adverse impact on ecological networks in the area. In addition, boundary features and woodland to south would need protection and enhancement; protected species surveys may be necessary; and a Right of Way/Norfolk Trail immediately adjacent to site would need protection and enhancement. There are at least four core services, including a primary school, within an accessible distance – mainly in Roydon. Subject to further evidence on highways impacts and access, the site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.</p> <p><b><i>An Ecological Appraisal submitted by the site promoter in 2021 concludes that the likely impacts on the majority of species can be mitigated via appropriate landscaping and scheme design, with the potential to deliver net ecological enhancement.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>  <b>The site is suitable and available</b>  <b>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</b>  <b>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <b>Yes / No</b></p>	<p><b><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available</i></b></p> <p>Unknown</p>

Summary of justification  
for rating

***The site is an agricultural land adjacent to the settlement boundary of Roydon. It is relatively well related to the settlement pattern of Roydon although full development of the site as GNLP0526 is likely to have significant impacts on its liner pattern and semi-rural character. The site is in close proximity to a range of services.***

***The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone. Residential development of 50 or more dwellings (GNLP0526) outside existing settlements would need to be consulted with Natural England.***

***Evidence submitted by the site promoter in 2021 indicates that vehicular access to the site can be potentially achieved from High Road (A1066) to provide a type 3 access road with the required visibility splays without the need for third party land to support a reduced form of development as SN0526REV. The preferred access is likely to be suitable to support the proposed development subject to further highways assessment and consultation with Norfolk County Council. The site is adjacent to the Norfolk Trail which would need to be protected and enhanced as appropriate.***

***The site is in close proximity to Roydon Fen Local Nature Reserve and is within the Network Enhancement Zone 2. Further habitats assessment may be required to ensure that development of the site will not harm the ecological network in the area and wherever possible promote habitats recreation.***

***The site has some intervisibility with existing properties and the converted water tower to the north as well as partial views to the east and southwest with Roydon Fen and the built-up area. This could be potentially mitigated through the use of boundary planting and careful siting the proposed development. Development of the site may have some mitigatable impact on the significance and setting of the Tower House if it were to be recognised as a non-designated heritage asset within the DDNP.***

***The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.***

***If the settlement boundary of Roydon was extended to include this site, taking into account emerging draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan as its reduced form, subject to mitigation of constraints related to establishing appropriate access, habitats, ecological network, views, landscape, heritage, ground stability, sewerage and water supply network, as well as the form and character of the settlement. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.***

# Scole

## 251

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	251
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	The Laurels, Diss Road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.17
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Commercial (currently used as a garage / vehicle storage area)
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	The site is proposed for 4 3-4 bedroom houses of approximately 45-60 sqm.
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan's consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	<p><b>Land directly to the south of the site (Scole Engineering):</b>                      October 2020, Planning Application (<a href="#">2020/1236</a>) approved for the change of use from the commercial use to residential use to create 6 dwellings including demolition of existing garage workshop buildings.</p> <p>Note: The site promoter has suggested that a historic planning application has been granted for residential dwellings in 1980s but AECOM is unable to verify this through Public Access (which provides cases since 1947 in South Norfolk). Nevertheless, considering the brownfield nature of the site and the significant changes in planning policy and the surrounding context, the application is likely to have limited relevance to this site assessment.</p>
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Residential and Agricultural



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk (Flood Zone 1)</p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low Risk (Only a small part of the site is subject to low risk of surface water flooding)</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> – There is potential to create a suitable access to the site through the approved site at Scole Engineering (within the same land ownership). The indicative layout of the approved site provides an access point to the site in concern, although further highways assessment and consultation with Norfolk County Council may be required.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> – There is potential to create a suitable pedestrian access extending the current pavement at Diss Road and proposed pedestrian access at Scole Engineering.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> – There is potential to create a suitable cycle access. There are no designated cycle networks in Scole.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes on boundary – the site is within the Conservation Area.</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	<400	<400	>1200	400-1200	<4000m	>800m	<400m to road network

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Low sensitivity</b> The site has few valued features and can accommodate change.</p>
--	--

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Medium sensitivity</b></p> <p>The site is screened by vegetation to the north and east but has some intervisibility with the surrounding properties, including listed buildings. The site is within the Conservation Area but there are no identified views from or to the site.</p>
--	--

## Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Some impact and mitigation possible</b></p> <p>The site is located within the Scole Conservation Area and is in close proximity to a number of Grade II listed buildings in the surrounding area. Development of the site is likely to be visible from the surrounding listed buildings but this could be potentially mitigated through the use of appropriate screening.</p> <p>The Scole Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines (December 2017) identifies the key characteristics of Scole Conservation Area as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concentration of built form at historic crossroads dominated by the Scole Inn</li> <li>• Important C14 church on raised platform</li> <li>• Key contribution of trees and openspace/recreation areas to the south</li> <li>• Modern expansion and development to east and south</li> </ul> <p>In relation to Diss Road, the Appraisal highlights the use of mix materials, particularly on the roof, of interest. The existing garages at Scole Engineering are identified as low in scale with only its forecourt having an impact on the Conservation Area, which could be improved by the use of more sympathetic advertisements, colour and surface finishes. Development of the site provides an opportunity to improve the character and setting of the Conservation Area if well designed. It should be noted that existing trees along the northern boundary of the site is generally considered to have a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>In terms of archaeological heritage, the site lies adjacent to the Scheduled Monument of Scole Roman Settlement. Evidence from the adjacent approved planning application at Scole Engineering suggests that the northern extent of this scheduled monument is unknown at present and might potentially extend into the site, according to excavation findings at the housing estate to the south of Diss Road and the A140 bypass. There is potential that heritage assets of archaeological interest will be present at the site and their significance may be adversely affected by the development subject to further archaeology assessments.</p>
--	---

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown - no map of non-designated assets available.</p>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Adopted Policy DM 1.3 The sustainable location of new development and emerging Policy 1 The Sustainable Growth Strategy</p> <p>Development of the site may lead to the loss of employment space. Policy DM2.2 of the Local Plan sets out two criteria for when to permit the loss of an employment site; these relate to either (a) the demonstration that the site is no longer viable or practical to retain as employment or (b) demonstration that the proposal would have an overriding economic, environmental or social benefit. It is assumed in this assesment that the change of use at Scole Engineering (approved planning application) will remove the existing employment premises.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Previously developed land</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>The site is adjacent and connected to the existing settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	None
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b>	Available now

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	<p>Unknown</p> <p>Considering the site's current and previous use as a former garage, the site presents a high risk of contamination that could be mobilised during construction to pollute controlled waters. The site is identified as a drinking water safeguard zone (surface water).</p>
--	---

### 5. Conclusions

<b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b>	4 dwellings
<b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b>	0-5 years
<b>Other key information</b>	N/A
<b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i>	<p><b><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available</i></b></p> <p>Unknown</p>

<b>Summary of justification for rating</b>	<p>The site is a previously developed garage adjacent to the committed development at Scole Engineering under the same land ownership. It is adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Scole.</p> <p>The site is within Scole Conservation Area and may contain heritage assets of archaeological interest. Further heritage and archaeological assessments would be required.</p> <p>Development of the site may lead to the loss of employment space and would need to comply with Policy DM2.2 of the Local Plan in demonstrating that the site is no longer viable or practical to retain as employment space.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Scole was extended to include this site taking into account draft Local Plan policy 7.2, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints in relation to heritage, archaeology, remediation and the loss of employment space.</p>
--	--

## SN4022 / DDNP11

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	SN4022 / <b>DDNP11 (southern part of SN4022)</b>
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	East of Norwich Road, Scole
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	SN4022: 5.20 / <b>DDNP11: 2.7</b>
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Large flat agricultural field
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	130 dwellings ( <b>DDNP11: No proposed capacity for the alternative boundary put forward</b> )
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted to Local Authority as part of GNLP Call for sites March 2020*
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern and eastern boundaries are adjacent to fields. The southern boundary is adjacent to site GNLP0511 and other housing. The western boundary is adjacent to Norwich Road.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.*

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Medium Risk*

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Expansion Zone which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access could be easily gained from Norwich Road</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access could be easily gained from Norwich Road</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - access could be easily gained from Norwich Road</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes - Public Right of Way through the site</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
---	---------

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
--	----

<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
--	----

<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
---	----

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	<400m	>1200m	<400m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low sensitivity - no identifiable landscape features in the site</p>
---	---

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low sensitivity</i> - site is screened from view from Norwich Road.</p>
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i> - 2 Grade II listed buildings adjacent to the site</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Scale - is classed as “village cluster” of its own, therefore draft policy 7.4 Housing target = 25 additional dwellings. Policy 7.4 of the <b>draft</b> GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies and cumulative impact should not be negative on character and scale of settlements in cluster. However, draft policy 7.5 states that development is acceptable if maximum of 3 dwellings within each parish during lifetime of plan is on sites adjacent to development boundary or infill sites within recognisable group of dwellings to respect form and character of the settlement as well as no detrimental impact on landscape / environment.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p><b>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p><b>Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary</b></p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>SN4022: <b>Yes</b></p> <p><b><i>DDNP11: No. However, considering the site's location at the fringe of settlement, the provision of appropriate landscape buffers to the northern and eastern boundary might be required to provide a soft edge to the development.</i></b></p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	Available now / 0-5 years

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
--	---------

### 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<i>The site is promoted for 130 dwellings but partial allocation as SN4022 is recommended</i>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	0-5
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	This site was put forward to the LA as part of VCHAP; The site is adjacent to a housing allocation (SCO1).
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b> <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><b>The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>

<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This large flat agricultural field is available. The site is in close proximity to Scole Primary School and is located on the edge of the built-up area of Scole.</p> <p>Traffic noise is clearly audible from the A140 dual carriageway, whereby development would potentially require additional noise attenuation.</p> <p>The site is served by footpath along Norwich Road. There is currently no access to the site although access could be gained from Norwich Road.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk to surface water flooding and therefore mitigation is required if the site is developed. In addition, a Public Right of Way runs through the site and therefore needs to be considered at detailed design stage.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the remarkable timber-frame Grade II listed High House on Norwich Road. Development of the whole site would significantly extend the village to the north along Norwich Road, however the site is screened from view from Norwich Road. The site contains no identifiable landscape features within the field. The site is adjacent to an unbuilt Local Plan residential allocation.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Scole. If the settlement boundary was extended to include this site <b>following discussions with South Norfolk Council</b>, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to establishing appropriate access, noise attenuation, heritage assets, surface water flooding and a Public Right of Way which runs through the site. If the full site was allocated, this would impact on the character of the settlement. Therefore, partial allocation is recommended. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p> <p><b><i>An alternative boundary has been put forward as part of the DDNP's Regulation 14 consultation which proposes partial development of the site concentrated on the southern part of the development. This is in line with the recommendations of this assessment for partial allocation to limit impact on the character of the settlement. Considering the site's location at the fringe of settlement, the provision of appropriate landscape buffers to the northern and eastern boundary might be required to provide a soft edge to the development.</i></b></p>
---	--

## SN4023 / GNLP0338 / GNLP0338R

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	SN4023 / GNLP0338 / GNLP0338R
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	South of Bungay Road, Scole
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	8.22. <b><i>A reduced form of the site focused at the northwestern corner is considered as GNLP0338 (1.45 Ha) and GNLP0338R (0.59 Ha) as part of the HELAA 2017 and 2018 Addendum.</i></b>
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	<b><i>GNLP0338R</i></b>
<b>Existing land use</b>	Partly agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	<b><i>SN4023: 206 dwellings</i></b> <b><i>GNLP0338:35-45 dwellings</i></b> <b><i>GNLP0338R:10-14 dwellings</i></b>
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted to Local Authority as part of GNLP Call for sites March 2020 *
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern and eastern boundary is adjacent to Bungay Road. The southern boundary is adjacent to the A143. The western boundary is adjacent to a field and private gardens.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?

**No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.**

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

**No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.**

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

**No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.**

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: **Low Risk**
- Flood Zone 2: **Medium Risk**
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): **Medium Risk**
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): **High Risk**

**Low Risk** - However in close proximity to area within Flood Zone 2 and 3

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – **Low Risk**
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – **Medium Risk**

**Low Risk** - However in close proximity to area within medium and high risk of surface water flooding

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

**Part of the site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.**

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p><i>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Enhancement Zone 1 and 2 which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - site has the potential to be accessed from the A143 or Bungay Road</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - site has the potential to be accessed from the A143 or Bungay Road</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - site has the potential to be accessed from the A143 or Bungay Road</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability							
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>				No			
<b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>				No			
<b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>				No			
<b>Accessibility</b> Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.							
<b>Facilities</b>	<b>Town / local centre / shop</b>	<b>Bus / Tram Stop</b>	<b>Train station</b>	<b>Primary School</b>	<b>Secondary School</b>	<b>Open Space / recreation facilities</b>	<b>Cycle Route</b>
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	>1200m	<400m	>1200m	<400m	>3900m	<400m	>800m
<b>Landscape and Visual Constraints</b> This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.							
<b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>				Low sensitivity - no identifiable landscape features in the site			
<b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>				Low sensitivity - site is screened from view from Norwich Road.			
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>							
<b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b>							

<i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b>	No
<b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b>	
<b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b>	Scole - is classed as "village cluster" of its own, therefore draft policy 7.4 applies. Policy 7.4 of the GNLP states that if the development is located adjacent to a settlement boundary of a village cluster it is only acceptable if affordable led with element of market housing if necessary for viability, up to 15 max in total, with good access to services incl. safe routes to schools, subject to other policies and cumulative impact shouldn't be negative on character and scale of settlements in cluster. However, draft policy 7.5 states that development is acceptable if maximum of 3 dwellings within each parish during lifetime of plan is on sites adjacent to development boundary or infill sites within recognisable group of dwellings to respect form and character of the settlement as well as no detrimental impact on landscape / environment.
<b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i>	Greenfield
<b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary
<b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	<b>Yes – Full development of the site as SN4023 will significantly change the size and character of Scole.</b>

3. Assessment of Availability	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	Available now / 0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
<p><b>What is the expected Development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p><i>The site is promoted for a range of sizes from 10 to 206 dwellings. If the settlement boundary of Scole is extended to include the site as GNLP0338, the site may be potentially suitable for 35-45 dwellings (proposed by the site promoter). If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</i></p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	0-5
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	This site was put forward to the LA as part of VCHAP;
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available</b>. The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available</b>. <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><b>The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>

<b>Summary of justification for rating</b>	<p>The site contains a farmhouse and barns adjacent to the built-up area of Scole with two fields that extend from the village to Bungay Road. The site is available.</p> <p>The site currently has no access although the site has the potential to be accessed from the A143 or Bungay Road.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is located within the River Valleys Extents where proposed development must have regard to Policy DM 4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys.</p> <p>Development of the whole site would significantly extend the village to the southeast towards Bungay Road. There is potential to develop the previously development land (PDL) part of the site and smaller paddock to the rear to continue and round off the built-up form of the village.</p> <p>Development of the whole site would significantly extend the village to the A143 and would require noise attenuation along Bungay Road due to proximity to the highway.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Scole. If the settlement boundary was extended to include this site, the site is potentially appropriate for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to establishing appropriate access, landscape, environment, scale, form and character of the settlement. As full allocation of the site would significantly alter the character of the settlement, partial allocation in keeping with the settlement form is recommended. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5, once the GNLP is adopted.</p>
--	---

# Brome and Oakley

## SS1011 / DDNP14 / Site 9

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	9 / <b>SS1011 / DDNP14 (southern part of the site)</b>
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Lower Oakly, plot A. Brome and Oakley / <b>Land north of B1118, Oakley</b>
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.00 ( <b>SS1011/DDNP14: 0.41</b> )
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	<b>SS1011</b>
<b>Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan SHELAA Report October 2020 Conclusions Assessment Findings</b>	<p><b>Site is potentially considered suitable for residential development taking identified constraints into account – Estimated yield: 10 dwellings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Suitability: Site is potentially suitable, but the following considerations would require further assessment:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>Highways: regarding access, footpaths and infrastructure required</b></li> <li>– <b>Heritage: potential impact upon heritage assets</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Availability: Land is under single ownership and is available in 0-5 years. Site has not been marketed. Submitted by agent on behalf of landowner.</b></li> <li>• <b>Achievability: The submission confirms that there are no legal restrictions on the land and no known abnormal costs which would affect viability</b></li> </ul>
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	9 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to a field and residential garden. The eastern boundary is adjacent to Low Road and the southern boundary is adjacent to B1118. The western boundary is adjacent to a residential property.



**2. Assessment of Suitability**

**Environmental Constraints**

<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes</b> – Natural England has confirmed that the site entirely comprise of priority habitat (Coastal and Flood Plain Grazing Marsh) where the loss of priority habitat is unavoidable.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> While the site that Natural England has investigated (i.e. SS1011) only make up the southern half of the site, the entire site (i.e. Site 9) is identified as a Priority Habitat (Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh) on MAGIC.</p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p>	<p>Low Risk</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b> See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Medium Risk</i></p>
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> - Grade 3 (Source: DEFRA – does not specify Grade 3a or 3b)</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes – Natural England has confirmed that the site entirely comprise of priority habitat (Coastal and Flood Plain Grazing Marsh) where the loss of priority habitat is unavoidable.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><i>Flat or relatively flat</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> - no access onto the Low Road or Lower Oakley, there is however potential to create access onto Lower Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> - no access onto the Low Road or Lower Oakley, there is however potential to create access onto Lower Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. The site is not served by a continuous footway at present.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> - no access onto the Low Road or Lower Oakley, there is however potential to create access onto Lower Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>

<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

#### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

#### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

**Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?**

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

**Medium Sensitivity - Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (September 2020) considers the site to have medium landscape sensitivity to residential development. This is elevated by the presence of priority habitat floodplain grazing marsh which creates a semi-natural character and its localised visual prominence. The development of the site is considered to be unlikely to significantly alter the existing settlement pattern. The site falls within the Special Landscape Areas. Policy CL2 of the saved Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that particular care will be taken to safeguard landscape quality within special landscape areas, and where development does occur it should be sensitively designed, with high standards of layout, materials and landscaping.**

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>High sensitivity</b> - the site is visible on approach to Oakley from Low Road and the B118. The site is part of the rolling valley open countryside landscape of the River Waveney valley.</p>
<p><b>Heritage Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>The site is situated partially within and partially adjacent to Oakley. Oakley is identified as a Hamlet Village in the BMDSDC Joint Local Plan Draft Policy SP03 where development within settlement boundaries is supported. However, draft policy SP03 is now subject to major modifications.</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within the existing settlement boundary / Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary - the site is partially within and partially adjacent to the settlement boundary</p>

<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No <i>Development of the site would reduce the sense of separation between Oakley to the west and more dispersed and isolated residential properties to the east along the B1118 including Low Farm, however it would not need to significant coalescence.</i></p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p>Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Is there a known time frame for availability? Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
---	----------------

### 5. Conclusions

<p>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</p>	<p><math>1 \times 0.85 = 0.85</math>. <math>0.85 \times 25 = 21.25 = 21</math> dwellings However development of full site would have cumulative impact on scale and character of settlement therefore lower number is recommended</p>
<p>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p>Other key information</p>	<p>Not included in the VCHAP schedule of sites</p>
<p>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><b><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</i></b>  Unknown</p>

Summary of justification for rating	<p><b><i>The site is a flat agricultural field available adjacent to the built-up area of Oakley. It is not in close proximity to services and facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The site entirely comprises of priority habitats (Coastal and Flood Plain Grazing Marsh) where its loss is unavoidable if developed. Development of the site would be in contrary to Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that Local Planning Authorities should refuse planning permission if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for. This Site Assessment shows that alternative sites with less harmful impacts are potentially suitable and available within the Diss and District Neighbourhood Planning Area. Allocation of the site for residential use in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan may also be contrary to Paragraph 179 of the NPPF which states that plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The site is located on the valley floor in a Special Landscape Area. Policy CL2 of the saved Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that particular care will be taken to safeguard landscape quality within special landscape areas, and where development does occur it should be sensitively designed, with high standards of layout, materials and landscaping. The site is considered to be of medium landscape sensitivity and highly visual sensitivity due to its prominence on approach to Oakley. Development of the site would reduce the sense of separation between Oakley to the west and more dispersed and isolated residential properties to the east along the B1118 including Low Farm, however it would not need to significant coalescence.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The site is subject to medium risk of surface water flooding.</i></b></p>
-------------------------------------	---

## SS0542 / DDNP15 / Site 10

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 10
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Lower Oakly, plot B. Brome and Oakley <i>(SS0542/DDNP15: Land north of B1118, Oakley)</i>
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.69 <i>(SS0542/DDNP15: 0.20 Ha)</i>
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	Reference: 0054/97/OL. Address: Land at North Lodge Lower Oakley. Application proposal: Severance of garden for erection of two storey house with garage, construction of new vehicular access and provision of private foul drainage system. Decision: refused (September 1997). Reason for refusal not stated.
<b>Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan SHELAA Report October 2020 Conclusions Assessment Findings</b>	<p><b>SS0542 (Land south of the B1118, Brome and Oakley) which forms the western part of Site 10:</b>  <i>The site is potentially considered suitable for residential development taking identified constraints into consideration – Estimated yield: 5 dwellings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Suitability:</b> <i>Site is potentially considered suitable, but the following constraints would require further investigation:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>Highways</b> – <i>regarding access, footpaths and infrastructure required</i></li> <li>– <b>Heritage</b> – <i>impact upon heritage assets required</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Availability:</b> <i>Land has not been marketed. Site is under single ownership and available within 0-5 years</i></li> <li>• <b>Achievability:</b> <i>The submission confirms that there are no legal restrictions on the land and no known abnormal costs which would affect viability</i></li> </ul>
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to the B1118 (Lower Oakly). The eastern and southern boundaries are adjacent to fields. The western boundary is adjacent to Upper Oakley Road.



**2. Assessment of Suitability**

**Environmental Constraints**

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**  
 Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**  
 Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**  
 Yes / No

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b><i>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Enhancement Zone 2 identified by which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CS5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><i>Gently sloping or uneven</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> - site access could be gained from the B118 (Lower Oakley) <b><i>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> - site access could be gained from the B118 (Lower Oakley) <b><i>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. The site is not served by a continuous footway at present.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i> - site access could be gained from the B118 (Lower Oakley) <b><i>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</i></b></p>

<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<i>The site is in close proximity to a water recycling centre (AW142 Oakley - Dross Ln Stw). It would need to be demonstrated that development of the site would not prejudice or be prejudiced by the waste management facility in accordance with Policy WP18 of the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</i>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

**Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?**

- Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.*
- Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.*
- High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.*

**High sensitivity**

*The Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (September 2020) considers the western parcel to have medium landscape sensitivity to residential development. This is elevated by the the setting provided to the adjacent Grade II listed building and its localised visual prominence. The development of the site is considered to be unlikely to significant alter the existing settlement pattern due to its compact size and adjacency to existing residential dwellings to its east and west. The Landscape Sensitivity Assesment have not considered the eastern parcel of the site.*

	<p><i>Full development of the site is likely to have a significant impact on the landscape character of this part of Oakley as it would represent a deep encroachment into the open countryside without any defensible boundaries.</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p>High sensitivity</p>
<p><b>Heritage Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible - Grade II listed Weaver's Cottage situated between sites.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>The site is situated partially within and partially adjacent to Oakley. Oakley is identified as a Hamlet Village in the BMDSDC Joint Local Plan Draft Policy SP03 where development within settlement boundaries is supported. However, draft policy SP03 is now subject to major modifications.</i></p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>

<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Within the existing settlement boundary (western parcel) / Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary (eastern parcel)</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No <i>Development of the site would reduce the sense of separation between Oakley to the west and more dispersed and isolated residential properties to the east along the B1118 including Low Farm, however it would not need to significant coalescence.</i></p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
--	----------------

### 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>0.22x25=5.5 = 6 dwellings and 0.47x25=11.75=12 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included in the VCHAP schedule of sites</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p>Western parcel: <b>The site is potentially suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Eastern parcel: <b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>

<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>Both greenfield parcels are available for development. The western parcel is adjacent to the built-up area of Oakley and is within the existing settlement boundary. The eastern parcel is adjacent to the settlement boundary. The site is not in close proximity to any services nor town centre and therefore is not the most suitable site in terms of accessibility. There is currently no access onto the site although access could be gained from the B118 (Lower Oakley).</p> <p>The site is located in open countryside and split into two separate parcels either side of the Grade II listed Weaver's Cottage.</p> <p>The sites are gently sloping and part of a larger steeply sloping valley land form. The sites form part of the rolling valley landscape, where development of the whole site would impact on landscape and character of the village and the setting of the listed building. The eastern parcel is not contained and is sited in open countryside. The village of Oakley is largely ribbon development on the valley floor on the north side of the B118.</p> <p>Both parcels could be brought into the settlement boundary through allocation, subject to agreement from the local authority.</p> <p><b><i>The site is in close proximity to a water recycling centre (AW142 Oakley - Dross Ln Stw). It would need to be demonstrated that development of the site would not prejudice or be prejudiced by the waste management facility in accordance with Policy WP18 of the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</i></b></p> <p>Due to its location and constraints, the western parcel is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to making appropriate access, subject to meeting relevant Plan policies, subject to sympathetic design minimising the impact on the setting of the heritage asset and village in the Waveney valley landscape, and subject to mitigation of impacts on habitats.</p> <p>Development of the eastern parcel of the site is not suitable due to its likely landscape impact (location of development on bottom of rolling valley land form); impact of development on valley views and setting of village along the valley floor; extension of ribbon development of the village to the east <b><i>encroaching into the open countryside</i></b>; and impact on the setting of a grade II listed building on approach to the village.</p>
---	--

## Site 11a

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 11a
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Brome - Brome and Oakley ( <i>Land south of Tanglewood</i> )
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.13
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to Upper Oakley. The eastern, southern and western boundaries are all adjacent to fields.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p><i>See guidance notes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p><i>See guidance notes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Medium Risk</i></p>
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes - Grade 2</i></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown. Further habitats survey may be required.</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No

**Accessibility**  
 Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
 This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p style="color: red;"><b>High sensitivity</b> - The site is located at an agricultural access point to a wider arable agricultural field, at a gap where expansive views can be seen in a special landscape area towards woodland of the River Dove valley to the south-east. The site is adjacent to a number of listed buildings in a special landscape area.</p> <p><b>Policy CL2 of the saved Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that particular care will be taken to safeguard landscape quality within special landscape areas, and where development does occur it should be sensitively designed, with high standards of layout, materials and landscaping.</b></p>
<b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p style="color: red;"><b>High sensitivity</b> - The site is located at an agricultural access point to a wider arable agricultural field, at a gap where expansive views can be seen in a special landscape area towards woodland of the River Dove valley to the south-east.</p>

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</b> - close to 3 Grade II listed buildings</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><b>Draft Policy LP01 (currently proposed for significant modification) states that proposals for windfall development within dwelling clusters may be acceptable provided that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>It would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the settlement, landscape (including the AONB), residential amenity or any heritage, environmental or community assets.</b></li> <li>• <b>It would not result in consolidating sporadic or ribbon development or result in loss of gaps between settlements resulting in coalescence. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the location, context and infrastructure is considered acceptable.</b></li> <li>• <b>The scale of development is infill only for a single dwelling and or pair of semi-detached dwellings.</b></li> <li>• <b>Special regard shall be given to development proposals preserving and enhancing the AONB and to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity affected by the proposal.</b></li> <li>• <b>All new development will be expected to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through implementation of sustainable construction practices and renewable energy technologies.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area</p>

<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>3. Assessment of Availability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment of Viability</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>5. Conclusions</b></p>	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>0.13x25=3.25=3 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included in the VCHAP schedule of sites</p>

<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>This greenfield site is available for development. The site is located in open countryside.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p> <p>The site currently has no access. However, access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is not in close proximity to any services or facilities.</p> <p>The site is located at an agricultural access point to a wider arable agricultural field, at a gap where expansive views can be seen in a special landscape area towards woodland of the River Dove valley to the south-east. The site is adjacent to a number of listed buildings in a Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome and also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway. Overall, due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services and constraints relating to the visual and landscape sensitivity of this site, it is not appropriate for development and therefore should not be considered as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## Site 11b

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 11b
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Brome - Brome and Oakley ( <i>Land north of the Old Post Office</i> )
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.24
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to Upper Oakley. The eastern, southern and western boundaries are all adjacent to fields.
	

2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Medium Risk</i></p>

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - Grade 2</p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, however the site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats.</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><b>Flat or relatively flat</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
<b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No

**Accessibility**  
 Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
 This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p style="color: #FFD700; margin: 0;"><b>Medium sensitivity / High sensitivity</b> - due to its rural setting among clusters of woodland and gently sloping river valley landscape of the River Dove. Development of the site would impact on the setting of Upper Oakley in an area of medium to high landscape value. <b>The site is located within the Special Landscape Area. Policy CL2 of the saved Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that particular care will be taken to safeguard landscape quality within special landscape areas, and where development does occur it should be sensitively designed, with high standards of layout, materials and landscaping.</b></p>
--	---

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>High sensitivity</b> – the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape and from the Public Rights of Way network in close proximity. The site is also located at an elevated position visible from the open countryside.</p>
Heritage Constraints	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible - close to 3 Grade II listed buildings</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>Draft Policy LP01 (currently proposed for significant modification) states that proposals for windfall development within dwelling clusters may be acceptable provided that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the settlement, landscape (including the AONB), residential amenity or any heritage, environmental or community assets.</i></li> <li>• <i>It would not result in consolidating sporadic or ribbon development or result in loss of gaps between settlements resulting in coalescence. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the location, context and infrastructure is considered acceptable.</i></li> <li>• <i>The scale of development is infill only for a single dwelling and or pair of semi-detached dwellings.</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Special regard shall be given to development proposals preserving and enhancing the AONB and to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity affected by the proposal.</b></li> <li>• <b>All new development will be expected to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through implementation of sustainable construction practices and renewable energy technologies.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Outside and not connected to the existing built up area
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	Available now / 0-5 years

#### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
---	----------------

#### 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected Development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>1.24x0.85=1.054x25=26.35=26 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b>                   Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The greenfield site is available for development. The site is flat arable agricultural land with agricultural access located in open countryside. The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. There is currently no access to the site but access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required. Although the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat Network which is a potential constraint in terms of the potential for harmful effects from development, this could also be a potential benefit as the development could contribute to the habitat corridor through incorporating open space, planted screening etc.</p> <p>The site is within a Special Landscape Area and is part of a wider field with expansive views towards woodland to the south.</p> <p>The site is a gap in tree cover that is characteristic of the area, with expansive views of agricultural fields and adjacent deciduous woodland due to the field</p>

---

	<p>having no hedgerow along the road frontage. The site has medium to high landscape sensitivity and visual amenity due to its rural setting among clusters of woodland and gently sloping river valley landscape of the River Dove.</p> <p>Development of the site would impact on the setting of Upper Oakley in an area of medium to high landscape value.</p> <p>The is outside of and remote from the settlement boundary and also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway.</p> <p>To conclude, due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services, as well as the high visual and landscape sensitivity of this site, it is not appropriate for development and therefore should not be considered as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
--	---

---

## Site 11c

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 11c
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Brome - Brome and Oakley ( <i>Land north of Rose Farm</i> )
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.25
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to a field. The eastern boundary is adjacent to Oakley Church Lane. The southern boundary is adjacent to Upper Oakley. The western boundary is adjacent to a field and farmhouse buildings.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*No*

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Medium Risk*

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - Grade 2 and Grade 3 (Source: DEFRA – does not specify Grade 3a or 3b)</p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, however the site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats.</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><b>Flat or relatively flat</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</li> <li><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</li> <li><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</li> </ul>	Low sensitivity
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</li> </ul>	<p><b>High sensitivity</b> - The site is located in a gap in open countryside in the hamlet of Upper Oakley. The site is open on approach and is part of a wider field with views across the field due to a lack of hedgerows on the eastern and southern boundaries.</p>

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>Draft Policy LP01 (currently proposed for significant modification) states that proposals for windfall development within dwelling clusters may be acceptable provided that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the settlement, landscape (including the AONB), residential amenity or any heritage, environmental or community assets.</i></li> <li>• <i>It would not result in consolidating sporadic or ribbon development or result in loss of gaps between settlements resulting in coalescence. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the location, context and infrastructure is considered acceptable.</i></li> <li>• <i>The scale of development is infill only for a single dwelling and or pair of semi-detached dwellings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Special regard shall be given to development proposals preserving and enhancing the AONB and to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity affected by the proposal.</i></li> <li>• <i>All new development will be expected to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through implementation of sustainable construction practices and renewable energy technologies.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>

## 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
--	----------------

## 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected Development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>0.25x25=6.25=6 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>

<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The greenfield site is available for development. The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. There is currently no access to the site but access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p> <p>The site is located adjacent and in close proximity to three Grade II listed buildings and is located at the beginning of Church Lane, which leads to the Grade II* listed Church of St Nicholas.</p> <p>The site is located in a gap in open countryside. The site is open on approach and is part of a wider field with views across the field due to a lack of hedgerows on the eastern and southern boundaries.</p> <p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome. It is also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting an existing adopted highway. Due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services, as well as due to the high visual sensitivity of this site, it is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## Site 12a

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 12a
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Brome - Brome and Oakley ( <i>Land north of Tanglewood</i> )
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.52
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to Upper Oakley. The eastern, southern, and western boundaries are adjacent to fields.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*No*

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Medium Risk*

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - all Grade 2</p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, however the site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><b>Flat or relatively flat</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Medium sensitivity – The site is located within the Special Landscape Area.</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Low sensitivity</b></p>

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible - Grade II listed building adjacent to the site</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>Draft Policy LP01 (currently proposed for significant modification) states that proposals for windfall development within dwelling clusters may be acceptable provided that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>It would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the settlement, landscape (including the AONB), residential amenity or any heritage, environmental or community assets.</i></li> <li><i>It would not result in consolidating sporadic or ribbon development or result in loss of gaps between settlements resulting in coalescence. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the location, context and infrastructure is considered acceptable.</i></li> <li><i>The scale of development is infill only for a single dwelling and or pair of semi-detached dwellings.</i></li> <li><i>Special regard shall be given to development proposals preserving and enhancing the AONB and to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity affected by the proposal.</i></li> <li><i>All new development will be expected to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through implementation of sustainable construction practices and renewable energy technologies.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>

## 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>

## 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
---	----------------

## 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>0.52x0.85=0.442x25=11.05=11 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included in the VCHAP schedule of sites</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The greenfield site is available for development.</p> <p>The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. There is currently no access to the site, but access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to three residential properties, one of which is Grade II listed, and is a vacant paddock.</p> <p>The site is located in a special landscape area. The site is contained and does not contain any identifiable landscape features.</p> <p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome. It is also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway.</p> <p>Due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services, as well as due to the high landscape sensitivity of this site, it is not appropriate for development and therefore is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## Site 12b

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 12b
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Brome - Brome and Oakley ( <i>Land at Upper Oakley adjacent to 12 High Street</i> )
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.34
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The southern boundary is adjacent to Upper Oakley. The eastern, northern and western boundaries are adjacent to fields.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*No*

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Medium Risk*

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - all Grade 2</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, however the site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><b>Flat or relatively flat</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	Low sensitivity - no identifiable landscape features
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	Low sensitivity

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible - site is adjacent to a number of listed buildings.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>Draft Policy LP01 (currently proposed for significant modification) states that proposals for windfall development within dwelling clusters may be acceptable provided that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>It would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the settlement, landscape (including the AONB), residential amenity or any heritage, environmental or community assets.</i></li> <li><i>It would not result in consolidating sporadic or ribbon development or result in loss of gaps between settlements resulting in coalescence. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the location, context and infrastructure is considered acceptable.</i></li> <li><i>The scale of development is infill only for a single dwelling and or pair of semi-detached dwellings.</i></li> <li><i>Special regard shall be given to development proposals preserving and enhancing the AONB and to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity affected by the proposal.</i></li> <li><i>All new development will be expected to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through implementation of sustainable construction practices and renewable energy technologies.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

**Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?**

*Within / Adjacent to and connected to /  
 Outside and not connected to*

Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary.

**Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

No

**Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

Unknown

## 3. Assessment of Availability

**Is the site available for development?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

Yes

**Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

Unknown

**Is there a known time frame for availability?**

**Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years**

Available now / 0-5 years

## 4. Assessment of Viability

**Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

Unknown

## 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>1.34x0.85=1.139x25=28.475=28 dwellings (AECOM calculation based on 25 dph)</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included in the Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan schedule of sites</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The greenfield site is available for development. The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. The site is part of a wider arable agricultural field and has agricultural access. There is currently no access to the site but access could be gained from Upper Oakley.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore significant mitigation would be required.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to a number of listed buildings in a special landscape area. The site is located in open countryside. The site does not contain any identifiable landscape features and is screened from view along the road frontage of Upper Oakley.</p> <p>Development of the site would constitute ribbon development along Upper Oakley. Policy LP01 states that proposals which would consolidate sporadic or ribbon development or the infilling of large gaps or extending edges, will be resisted.</p> <p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome. It is also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway.</p> <p>Due to its location in open countryside, disconnected from the settlement and local services and due to development of the site constituting ribbon development, the site is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## Site 12c

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 12c
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Brome - Brome and Oakley ( <i>Land north of Ivy House</i> )
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.70
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Not known
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	<i>No recent or relevant planning applications but a recent planning permission at Site 12d should be considered as part of the site context: April 2021, Full Planning Permission Granted (DC/21/01192) for the conversion of and extension to single storey barn to create 1 no. dwelling house with associated landscaping and sewage package treatment plant.</i>
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern, eastern and southern boundaries are all adjacent to fields. The western boundary is adjacent to a farmhouse (site 12d, <i>note recent planning permission for conversion to 1 dwelling</i> ) as well as fields.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*No*

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Medium Risk*

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - all Grade 2</p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, however the site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><b>Flat or relatively flat</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	Judgement cannot be made as cannot access the site or view the site from Google Earth
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	Judgement cannot be made as cannot access the site or view the site from Google Earth

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>Draft Policy LP01 (currently proposed for significant modification) states that proposals for windfall development within dwelling clusters may be acceptable provided that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the settlement, landscape (including the AONB), residential amenity or any heritage, environmental or community assets.</i></li> <li>• <i>It would not result in consolidating sporadic or ribbon development or result in loss of gaps between settlements resulting in coalescence. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the location, context and infrastructure is considered acceptable.</i></li> <li>• <i>The scale of development is infill only for a single dwelling and or pair of semi-detached dwellings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Special regard shall be given to development proposals preserving and enhancing the AONB and to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity affected by the proposal.</i></li> <li>• <i>All new development will be expected to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through implementation of sustainable construction practices and renewable energy technologies.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>

## 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now / 0-5 years</p>

## 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
---	----------------

## 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>1.70x0.85=1.445x25=36.125=36 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included in the VCHAP schedule of sites</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The site is greenfield, arable agricultural land in close proximity to a farmhouse and barns but removed from the built-up area of Brome. The site is available for development.</p> <p>The site could not be visited as it doesn't have a road frontage and is private land accessed through the farmyard. The site does not have direct access to the road.</p> <p>The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole.</p> <p>The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and therefore mitigation would be required if developed. Development of the whole site would be of a scale that has potential to impact on the character and setting of the settlement of Brome.</p> <p>The site is outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Brome. It is also not located within a cluster of at least ten dwellings adjacent to or fronting and existing adopted highway.</p> <p>Due to its location disconnected from the settlement and local services, lack of access and potential impact on the character and setting of the settlement, this site is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## Site 13

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	Site 13
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Brickle Meadow, Brome and Oakley
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	3.64
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	n/a
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Housing
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	25 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan Issues and Options consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	None of relevance
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	The northern boundary is adjacent to Upper Oakley. The eastern, southern and western boundary are also adjacent to fields.
	

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent*

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)\*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

*\*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

*No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:**

*Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown*

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

*No*

**Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?**

*Yes / No*

*No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.*

**Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?**

*See guidance notes:*

- Flood Zone 1: *Low Risk*
- Flood Zone 2: *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): *Medium Risk*
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): *High Risk*

*Low Risk*

**Site is at risk of surface water flooding?**

*See guidance notes:*

- *Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk*
- *>15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk*

*Low Risk*

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - Grade 2</p>
<p><b>2. Assessment of Suitability</b></p>	
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife- rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, however the site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats</b></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Physical Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p><b>Flat or relatively flat</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> - site access could be gained from Upper Oakley <b>subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required.</b></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	>800m	>1200m	>1200m	>3900m	<400m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	Low sensitivity
<p><b>Is the site low , medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	Low sensitivity - the site is removed and screened from the built-up area of the hamlet by woodland along The Avenue and The Street

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i> - Grade II listed building named the bungalow is in close proximity to the site. Grade II Estate lodge cottage within the wider field</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b> <i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>
<p><b>Planning Policy Constraints</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p><i>Draft Policy LP01 (currently proposed for significant modification) states that proposals for windfall development within dwelling clusters may be acceptable provided that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the settlement, landscape (including the AONB), residential amenity or any heritage, environmental or community assets.</i></li> <li>• <i>It would not result in consolidating sporadic or ribbon development or result in loss of gaps between settlements resulting in coalescence. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the location, context and infrastructure is considered acceptable.</i></li> <li>• <i>The scale of development is infill only for a single dwelling and or pair of semi-detached dwellings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Special regard shall be given to development proposals preserving and enhancing the AONB and to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity affected by the proposal.</i></li> <li>• <i>All new development will be expected to minimise dependence on fossil fuels and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of climate change through implementation of sustainable construction practices and renewable energy technologies.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

**Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?**

*Within / Adjacent to and connected to /  
 Outside and not connected to*

Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary

**Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

No

**Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

Unknown

## 3. Assessment of Availability

**Is the site available for development?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

Yes

**Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

Unknown

**Is there a known time frame for availability?  
 Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years**

Available now / 0-5 years

## 4. Assessment of Viability

**Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?**

*Yes / No / Unknown*

Unknown

## 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected Development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>3.64x0.75=2.73x25=68.25=68 dwellings (AECOM calculation based on 25 dph)</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>Not included in the VCHAP schedule of sites; Neighbourhood Group states that: This site was put forward as the preferred option in the issues &amp; options consultation. The Landowner has provided AECOM with a drawing of what a development on the site could look like.</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                  Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>Unknown</p>

**Summary of justification for rating**

This meadow /paddock is available for development. The site is not in close proximity to services, facilities nor the town centre of Diss or Scole. There is currently no access to the site, but access could be gained from Upper Oakley. The site is in close proximity to the built-up area of The Street in Brome. However, the site is removed and screened from the built-up area of the hamlet by woodland along The Avenue and The Street.

The wider field contains the Grade II listed Estate lodge cottage, with the site being part of the wider estate of Brome Hall. There is a single tree in the centre of the site, with the site being largely contained and screened by mature trees on three sides. Development of the site would be a scale that could be considered large enough to physically change the size and character of the existing settlement of Brome.

Development of the site has potential to impact on the character and setting of the heritage asset, planned layout of the wider estate and the settlement of Brome. The site owner has provided AECOM with a drawing of what the potential development could look like and the number of dwellings proposed for the site.

As the site is adjacent to the settlement boundary, it could be brought into the settlement boundary through allocation, subject to agreement from the local authority. However, due to its location removed and screened from the built-up area and remote from services, the potential impact on the size and character of the existing settlement and on the character and setting of a heritage asset, the site is assessed as not appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

# Palgrave

## PAL01

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	PAL01
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land to the east of Priory Road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.67
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Proposed for up to 8 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	Land to the north of the site: January 2018, Outline planning application (DC/17/03178) granted for the erection of 9 dwellings.
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Residential to the north (under construction), an existing woodland to its west and agricultural fields to all other directions



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed capacity (below 50 dwellings) does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk - the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Enhancement Zone 1 identified by which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CS5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Gently sloping</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. Vehicular access can be facilitated through a private road (Gassock Drive) from the adjoining development. The private road is of adequate width and has an existing visibility splay to serve the level of development proposed, subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. Information submitted through the planning application (DC/17/03178) indicates that Gassock Drive is in the same ownership but further confirmation may be required to confirm access.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable pedestrian access could be potentially created subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. The site is served by a pedestrian network along Priory Road although a segregated pavement is not available along Gassock Drive. Pedestrians would be accessing the site through 30mph residential roads common in Palgrave.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable cycle access could be potentially created although there are no segregated cycle paths in Palgrave.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PROW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no veteran or ancient trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no significant trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Further assessments would be required. However, it is unlikely that the site is affected by ground contamination as an undeveloped greenfield.</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	<400m	>1200m	400-1200m *A new primary school is proposed at PAL06	>3300m	400-1200m	>800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Low sensitivity</b></p> <p>The site has few identified valued landscape features that contribute to the local landscape character and could accommodate change. The site falls within the Ancient Plateau Claylands Landscape Character Area (Source: Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment) where the key actions are to protect the old existing hedgelines and mitigate development that might be visually intrusive. Development of the site is unlikely to impact existing hedgerows or have significant impact on the surrounding landscape character due to its enclosed nature. The site has a strong association with the existing settlement.</p>
--	--

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Low sensitivity</b></p> <p>The site is excellently screened by a thick hedgerow to the rear which provides a soft settlement edge. It is not visible from the public footpath leading southwards from the village.</p> <p>While the site would be visible from the private development to its north, it is unlikely to negatively impact the residential visual amenity of the properties but rather represents an opportunity to integrate with the existing townscape.</p>
--	--

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Some impact and mitigation possible</b></p> <p>The existing access off Priory Road is opposite to a Grade II listed building, the Priory. However, it does not appear that any modification would be required to support the development subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority and heritage officers.</p> <p>There might be a possibility that heritage assets of potential archaeological interest from Roman, Saxon and Medieval times might be encountered due to the site's location at the edge of the historic settlement. Further heritage and archaeological assessments might be required.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to identified non-designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p>
--	--

### Planning Policy Constraints

<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Policy CS1 Settlement Hierarchy of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (September 2008 with a Focused Review in 2012) which identifies Palgrave as a ‘Secondary Village’ (lowest in the settlement hierarchy apart from countryside and countryside villages). Paragraph 2.33 of the Core Strategy defines ‘secondary village’s as villages unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs only. Local needs include employment, amenity and community facilities as well as small-scale infill housing and ‘rural exception’ sites for affordable housing.</p> <p>Palgrave is identified as a ‘Mid Suffolk Hinterland Village’ (lowest in the settlement hierarchy) in Policy SP03 of the draft Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk Plan however this is likely to be withdrawn from the draft Plan.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p><b>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area (taken into account the adjacent development under construction).</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p><b>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary</b></p> <p>The site is outside and not connected to the adopted settlement boundary (saved policies of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 and Proposals Map). Although it is adjacent to the proposed settlement boundary contained in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan currently under examination, correspondence between the Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils and the Inspectors in December 2021 (document G09/10) have indicated that the emerging Local Plan will be divided into two parts, in which the existing housing allocation policies would be deleted from the emerging Local Plan with the settlement boundaries in the adopted (as opposed to proposed) policies map to be retained (among other modifications). These elements are considered to be unsound at present and would require further review upon up-to-date and robust evidence base.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p> <p>The site is well-related to the existing settlement pattern.</p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. The site is promoted by an agent on behalf of the landowner for residential development as part of the Reg 14 consultation of the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No. The site is in single ownership.</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now</p>

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No known abnormal costs</p>
---	--------------------------------

### 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>8 dwellings</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                  The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                  The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                  The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>  <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p>The site is potentially suitable, and available                  No known viability issues.</p>

**Summary of  
justification for  
rating**

The site is a greenfield adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area. Although the site is well related to the existing settlement pattern, it is outside of and not connected to the adopted settlement boundary as its surrounding development have not been built at the time. The site is adjacent to the proposed settlement boundary contained in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan but this is expected to be withdrawn. The site is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities, though in close proximity to local bus stops with services to and from Diss.

A suitable access could be facilitated through Gassock Drive subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. The private drive appears to be under the same land ownership and available to be used as the key access to the site, although this would need to be confirmed. This access is opposite to a Grade II listed building, the Priory, but it is unlikely that any modifications that might potentially harm the designated heritage asset would be required. Given the site's location at the edge of the historic settlement, there might be a possibility that heritage assets of potential archaeological interest might be encountered. Further heritage and archaeological assessments might be required.

The site is excellently screened by a thick hedgerow to the rear which provides a soft settlement edge. Development of the site is not likely to negatively impact the landscape character of the area but instead presents an opportunity to integrate and improve the existing townscape.

The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.

The site falls within the Network Enhancement Zone 1 identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Development of the site should not harm its potential biodiversity value and should where possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CP5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.

The site is available for development and promoted by an agent on behalf of the landowner for 8 dwellings. If the settlement boundary of Palgrave is extended to include the site through the Neighbourhood Plan and that the proposed development is capable of meeting local needs as defined in Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to confirmation of access (including land ownership), mitigation of constraints and further investigation related to biodiversity, agricultural land quality, as well as heritage and archaeology.

## PAL02

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	PAL02
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land to the south of Priory Road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	0.51
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Proposed for up to 6 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	Land to the east of the site (opposite Priory Road) – now under construction: May 2019, Application for reserved matters (DC/19/02225) granted for approved outline planning permission 4010/16. June 2017, Outline planning application (4010/16) granted for the erection of 5 no. dwellings and garages and construction of a new vehicular access.
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Residential to the north and east with agricultural fields to all other directions



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed capacity (below 50 dwellings) does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk - the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Expansion Zone which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CS5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

### Physical Constraints

<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Steeply sloping</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>It is unlikely that a suitable access could be created – further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority would be required</b></p> <p>There is an existing field access to the site however it is at an acute blind turn from the narrow Priory Road with poor visibility due to the presence of thick hedgerows and trees along the boundary of the site. There is also a public footpath branching off from Priory Road and therefore vehicular access at this location may potentially endanger pedestrians coming out of the public footpath.</p> <p>There may be potential to create an alternative access with extensive removal of existing hedgerows further south of Priory Road but due to the narrow width of Priory Road it may not be able to accommodate further increase in traffic. Further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority would be required.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>It is unlikely that a suitable access could be created – further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority would be required</b></p> <p>There are no footways along this part of Priory Road although this is commonplace in Palgrave. However, notable concerns that vehicles would not be able to see pedestrians who are coming out of the public footpath. Further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority would be required.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p style="color: red;">It is unlikely that a suitable access could be created – further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority would be required</p> <p>A suitable cycle access may be potentially created if issues in relation to safety and visibility are resolved, subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. There are no segregated cycle paths in Palgrave.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b> The site is not crossed, but adjacent, to an existing Public Rights of Way along the northwestern boundary of the site.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no veteran or ancient trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no significant trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Further assessments would be required. However, it is unlikely that the site is affected by ground contamination as an undeveloped greenfield.</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	>1200m	400-800m	>1200m	400-1200m *A new primary school is proposed at PAL06	>3300m	400-1200m	>800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Medium Sensitivity</b></p> <p>The site falls within the Ancient Plateau Claylands Landscape Character Area (Source: Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment) where the key actions are to protect the old existing hedgelines and mitigate development that might be visually intrusive. Although the site only contains limited landscape features, the current landscape makes a positive contribution to the local landscape character due to its distinctive landform. Development of the site is likely to require extensive removal of the existing hedgerows to provide access and would be visually encroaching to the open countryside, negatively impacting the landscape character of the area.</p> <p>The submitted site boundary is along the triangular corner of a wider field. It is unclear how development would be accommodated that is in keeping with the linear character of Priory Road, although this could be potentially mitigated through careful design.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>High sensitivity</b></p> <p>The site is located at a commanding position above a valley to the south east and is visually prominent due to its steeply sloping and uneven topography. Development of the site would extend the settlement downslope of its plateau position and create the impression of sprawl encroaching the open countryside to the immediate south west. Furthermore, development of the site is likely to adversely impact the rural and tranquil character and views from the public footpath to the north of the site.</p>
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Some impact and mitigation possible</b></p> <p>The site is in close proximity to the Grade II listed Fairways but have limited visual and historic relationship with the designated heritage. Any identified impacts could be potentially mitigated through screening and careful design. There might be a possibility that heritage assets of potential archaeological interest from Roman, Saxon and Medieval times might be encountered due to the site's location at the edge of the historic settlement. Further heritage and archaeological assessments might be required.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to identified non-designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Policy CS1 Settlement Hierarchy of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (September 2008 with a Focused Review in 2012) which identifies Palgrave as a 'Secondary Village' (lowest in the settlement hierarchy apart from countryside and countryside villages). Paragraph 2.33 of the Core Strategy defines 'secondary village's as villages unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs only. Local needs include employment, amenity and community facilities as well as small-scale infill housing and 'rural exception' sites for affordable housing.</p> <p>Palgrave is identified as a 'Mid Suffolk Hinterland Village' (lowest in the settlement hierarchy) in Policy SP03 of the draft Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk Plan however this is likely to be withdrawn from the draft Plan.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p><b>Adjacent but not connected to the existing built up area</b></p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p><b>Adjacent to the settlement boundary</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the adopted settlement boundary contained in the saved policies of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 and Proposals Map. It is not clear from the Proposals Map as to whether the site is connected to the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to (but not connected to) the proposed settlement boundary contained in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan currently under examination. However, correspondence between the Councils and the Inspectors in December 2021 (document G09/10) have indicated that the emerging Local Plan will be divided into two parts, in which the existing housing allocation policies would be deleted from the emerging Local Plan with the settlement boundaries in the current (as opposed to proposed) policies map to be retained (among other modifications) as these elements are considered to be unsound at present and would require further review upon up-to-date and robust evidence base. These elements would be considered in the preparation and adoption of a 'Part 2' Local Plan which is expected to start as soon as possible after the adoption of 'Part 1' of the emerging Local Plan.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. The site is promoted by an agent on behalf of the landowner for residential development as part of the Reg 14 consultation of the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No. The site is in single ownership.</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now</p>

## 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No known abnormal costs</p>
---	--------------------------------

5. Conclusions	
<b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b>	6 dwellings
<b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b>	0-5 years
<b>Other key information</b>	N/A
<b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> Yes / No	The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available</b>  No known viability issues
<b>Summary of justification for rating</b>	<p>The site is a greenfield adjacent, though not connected, to the existing built-up area and settlement boundary of Palgrave. Palgrave is a secondary village that is defined as generally unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs according to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities.</p> <p>The site is served by an existing access however it is at an acute blind turn from the narrow Priory Road. There is also limited potential to create an alternative access further south of Priory Road which has limited capacity to accommodate further increase in traffic. It is unlikely that a safe and suitable access could be created to support the development although this would need to be further consulted with the relevant Highways Authority.</p> <p>The submitted site boundary is along a triangular corner of a wider field located at a commanding position above a valley to the south east. Development of the site would represent an illogical extension of the settlement downslope, encroaching into the open countryside. Due to its visual prominence, development of the site will also adversely impact the rural and tranquil character and views from the public footpath along the northern boundary of the site.</p> <p>The site is available for development. However, it is not suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present due to significant constraints in relation to access and impacts on settlement, landscape and visual character of Palgrave.</p>

## PAL03

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	PAL03
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land to the south of Lion Road (adjacent to Clarke Close)
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.00
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Proposed for up to 25 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	Land to the northeast of the site: November 2016, Full planning application (4195/15) approved for the erection of 21 dwellings , 3 no. new highways accesses, associated parking turning & on-site open space. The site has now been built out.
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Residential with an existing tree belt to the east and north east. Agricultural fields to all other directions.



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed capacity (below 50 dwellings) does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk - the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Expansion Zone which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CS5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

### Physical Constraints

<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Relatively flat</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>It is unlikely that a suitable access could be created if the site was to be brought forward without PAL04 – further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority would be required</i></p> <p>The site is served by an existing field access at present. However, if the site was to be brought forward without PAL04, there is only a very narrow gap between the properties and an electricity substation to the east and the overhead power lines to the west, and therefore visibility is likely to be concealed. It is noted that there might be potential to put the overhead powerlines underground as per information submitted by the landowner, however further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority and the National Grid would be required to ensure that a safe and suitable access could be created.</p> <p>If the site is to be developed along with PAL06 (although it is noted that the landowner has indicated a preference to develop PAL06 over other sites submitted PAL01-PAL05), given where the access road is proposed to PAL06 there might not be adequate space for a separate T junction opposite and a crossroad junction may create the appearance of an urban loop road at the approach of Palgrave.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes. A suitable pedestrian access could be potentially created. There are pavements that run along Lion Road that could be potentially extended to serve the site subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes. A suitable cycle access could be potentially created subject to further consultation with the relevant Highway Authority.</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i> There are no trees protected under the Tree Preservation Order within the site but trees along the eastern boundary of the site are protected under the Tree Preservation Order (MS06/A1).</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no veteran or ancient trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no significant trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Further assessments would be required. However, it is unlikely that the site is affected by ground contamination as an undeveloped greenfield.</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i> The site is not crossed by significant utilities infrastructure but it is adjacent to an electricity sub-station and overhead power lines to the east and west respectively. Development of the site would need to ensure that the existing service easement for the electricity sub-station and the legally-binding safety clearances for the overhead powerlines are maintained. Development on the site may need to be consulted with Natural Grid and have regard to its Design Guidelines for Developments near Pylons and High Voltage Overhead Power Lines. This may reduce the developable area of the site.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No</i></p>

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
------------	----------------------------	-----------------	---------------	----------------	------------------	------------------------------------	-------------

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<b>Distance (metres)</b>	>1200m	400-800m	>1200m	400-1200m *A new primary school is proposed at PAL06	>3300m	400-1200m	>800m
--------------------------	--------	----------	--------	---	--------	-----------	-------

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Medium Sensitivity</b></p> <p>The site falls within the Ancient Plateau Claylands Landscape Character Area (Source: Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment) where the key actions are to protect the old existing hedgelines and mitigate development that might be visually intrusive.</p> <p>While the site itself contains limited valued features, development of the site would have a poor relationship with the existing settlement form by crossing the soft settlement edge of the tree belt and encroaching into the open countryside. The site does not have any defensible boundaries and would represent an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west.</p> <p>Development of the site would also amount to backland development with no relation to Lion Road.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>High Sensitivity</b></p> <p>The site is very exposed to a broad area of open countryside. The undeveloped character of the site contributes to the existing view quality, although it is acknowledged that the overhead power lines adjacent are prominent features of the view at present. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from public rights of way in the immediate vicinity and from the wider landscape.</p>
--	---

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p> <p>The site is not in close proximity to designated heritage assets in Palgrave, however, there might be a possibility that heritage assets of potential archaeological interest from Roman, Saxon and Medieval times might be encountered due to the site's location at the edge of the historic settlement. Further heritage and archaeological assessments might be required.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to non-designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p>
--	---

2. Assessment of Suitability	
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b> <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Policy CS1 Settlement Hierarchy of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (September 2008 with a Focused Review in 2012) which identifies Palgrave as a 'Secondary Village' (lowest in the settlement hierarchy apart from countryside and countryside villages). Paragraph 2.33 of the Core Strategy defines 'secondary village's as villages unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs only. Local needs include employment, amenity and community facilities as well as small-scale infill housing and 'rural exception' sites for affordable housing.</p> <p>Palgrave is identified as a 'Mid Suffolk Hinterland Village' (lowest in the settlement hierarchy) in Policy SP03 of the draft Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk Plan however this is likely to be withdrawn from the draft Plan.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent though not connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p><b>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary</b> The site is outside and not connected to the adopted settlement boundary (saved policies of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 and Proposals Map) and is only partially adjacent to the proposed settlement boundary contained in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan currently under examination. Correspondence between the Councils and the Inspectors in December 2021 (document G09/10) have indicated that the emerging Local Plan will be divided into two parts, in which the existing housing allocation policies would be deleted from the emerging Local Plan with the settlement boundaries in the current (as opposed to proposed) policies map to be retained (among other modifications) as these elements are considered to be unsound at present and would require further review upon up-to-date and robust evidence base.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No, however development of the site will elongate the existing settlement pattern and encroach into the open countryside.</p>
--	--

## 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. The site is promoted by an agent on behalf of the landowner for residential development as part of the Reg 14 consultation of the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No. The site is in single ownership.</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now</p>

## 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No known abnormal costs but the site's developable area may be reduced due to its proximity to the overhead power lines.</p>
---	---

5. Conclusions	
<b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b>	The site is proposed for 25 dwellings although considering the surrounding character and the indicative site boundaries this is unlikely to be achieved in a sensitive approach.
<b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b>	0-5 years
<b>Other key information</b>	N/A
<b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b> The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b>  <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> Yes / No	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>No known abnormal costs but the site's developable area may be reduced due to its proximity to the overhead power lines.</p>
<b>Summary of justification for rating</b>	<p>The site is a greenfield adjacent, though not connected, to the existing built-up area. It is outside of the settlement boundary of Palgrave. Palgrave is a secondary village that is defined as generally unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs according to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities.</p> <p>Development of the site would have a poor relationship with the existing settlement form, crossing the soft settlement edge formed by existing tree belts and encroaching into the open countryside. It represents an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west with no defensible boundaries in the vicinity. It would also amount to backland development.</p> <p>The site is exposed to a broad area of open countryside, where its undeveloped character contributes to the existing view quality. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from nearby public rights of way and the wider landscape, although it is acknowledged that existing overhead power lines forms a prominent feature at present.</p> <p>The site is served by an existing field access which might not have adequate visibility splays to support the proposed development. Further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority would be required.</p> <p>The site is available for development. However, it is not suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present due to significant constraints in relation to settlement form, landscape and visual sensitivity.</p>

## PAL04

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	PAL04
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land to the south of Lion Road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.00
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Proposed for up to 25 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	June 2021, Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion request (DC/21/02867) for a proposed Solar Farm on the site has been decided (EIA not required).
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Agricultural fields to all directions



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed capacity (below 50 dwellings) does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk - the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Expansion Zone which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CS5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Gently sloping</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable vehicular access could be potentially created subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. This is likely to require the removal of some existing hedgerows. The access may be drive under or over, should they be put underground, the power lines which would need to be consulted with National Grid.</p> <p>If the site is to be developed along with PAL06 (although it is noted that the landowner has indicated a preference to develop PAL06 over other sites submitted PAL01-PAL05), given where the access road is proposed to PAL06 there might not be adequate space for a separate T junction opposite and a crossroad junction may create the appearance of an urban loop road at the approach of Palgrave.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable pedestrian access could be potentially created. There are pavements that run along Lion Road that could be potentially extended to serve the site subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable cycle access could be potentially created subject to further consultation with the relevant Highway Authority.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown. Further assessments would be required. However, it is unlikely that the site is affected by ground contamination as an undeveloped greenfield.
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present. It is noted that the landowner is exploring the option to place this underground. Development of the site would need to be consulted with National Grid to ensure that the legally-binding safety clearances for the overhead powerlines or an underground cable easement are maintained. It should also have regard to National Grid's Design Guidelines for Developments near Pylons and High Voltage Overhead Power Lines. This is likely to impact the developable area and/or viability of the site.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	>1200m	400-800m	>1200m	400-1200m *A new primary school is proposed at PAL06	>3300m	400-1200m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Medium Sensitivity</b></p> <p>The site falls within the Ancient Plateau Claylands Landscape Character Area (Source: Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment) where the key actions are to protect the old existing hedgelines and mitigate development that might be visually intrusive.</p> <p>While the site itself contains limited valued features, it is removed from the existing settlement form. The site does not have any defensible boundaries and would represent an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west encroaching into the open countryside.</p>
<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></li> <li>• <i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>High Sensitivity</b></p> <p>Sitting at the highest point of the plateau, the site is very exposed to a broad area of open countryside. The undeveloped character of the site contributes to the existing view quality, although it is acknowledged that the overhead power lines adjacent are prominent features of the view at present. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from public rights of way in the immediate vicinity and from the wider landscape.</p> <p>The new community may also be severed if the existing power lines are maintained.</p>
<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p> <p>The site is not in close proximity to designated heritage assets in Palgrave, however, there might be a possibility that heritage assets of potential archaeological interest from Roman, Saxon and Medieval times might be encountered due to the site's location at the edge of the historic settlement. Further heritage and archaeological assessments might be required.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to non-designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>

**2. Assessment of Suitability**

<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Policy CS1 Settlement Hierarchy of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (September 2008 with a Focused Review in 2012) which identifies Palgrave as a ‘Secondary Village’ (lowest in the settlement hierarchy apart from countryside and countryside villages). Paragraph 2.33 of the Core Strategy defines ‘secondary village’s as villages unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs only. Local needs include employment, amenity and community facilities as well as small-scale infill housing and ‘rural exception’ sites for affordable housing.</p> <p>Palgrave is identified as a ‘Mid Suffolk Hinterland Village’ (lowest in the settlement hierarchy) in Policy SP03 of the draft Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk Plan however this is likely to be withdrawn from the draft Plan.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b>  <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>The site is outside and not connected to the adopted nor emerging settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No, however development of the site will elongate the existing settlement pattern and encroach into the open countryside.</p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. The site is promoted by an agent on behalf of the landowner for residential development as part of the Reg 14 consultation of the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019. However, it is also recently considered for a proposed Solar Farm EIA Scoping Opinion and therefore it is not clear whether the site might still be available for residential development as of February 2022. If the site is to be allocated in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, its availability for residential development would need to be confirmed with the landowner.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site is in single ownership.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now</p>

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b>                  The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present, which is likely to impact the viability of the site due to reduced developable area and the potential option to relocate them underground.</p>
---	---

5. Conclusions	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>The site is proposed for 25 dwellings, although considering the surrounding landscape and townscape character, an estimated capacity of below 20 dwellings may be more appropriate. Note that this has not taken into account the impact of the overhead powerlines which may reduce developable area.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                      The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                      The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                      The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                      Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present, which is likely to impact the viability of the site due to reduced developable area and the potential option to relocate them underground.</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The site is a greenfield outside of the existing built-up area and settlement boundary of Palgrave. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities. The site is removed from the existing settlement form with no defensible boundaries in the vicinity. Its development would represent an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west encroaching into the open countryside. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs.</p> <p>The site also sits at the highest point of the plateau exposed to a broad area of the open countryside. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from public rights of way in the immediate vicinity and from the wider landscape.</p> <p>The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present which would have implications to the site's developable area, viability, access, safety and design, which would need to be consulted with the National Grid and the Local Planning Authority. It is noted that the landowner is exploring the option to place this underground.</p> <p>The site is put forward for residential development as part of the DDNP's consultation in 2019 but has been recently proposed for a solar farm. It is unclear as to whether the site is still available for residential development.</p>

## PAL05

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	PAL05
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land to the north of Lion Road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	1.00
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	N/A
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Proposed for up to 25 dwellings
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	June 2021, Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion request (DC/21/02867) for a proposed Solar Farm on the site has been decided (EIA not required).
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Agricultural fields to all directions
	

2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed capacity (below 50 dwellings) does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk - the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Expansion Zone which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CS5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
Physical Constraints	
<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Gently sloping</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable access could be potentially facilitated from Lion Road subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. This is likely to require the removal of some existing hedgerows.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable pedestrian access could be potentially created. There are pavements that run along Lion Road that could be potentially extended to serve the site subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable cycle access could be potentially created subject to further consultation with the relevant Highway Authority.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No The site is not crossed, but adjacent, to an existing Public Rights of Way along the eastern boundary of the site.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no veteran or ancient trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b> <i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no significant trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Further assessments would be required. However, it is unlikely that the site is affected by ground contamination as an undeveloped greenfield.</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b> The site is not crossed by significant utilities infrastructure but it is adjacent to overhead power lines and existing transmission towers. Development of the site would need to ensure that the legally-binding safety clearances for the overhead powerlines are maintained. Development on the site may need to be consulted with Natural Grid and have regard to its Design Guidelines for Developments near Pylons and High Voltage Overhead Power Lines. This may reduce the developable area of the site.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>

**Accessibility**  
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
<b>Distance (metres)</b>	>1200m	400-800m	>1200m	400-1200m *A new primary school is proposed at PAL06	>3300m	400-1200m	>800m

**Landscape and Visual Constraints**  
This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</li> <li>• <b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</li> <li>• <b>High sensitivity:</b> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Medium Sensitivity</b> The site falls within the Ancient Plateau Claylands Landscape Character Area (Source: Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment) where the key actions are to protect the old existing hedgelines and mitigate development that might be visually intrusive.</p> <p>While the site itself contains limited valued features, development of the site would have a poor relationship with the existing settlement form and encroaching into the open countryside. The site does not have any defensible boundaries and would represent an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west.</p>
--	--

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</b></p>	<p><b>High Sensitivity</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li>• <b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</li> <li>• <b>High sensitivity:</b> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</li> </ul>	<p>Sitting at the highest point of the plateau with surrounding land dipping away to 45m altitude rapidly to the north, the site is very exposed to a broad area of open countryside. The undeveloped character of the site contributes to the existing view quality, although it is acknowledged that the overhead power lines adjacent are prominent features of the view at present. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from public rights of way in the immediate vicinity and from the wider landscape. In particular, it will dominate views southwards from public footpaths and Millway Lane.</p> <p>The new community may also be severed if the existing power lines are maintained.</p>

### Heritage Constraints

<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p>
<p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>The site is not in close proximity to designated heritage assets in Palgrave, however, there might be a possibility that heritage assets of potential archaeological interest from Roman, Saxon and Medieval times might be encountered due to the site's location at the edge of the historic settlement. Further heritage and archaeological assessments might be required.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to non-designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p>
<p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	

### Planning Policy Constraints

<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	

**2. Assessment of Suitability**

<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Policy CS1 Settlement Hierarchy of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (September 2008 with a Focused Review in 2012) which identifies Palgrave as a ‘Secondary Village’ (lowest in the settlement hierarchy apart from countryside and countryside villages). Paragraph 2.33 of the Core Strategy defines ‘secondary village’s as villages unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs only. Local needs include employment, amenity and community facilities as well as small-scale infill housing and ‘rural exception’ sites for affordable housing.</p> <p>Palgrave is identified as a ‘Mid Suffolk Hinterland Village’ (lowest in the settlement hierarchy) in Policy SP03 of the draft Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk Plan however this is likely to be withdrawn from the draft Plan.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b>  <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>The site is outside and not connected to the adopted nor emerging settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No, however development of the site will elongate the existing settlement pattern and encroach into the open countryside.</p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. The site is promoted by an agent on behalf of the landowner for residential development as part of the Reg 14 consultation of the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019. However, it is also recently considered for a proposed Solar Farm EIA Scoping Opinion and therefore it is not clear whether the site might still be available for residential development as of February 2022. If the site is to be allocated in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, its availability for residential development would need to be confirmed with the landowner.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site is in single ownership.</i></p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b>  <b>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</b></p>	<p>Available now</p>

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No known abnormal costs but the site's developable area may be reduced due to its proximity to the overhead power lines.</p>
---	---

5. Conclusions	
<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>The site is proposed for 25 dwellings, although considering the surrounding landscape and townscape character, an estimated capacity of below 20 dwellings may be more appropriate as this part of Lion Road is characterised by its large and long plots.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b>                      The site is <b>suitable and available</b>                      The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available.</b>                      The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available.</b></p> <p><b>Are there any known viability issues?</b>                      Yes / No</p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b></p> <p>No known abnormal costs but the site's developable area may be reduced due to its proximity to the overhead power lines.</p>
<p><b>Summary of justification for rating</b></p>	<p>The site is a greenfield outside of the existing built-up area and settlement boundary of Palgrave. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities. The site is removed from the existing settlement form with no defensible boundaries in the vicinity. Its development would represent an illogical extension of Palgrave to its west encroaching into the open countryside. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs.</p> <p>The site also sits at the highest point of the plateau with surrounding land dipping away to 45m altitude rapidly to the north. It is exposed to a broad area of the open countryside. Development of the site will dominate views southwards from public rights of ways and Millway Lane and adversely impact the tranquillity and rural character of the wider landscape.</p> <p>The site is put forward for residential development as part of the DDNP's consultation in 2019 but has been recently proposed for a solar farm. It is unclear as to whether the site is still available for residential development.</p>

## PAL06

1. Site Details	
<b>Site Reference / Name</b>	PAL06
<b>Site Address / Location</b>	Land north of Lion Road
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	4.00
<b>SHLAA/SHELAA Reference</b> (if applicable)	SS0734
<b>Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan SHELAA Report October 2020 Assessment Conclusions</b>	Discounted – Site has poor connectivity to the existing settlement.
<b>Existing land use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Land use being considered</b>	Residential and Education
<b>Development Capacity</b> (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Proposed for 45 dwellings and a 1.5 Ha new primary school
<b>Site identification method / source</b>	Put forward as part of the DDNP's consultation
<b>Planning history</b>	No recent or relevant planning applications.
<b>Neighbouring uses</b>	Residential to the south, east and north. Agricultural fields to the west.



2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ancient Woodland</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• Biosphere Reserve</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve (NNR)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Ramsar Site</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> </ul> <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but the proposed use does not trigger the requirement to consult Natural England.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Corridor</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</li> <li>• Public Open Space</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</li> <li>• Nature Improvement Area</li> <li>• Regionally Important Geological Site</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>	<p><i>No. The site is not within or adjacent to identified non-statutory environmental designations.</i></p>
<p><b>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><i>No. The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i></li> <li>• Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk - the site is wholly within Flood Zone 1.</i></p>
<p><b>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</b></p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>• <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Low Risk</i></p>

## 2. Assessment of Suitability

<p><b>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land.</p>
<p><b>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>The site does not contain national or locally identified wildlife rich habitats. However, it falls within the Network Enhancement Zone 1 which is land identified by Natural England with potential for habitat recreation. Further habitats assessment might be required to ensure that any development of the site will not harm its potential biodiversity value and wherever possible promote habitats recreation in accordance with Policy CS5 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy LP18 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

### Physical Constraints

<p><b>Is the site:</b> <i>Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping</i></p>	<p>Gently sloping</p>
<p><b>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. A suitable access could be potentially facilitated from Lion Road subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. This is likely to be underneath a high voltage power line or above an underground cable easement (as proposed by the landowner) which would need to be consulted with the National Grid.</p> <p>The existing loop road as proposed, however, will completely erase part of a public footpath leading to the north west. An alternative route has not been set out in the indicative layout. This Site Assessment only considers the suitability, availability and achievability of the site instead of the specific details of any proposals, but it is clear that any access points facilitated from Lion Road would significantly impact the existing public footpath in terms of access and character (see section 'Landscape and Visual Constraints'). The Rights of Way Circular 01/09 advises that paths should be retained on their existing routes wherever possible. Similarly, the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 257 states that diversions should only be made if it is considered 'necessary to do so to enable development to be carried out'. If the diversion of the existing public rights of way is essential, the alternative route should be consulted with the Local Planning Authority.</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability	
<p><b>Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes.</i> A suitable pedestrian access could be potentially created. There are pavements that run along Lion Road that could be potentially extended to serve the site subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority.</p>
<p><b>Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes.</i> A suitable cycle access could be potentially created subject to further consultation with the relevant Highway Authority.</p>
<p><b>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes,</i> a public footpath crosses the site near Lion Road where the access point is proposed. Development of the site is likely to significantly impact the existing public footpath in terms of access and character. An alternative route may be required subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no veteran or ancient trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?</b></p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown, further arboricultural assessments might be required. However, no significant trees are identified within or adjacent the site from the AECOM site visit and publicly available information.</p>
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Further assessments would be required. However, it is unlikely that the site is affected by ground contamination as an undeveloped greenfield.</p>
<p><b>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><i>Yes</i></p> <p>The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present. It is noted that the landowner is exploring the option to place this underground. Development of the site would need to be consulted with National Grid to ensure that the legally-binding safety clearances for the overhead powerlines or an underground cable easement are maintained. It should also have regard to National Grid's Design Guidelines for Developments near Pylons and High Voltage Overhead Power Lines. This is likely to impact the developable area and/or viability of the site.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Development of the site is likely to alter the existing public rights of way network whereby an alternative route would need to be identified.</p> <p>However, it is also recognised that the development will include a 1.5 Ha primary school which could potentially help provide an important social infrastructure. Suffolk County Council's representations to multiple recent planning permissions in the Palgrave area has indicated that schools within the local catchments have no available capacity and it is not currently possible to expand the school at their current locations and other options, including temporary provision.</p>

### Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	>1200m	400-800m	>1200m	400-1200m *A new primary school is proposed at PAL06	>3300m	400-1200m	>800m

### Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence or by a qualified landscape consultant.

#### Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

#### Medium sensitivity

The site falls within the Ancient Plateau Claylands Landscape Character Area (Source: Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment) where the key actions are to protect the old existing hedgelines and mitigate development that might be visually intrusive.

The site contains hedgerow boundaries and has clearly visibility from public rights of way within and in the immediate visibility of the site where the undeveloped character of the landscape currently contributes to the quality of the view. Development of the site would also represent a significant backland development that poorly relate to the existing settlement and may have some nuisance implications for the property to the east.

#### Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

#### High sensitivity

The site sits at a flat plateau and is visually open. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from public rights of way in the immediate vicinity to the east of the site and from the wider landscape. In particular, views to and from designated heritage assets and existing public rights of way will be completely blocked with limited mitigation possible, although it is acknowledged that the existing overhead power lines are prominent features of the view at present and that impacts on further views from the wider landscape will be partly mitigated with the existing tree belt to the west of the site.

<b>Heritage Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /                      Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /                      Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Some impact to designated heritage assets but mitigation not possible</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the Grade II listed Ivy Cottage and in close proximity to the Grade II listed Longs Farm House. Development of the site is likely to block the existing views to and from the designated heritage assets, especially Ivy Cottage, though less so for the Grade II Longs Farm House which is more concealed by existing trees. These are unavoidable impacts as the views across the flat plateau would be inevitably disrupted. Development of the site is likely to negatively impact the character of setting in which the existing designated heritage assets are experienced and observed, particularly when at the approach of Palgrave with the two Grade II listed buildings from Millway Lane which remains rural and tranquil in character. Views to the roofline of the Conservation Area from the existing footpath will also be negatively impacted.</p> <p>There might be a possibility that heritage assets of potential archaeological interest from Roman, Saxon and Medieval times might be encountered due to the site's location at the edge of the historic settlement. Further heritage and archaeological assessments might be required.</p>
<p><b>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</b></p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /                      Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /                      Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p><b>Limited or no impact to non-designated heritage assets or their setting</b></p>
<b>Planning Policy Constraints</b>	
<p><b>Is the site in the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</b></p> <p><b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>No</p>

<p><b>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</b></p>	<p>Policy CS1 Settlement Hierarchy of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (September 2008 with a Focused Review in 2012) which identifies Palgrave as a 'Secondary Village' (lowest in the settlement hierarchy apart from countryside and countryside villages). Paragraph 2.33 of the Core Strategy defines 'secondary village's as villages unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs only. Local needs include employment, amenity and community facilities as well as small-scale infill housing and 'rural exception' sites for affordable housing.</p> <p>Palgrave is identified as a 'Mid Suffolk Hinterland Village' (lowest in the settlement hierarchy) in Policy SP03 of the draft Joint Babergh and Mid Suffolk Plan however this is likely to be withdrawn from the draft Plan.</p>
<p><b>Is the site:</b>  <i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p><b>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</b>  <i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p><b>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary</b></p> <p>The site is outside and not connected to the adopted settlement boundary (saved policies of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 and Proposals Map) and is only partially adjacent to the proposed settlement boundary contained in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan currently under examination. The majority of the site is not connected to the proposed settlement boundary. Correspondence between the Councils and the Inspectors in December 2021 (document G09/10) have indicated that the emerging Local Plan will be divided into two parts, in which the existing housing allocation policies would be deleted from the emerging Local Plan with the settlement boundaries in the current (as opposed to proposed) policies map to be retained (among other modifications) as these elements are considered to be unsound at present and would require further review upon up-to-date and robust evidence base.</p>
<p><b>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</b>  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

### 3. Assessment of Availability

<p><b>Is the site available for development?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes. The site is promoted by an agent on behalf of the landowner for residential and education development as part of the Reg 14 consultation of the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan in September 2019.</p>
<p><b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No. The site is in single ownership.</p>
<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</p>	<p>Available now</p>

### 4. Assessment of Viability

<p><b>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?</b> <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present, which is likely to impact the viability of the site due to reduced developable area and the potential option to relocate them underground.</p>
--	--

### 5. Conclusions

<p><b>What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)</b></p>	<p>The site is promoted for 45 dwellings and a new 1.5 Ha primary school.</p>
<p><b>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</b></p>	<p>0-5 years</p>
<p><b>Other key information</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</b> The site is <b>suitable and available</b> The site is <b>potentially suitable, and available</b>. The site is <b>not currently suitable, and available</b>. <b>Are there any known viability issues?</b> <i>Yes / No</i></p>	<p><b>The site is not currently suitable, and available</b>  No known abnormal costs but the site's developable area may be reduced due to its proximity to the overhead power lines.</p>

**Summary of justification for rating**

The site is a greenfield adjacent and connected to the existing built-up area. However it is outside and not connected to the adopted settlement boundary, with the majority of the site also not connected to the proposed settlement boundary of Palgrave. Development of the site would represent a significant backland development that poorly relate to the existing settlement. Palgrave is a secondary village that is defined as generally unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs according to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy. It is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities.

The site sits at a flat plateau and is visually open. Development of the site would be visually intrusive when viewed from public rights of way in the immediate vicinity to the east of the site and from the wider landscape. In particular, views to and from designated heritage assets and existing public rights of way will be completely blocked with limited mitigation possible. Development of the site is likely to negatively impact the character of setting in which the existing designated heritage assets are experienced and observed, particularly when at the approach of Palgrave with the two Grade II listed buildings from Millway Lane which remains rural and tranquil in character.

A suitable access could be potentially facilitated from Lion Road however it is likely to completely erase part of a public footpath leading to the north west. If the diversion of the existing public rights of way is essential, an alternative route would need to be identified and consulted with the Local Planning Authority.

The site is crossed by overhead power lines and their transmission towers at present which would have implications to the site's developable area, viability, access, safety and design, which would need to be consulted with the National Grid and the Local Planning Authority. It is noted that the landowner is exploring the option to place this underground.

The site is available for development and is promoted for 45 dwellings and a new primary school. It is acknowledged that the proposal could potentially deliver an important social infrastructure as representations from Suffolk County Council to multiple recent planning permissions has highlighted that schools within the local catchments have no available capacity at present and that it is not currently possible to expand the schools at their current locations. However, the site is currently unsuitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan due to significant constraints in relation to settlement pattern, landscape and visual sensitivity, heritage and public rights of way.

# Appendix B GNLP HELAA and BMJSLP SHELAA Review

## GNLP0349

GNLP0349 Land west of Gissing Road	
Site Reference	GNLP0349
Site Address	Land west of Gissing Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2018 Addendum
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1.54
Proposed Development	Residential development of approximately 15-20 dwellings, with landscaping and open space
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> – This is a large greenfield site west of Gissing Road, adjacent to the development boundary and housing on the opposite side of the road. It is well related to services and character of the village. Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. Also, subject to suitable footpath provision, any potential impact on the functioning of local roads could be reasonably mitigated. There are no concerns over potential contamination, ground stability, loss of high quality agricultural land, loss of open space, nor ecology. Other constraints include SSSI within 3,000m, possible impact to listed building and conservation area. Anglian Water has advised of major constraints to provision of sewerage infrastructure - substantial off-site sewerage required to connect foul water. There are a number of constraints affecting this site, but these may be possible to mitigate. The site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No, however additional information includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments</li> <li>The site falls within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone however the proposed use does not trigger the need to consult Natural England</li> <li>The Burston Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines (July 2021) describes the settlement pattern of Burston as historically relatively dispersed fronting onto historic lanes. The lack of consistency in curtilage size, building orientation, building line or setbacks, contributes to the more informal and rural character of the village. Later infilling has concentrated development along Diss Road with the presence of large estates to the east of Audley Close.</li> </ul>

<p>Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?</p>	<p>Yes. Full development of the site may potentially impact the rural settlement character and size of Burston, although it is acknowledged that there is an existing presence of large estates on Rectory Road. Policy 16 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy states that Burston could only accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings to provide for local housing needs subject to form and character considerations, rather than significant new development due to the limited village's local service level. It is therefore recommended that if the site is allocated, the Qualifying Body should allocate part of the site in considerations of the form, character and service levels of Burston, unless larger scale development proposals could bring local facilities up to the level of those in a Service Village and is acceptable having regard to the other policies in the development plan.</p> <p>In addition, the site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land and as to whether development of the site would lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<p><b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b></p>	<p>The site is adjacent and well-related to the settlement boundary of Burston.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Burston was extended to include this site through the Neighbourhood Plan following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site would be <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to settlement character, access, footpath provision, the potential impact on listed buildings and the Conservation Area, as well as adequate provision of sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>Full development of the site may potentially change the rural settlement character and size of Burston. Therefore, partial allocation well related to the existing settlement form, character and service levels is recommended unless larger scale development proposals could bring local facilities up to the level of those in a Service Village. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.5.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

## GNLP0386

GNLP0386 Land at Rectory Road	
Site Reference	GNLP0386
Site Address	Land at Rectory Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	2.44
Proposed Development	Residential
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> – This is a large scale proposal on greenfield site off Rectory Road adjacent to the build-up area. It is well related to services and character of the village. Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. Also, subject to suitable footpath provision, any potential impact on the functioning of local roads could be reasonably mitigated. There are no concerns over potential contamination, ground stability, loss of high quality agricultural land, loss of open space, or ecology. Other constraints include SSSI within 3000m, potential impact to listed building and conservation area. Anglian Water has advised that major constraints to provision of sewerage infrastructure - substantial off-site sewerage required to connect foul water. There are a number of constraints affecting this site, but these may be possible to mitigate. The site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No, however additional information includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments</li> <li>The site falls within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone however the proposed use does not trigger the need to consult Natural England</li> <li>The Burston Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines (July 2021) describes the settlement pattern of Burston as historically relatively dispersed fronting onto historic lanes. The lack of consistency in curtilage size, building orientation, building line or setbacks, contributes to the more informal and rural character of the village. Later infilling has concentrated development along Diss Road with the presence of large estates to the east of Audley Close.</li> </ul>

<p>Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?</p>	<p>Yes. The site is partially outside of and partially (on the northern edge) adjacent to the settlement boundary. Full development of the site will reduce the gap between Burston and Audley End, although the cluster of dwellings at Audley End is not identified as a settlement at present. Full development of the site would extensively change the character of the settlement, contrary to Policy 16 of the adopted JCS and Policy DM1.3 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document. The site has medium to high visual sensitivity from the surrounding open countryside and adjacent properties.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to a ford and therefore the access road is subject to flooding.</p> <p>In addition, the site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land and as to whether development of the site would lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<p><b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b></p>	<p>The site is a large greenfield partially outside of and partially (on the northern edge) adjacent to the settlement boundary of Burston. Policy 16 of the adopted JCS states that significant expansion of 'Other Villages', including Burston, is generally sustainable due to limited local service levels. Development of the whole site would extend considerably into the open countryside and would change the character of the settlement. Therefore, partial allocation of the north western end of the site for a reduced capacity is recommended.</p> <p>The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Burston was extended to include this site through the Neighbourhood Plan following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to settlement character, visual sensitivity, flood risk, access, suitable footpath provision, potential impact on listed buildings and the Conservation Area as well as adequate provision of sewerage infrastructure. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.5.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

## GNLP0560

### GNLP0560 Land at Diss Road (north of Willow End)

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0560
<b>Site Address</b>	Land at Diss Road (north of Willow End)
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	1.51
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development of approximately 5 dwellings

### GNLP HELAA Conclusions

<b>Suitability</b>	<b>Suitable</b> - The site is large greenfield site beyond the development boundary. It is slightly disconnected to the services and character of the village. Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. However, the site is considered to be remote from services for housing so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There are no concerns over potential contamination, ground stability, loss of high quality agricultural land, loss of open space, nor ecology. However, other constraints include landscape sensitivities, SSSI buffer, county wildlife site opposite, and proximity to conservation area. Anglian Water has advised that major constraints to provision of sewerage infrastructure - substantial off-site sewerage required to connect foul water. There are a number of constraints affecting this site, but these may be possible to mitigate. The site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.
<b>Availability</b>	<b>Available</b>
<b>Achievability</b>	<b>Achievable</b>

### How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?

<b>Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?</b>	No
<b>Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?</b>	No, however additional information includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchment</li> <li>The site falls within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone however the proposed use does not trigger the need to consult Natural England</li> <li>The Burston Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines (July 2021) describes the settlement pattern of Burston as historically relatively dispersed fronting onto historic lanes. The lack of consistency in curtilage size, building orientation, building line or setbacks, contributes to the more informal and rural character of the village. Later infilling has concentrated development along Diss Road with the presence of large estates to the east of Audley Close.</li> </ul>

<p>Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?</p>	<p>Yes. The site is in a remote location outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside unsympathetic to the settlement character and form, contrary to Policy 16 of the adopted JCS and Policy DM1.3 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document. If the site is to be developed alongside GNLP0561 and GNLP0562, the significant cumulative impact on the settlement, landscape and historic character of the settlement would need to be considered.</p> <p>In addition, the site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land and as to whether development of the site would lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<p><b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b></p>	<p>The site is in a remote location outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary and built-up area of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside and have significant impacts on the character and form of the settlement. The site is <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, the site is also constrained in terms of access, landscape sensitivities, biodiversity, potential loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, potential impacts on the Conservation Area and sewerage infrastructure. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

## GNLP0561

### GNLP0560 Land at Diss Road (West of Willow Road)

<p><b>Site Reference</b></p>	<p>GNLP0561</p>
<p><b>Site Address</b></p>	<p>Land at Diss Road (West of Willow End)</p>
<p><b>Site Source</b></p>	<p>Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017</p>
<p><b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b></p>	<p>0.88</p>
<p><b>Proposed Development</b></p>	<p>Residential development (proposed as 30 'starter homes')</p>

### GNLP HELAA Conclusions

Suitability	<p><b>Suitable</b> - This is a large greenfield site off Diss Road and beyond the development boundary. It is slightly disconnected to the services and character of the village. Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. However, the site is considered to be remote from services for housing so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There are no concerns over potential contamination, ground stability, loss of high quality agricultural land, loss of open space, nor ecology. However, other constraints include landscape sensitivities, SSSI buffer, county wildlife site opposite, and proximity to conservation area. Anglian Water has advised that major constraints to provision of sewerage infrastructure - substantial off-site sewerage required to connect FW. There are a number of constraints affecting this site but these may be possible to mitigate. The site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>

**How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?**

Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	<p>No, however additional information includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchment</li> <li>• The site falls within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone however the proposed use does not trigger the need to consult Natural England</li> <li>• The Burston Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines (July 2021) describes the settlement pattern of Burston as historically relatively dispersed fronting onto historic lanes. The lack of consistency in curtilage size, building orientation, building line or setbacks, contributes to the more informal and rural character of the village. Later infilling has concentrated development along Diss Road with the presence of large estates to the east of Audley Close.</li> </ul>
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	<p>Yes. The site is outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside unsympathetic to the settlement character and form, contrary to Policy 16 of the adopted JCS and Policy DM1.3 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document. If the site is to be developed alongside GNL0560 and GNL0562, the significant cumulative impact on the settlement, landscape and historic character of the settlement would need to be considered.</p> <p>In addition, the site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine if the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land and as to whether development of the site would lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The site is proposed for 'Starter Homes', which is no longer pursued as a policy by DLUCH (previously as MHCLG). However, this indicates the potential interest of the landowner in developing First Homes or other varieties of affordable housing on the site. The site may be potentially acceptable as a Rural Exception Site subject to discussion with South Norfolk Council in relation to the adopted and emerging policy context.</p>

<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	No
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is in a remote location outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside and have significant impacts on the character and form of the settlement. The site is <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in principle, but it may be acceptable as a Rural Exception Site, subject to discussion with the South Norfolk Council. In addition, the site is also constrained in terms of access, landscape sensitivities, biodiversity, potential loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, potential impacts on the Conservation Area and sewerage infrastructure. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLPO562

<b>GNLPO562 Land at Diss Road (East of Hill Farmhouse and Hill Farm Barn)</b>	
<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLPO562
<b>Site Address</b>	Land at Diss Road (East of Hill Farmhouse and Hill Farm Barn)
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	0.75
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development, proposed for one dwelling
<b>GNLP HELAA Conclusions</b>	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This is a large greenfield site off Diss Road and beyond the development boundary. It is slightly disconnected to the services and character of the village. Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. However, the site is considered to be remote from services for housing so development here would be likely to result in an increased use of unsustainable transport modes. There are no concerns over potential contamination, ground stability, loss of high quality agricultural land, loss of open space. However, other constraints include landscape sensitivities, SSSI buffer, and proximity to listed building and conservation area. Anglian Water has advised that major constraints to provision of sewerage infrastructure - substantial off-site sewerage required to connect FW. There are a number of constraints affecting this site but these may be possible to mitigate. The site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No

<p>Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?</p>	<p>No, however additional information includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchment</li> <li>• The site falls within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone however the proposed use does not trigger the need to consult Natural England</li> <li>• The Burston Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines (July 2021) describes the settlement pattern of Burston as historically relatively dispersed fronting onto historic lanes. The lack of consistency in curtilage size, building orientation, building line or setbacks, contributes to the more informal and rural character of the village. Later infilling has concentrated development along Diss Road with the presence of large estates to the east of Audley Close.</li> </ul>
<p>Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?</p>	<p>Yes. The site is outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside unsympathetic to the settlement character and form, contrary to Policy 16 of the adopted JCS and Policy DM1.3 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document. If the site is to be developed alongside GNLPO560 and GNLPO561, the significant cumulative impact on the settlement, landscape and historic character of the settlement would need to be considered.</p> <p>In addition, the site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land and as to whether development of the site would lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>It is recognised that the site is proposed for one dwelling. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF seeks to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more the exceptions apply, including criteria e where the design is of exceptional quality, in that it is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help raise standards of design more generally in rural areas, and would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. The site remains unsuitable for development in principle unless it is demonstrated that one of the exceptions apply.</p>
<p><b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b></p>	<p>The site is in a remote location outside of and disconnected from the settlement boundary of Burston. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside and have significant impacts on the character and form of the settlement. The site is <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in principle. It is recognised that the site is promoted for one dwelling. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF seeks to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the exceptions apply. No evidence has been received in relation the exception criteria. In addition, the site is also constrained in terms of access, landscape sensitivities, biodiversity, potential impacts on listed buildings and the Conservation Area, potential loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and sewerage infrastructure. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

## GNLP1028

GNLP1028 Land east of Mill Road, Crown Farm Barn	
Site Reference	GNLP1028
Site Address	Land east of Mill Road, Crown Farm Barn
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.3
Proposed Development	Residential development of 5 dwellings
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This is a greenfield site outside the development boundary and adjacent to the conservation area. It is well related to services and character of the area. Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that there is no possibility of creating suitable access to the site based on current evidence. Also, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There are no concerns over potential contamination, ground stability, loss of open space, loss of high quality agricultural land. However, other constraints include potential impacts on the setting of heritage assets, listed buildings, pond and ecology. The Crown PH is immediately to the south and is known as a music venue, so noise may be an issue. Anglian Water has advised that major constraints to provision of sewerage infrastructure - substantial off-site sewerage required to connect foul water. There are a number of constraints affecting this site, but these may be possible to mitigate. The site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	The site has been newly added to the Burston Conservation Area in the recent Burston Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Policies (July 2021) produced by South Norfolk Council. It consists of remains of an archaeological moated site (NH 10991). The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchment
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. Detailed surveys would be required to determine the site is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land and as to whether development of the site would lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes

**In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)**

The site is outside of the settlement boundary but is adjacent to and well related to the built-up area of Burston.

The site contains remains of a moat of potential historic and archaeological value which would need to be further investigated. Development of the site would need to protect and enhance the character and setting of the heritage asset and the Conservation Area.

The site is Grade 3 Good to Moderate Quality Agricultural Land. More detailed site surveys would be required to assess whether it is Grade 3a Good Quality Agricultural Land. Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. Footnote 53 suggests that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of higher quality.

If the settlement boundary of Burston was extended to include this site through the Neighbourhood Plan following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is **potentially suitable** for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to access, potential impacts on the archaeological site, potential impacts on listed buildings and the Conservation Area, noise, biodiversity and sewerage infrastructure. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, the development capacity of the site would be limited in line with draft GNLP 7.5.

The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP0102

### GNLP0102 Land at Frontier Agriculture on Sandy Lane

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0102
<b>Site Address</b>	Land at Frontier Agriculture on Sandy Lane
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	3.61
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development

### GNLP HELAA Conclusions

Suitability	<p><b>Suitable</b> - This site is in use as a grain processing and storage facility (and has been for decades), and so is a brownfield site. There is therefore the potential for some land contamination. Any potential access constraints and localised highways impacts could probably be overcome through re-development, although improvements to the Sawmills Road/Victoria Road junction may be necessary and general peak-time traffic congestion along the A1066 is acknowledged. The site is well-located to local services, being adjacent to the railway station (which is Grade II-listed) and close to employment opportunities and within easy reach of schools and the town centre. Whilst the site is proximal to the railway line and other employment uses, any noise impacts are thought likely to be able to be mitigated. Some sewerage upgrades are likely to be necessary. Some mitigation measures may be necessary due to the proximity of Frenze County Wildlife Site. There are some likely constraints affecting this site, including potential contamination and highways impacts, but they should be able to be overcome. The site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>
-------------	--

Availability	<b>Available</b> (1 to 5 years)
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	<p>The site is proposed for allocation in the draft Greater Norwich Local Plan for residential development to accommodate approximately 15 homes. This is the only site proposed for allocation in the Examination version of the draft GNLP. Development of the site is expected to address the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of site contamination with subsequent mitigation and considerations of development viability if required.</li> <li>• Assessment and mitigation measures to address adverse impacts from the railway and neighbouring employment uses on residential amenity.</li> <li>• Consider and mitigate surface water flood risk.</li> <li>• Road widening of Sandy Lane to a minimum of 6.0 metres for the extent of frontage.</li> <li>• Provision of a 3.0m wide cycle/footway at the site frontage to link to Nelson Road.</li> <li>• The trees/hedgerows surrounding the site will be protected, enhanced and incorporated into the scheme.</li> <li>• Historic Environment Record to be consulted to determine any need for archaeological surveys prior to development.</li> </ul> <p>The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</p>
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	<p>The site is a proposed allocation included in the Examination version of the GNLP. <b>Therefore it is not necessary to allocate the site in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</b></p> <p>If the site is excluded from the draft policy prior to adoption, the site is potentially suitable for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to assessment and mitigation of potential contamination, potential impacts on surrounding heritage assets, potential adverse impacts from the surrounding railway and neighbouring employment uses, surface water flood risk and access. Residential development on the site would be in line with the draft GNLP Policy 7.2 as the site is located within the settlement boundary and well-related to services. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

## GNLP0112

**GNLP0112 Frenze Hall Lane (Land to the south side of Frenze Road)**

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0112
<b>Site Address</b>	Frenze Hall Lane (Land to the south side of the Frenze Road)
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	0.23
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development for about 4-8 dwellings
<b>GNLP HELAA Conclusions</b>	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This is a small greenfield site for about 4-8 dwellings. The sewerage system would need upgrading, but this would be likely to be achievable, given the proximity of existing development. The site lies within one mile of a range of services, including employment opportunities, schools, shops and the railway station. There are no significant areas of flood risk on the site, just a small area of surface water flooding risks along the northern boundary. The site would not affect the setting of any heritage assets, and any noise impacts (from the railway line and Diss Business Park) would be limited and likely to be mitigatable. Some mitigation of potential ecological impacts on Frenze Hall County Wildlife Site may be necessary. Appropriate access to the site may not be easy to secure, as it would inevitably be close to the junction of Frenze Hall Lane and Walcot Green. Walcot Green to the east passes underneath the railway line, and this link would need to be maintained appropriately. Whilst appropriate highways mitigation work would need to be demonstrated, the site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No, however site observations agrees that appropriate access may be difficult to achieve as the it is located on a bend in the road near traffic lights. As it is opposite a high pressure gas station and protected tree, it is unlikely that the road could be widened. The site is also adjacent to a pond with protected newts. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP policy 7.2, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints in relation to sewerage, noise impacts, biodiversity and achieving appropriate access. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP0250

GNLP0250 Heywood Road, Diss	
Site Reference	GNLP0250
Site Address	Heywood Road, Diss
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	3.00
Proposed Development	Residential development
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<p><b>Suitable</b> - This greenfield site is located immediately north of the Diss Cemetery (which is a County Wildlife Site and non-designated heritage asset); mitigation measures (perhaps including a buffer zone) would probably be needed. As a location within the Waveney Valley landscape area, development would need to be designed sensitively. Access to the site would probably be from Heywood Road, to the east. Some mitigation measures may be needed to ensure an appropriate highways access, and enhanced footpath provision is probably achievable. However, especially if developed alongside other nearby sites, additional traffic pressure could be put on Shelfanger Road and the surrounding area; some wider traffic mitigation measures may be necessary. No designated heritage assets would be affected by the development of the site. Enhancements to the sewerage and water supply network would be needed. The site is relatively close to the town centre, and has good access to shops, public transport, employment opportunities and schools. The site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. However, along with GNLP0342 and GNLP0291, the site is submitted for planning application (pending consideration as of April 2022 for a comprehensive residential development up to 179 dwellings (2021/2782). The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments. The site is also adjacent to existing Public Rights of Way.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes

**In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)**

The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include the site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is **potentially suitable** for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to biodiversity, landscape sensitivity, achieving appropriate access, impacts on the wider road network and the sewerage and water supply network. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and is currently subject to a pending planning application for 179 dwellings (along with GNLP0342 and GNLP0291). If permission is granted the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation.

## GNLP0341

### GNLP0341 Land between Shelfanger Road and Mount Street

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0341
<b>Site Address</b>	Land between Shelfanger Road and Mount Street
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	3.21
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development of 35 retirement living units, 5 detached dwellings and land set aside for future Health Centre expansion. Note that later plans received for the site are for 24 bungalows with land safeguarded for future expansion of the neighbouring medical centre with the remainder of the site designated as public open space.
<b>GNLP HELAA Conclusions</b>	
Suitability	<b>Unsuitable</b> - This greenfield site is currently identified as an Important Local Open Space in the South Norfolk Local Plan, and its development for retirement-led residential use would clearly adversely affect the openness of the area. In addition, the site is a very important historic open space within the Conservation Area, with strong historic links to 60 Mount Street (the only detached landscape park in Norfolk) and other listed buildings; development of the site would clearly be damaging in this context too. Whilst the precise access point(s) are unclear, it is thought likely that the highways and footpath impacts could be mitigated satisfactorily. Given the proximity to existing development, sewerage upgrades are likely to be achievable, and the small area of surface water flooding (1 in 100-year) could either be avoided or mitigated. As a site with mature trees, were any to potentially be lost, it might affect the local bat population – further work would need to be done. Clearly, given its location adjacent to the town centre, the site is well-located to shops, with employment opportunities, public transport, a GP surgery and schools close by too. The significance of the Open Space is a major constraint and the site is concluded as being unsuitable for the land availability assessment
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No

Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments. Norfolk Wildlife Trust indicates that the site may have local biodiversity value and may contain veteran trees.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is currently identified as an Important Local Open Space in the South Norfolk Local Plan and the proposed residential use is likely to adversely affect the openness of the area, contrary to the adopted Local Plan Policy DM4.4. In addition, the site is identified for Norfolk County Council as a Historic Environment Site (NHER33463) with its development likely to negatively impact the historic character and context of the Conservation Area. The site is therefore assessed as <b>unsuitable</b> for housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other significant constraints identified include access, surface water flooding, sewerage capacity and biodiversity.

## GNLP0342

### GNLP0342 Land east of Shelfanger Road

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0342
<b>Site Address</b>	Land east of Shelfanger Road
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	4.76
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development of approximately 100 dwellings and open space

### GNLP HELAA Conclusions

Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - Direct access to the site would be very difficult, as it might require the use of a single track road going past the Catholic church to access Shelfanger Road (which, unless widened, would be very unlikely to be acceptable). However, if the site could be developed in conjunction with neighbouring promoted sites then much better access could potentially be secured; with sites 119 and 291 to the west, better access to Shelfanger Road might be secured; and/or with sites 250 to the east, better access to Heywood Road could be secured. Especially if developed alongside other nearby sites, additional traffic pressure could be put on Shelfanger Road and the surrounding area; some wider traffic mitigation measures may be necessary. This greenfield site is located immediately north of the Diss Cemetery (which is a County Wildlife Site and non-designated heritage asset); mitigation measures (perhaps including a buffer zone) would probably be needed. As a location within the Waveney Valley landscape area, development would be need to be designed sensitively. No designated heritage assets would be affected by the development of the site. Enhancements to the sewerage and water supply network would be needed and there is a small area of surface water flooding (1:100 years) that would need to be avoided or mitigated. The site is relatively close to the town centre, and has good access to shops, public transport, employment opportunities and schools. Subject to an appropriate highways access being deliverable through third-party land, the site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.
-------------	--

Availability	<b>Available</b> (1 to 5 years)
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. However, along with GNLP0340 and GNLP0291, the site is submitted for planning application (pending consideration as of April 2022 for a comprehensive residential development up to 179 dwellings (2021/2782). The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments. The site is also adjacent to existing Public Rights of Way.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include the site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to biodiversity, landscape sensitivity, impacts on heritage assets, surface water flooding, achieving appropriate access and the sewerage and water supply network. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and is currently subject to a pending planning application for 179 dwellings a(along with GNLP0342 and GNLP0291. If permission is granted the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation.

## GNLP0599

### GNLP0599 Walcot Road and Walcot Green

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0599
<b>Site Address</b>	Walcot Road and Walcot Green
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (Hectares)	3.29
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development

### GNLP HELAA Conclusions

Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This greenfield site lies between Diss and Walcot Green. The sewerage system would need upgrading, but this would be likely to be achievable. The site lies within one mile of a range of services, including employment opportunities, schools, shops and the railway station. The site could impact on some listed buildings in Walcot Green, but is thought likely to be mitigatable. Particularly in combination with site 599, pressure would be put on the local road network, but if access would be via a continuation of Walcot Rise (to the south), this would likely be acceptable in highways terms. If access to narrow
-------------	--

	Walcot Road was considered, some mitigation to the bend (which has poor visibility) would likely be required. There are no significant areas of flood risk on the site, just some minor surface water flooding risks along the eastern boundary with the railway line. The site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No, however the site is subject to a pending outline planning application (2019/1555) for up to 80 residential dwellings. Comments submitted by South Norfolk and Broadland Council Senior Heritage and Design Officers highlighted the site's potential impacts on the existing separation and difference in character between the hamlet of Walcott Green and the suburban settlement expansion of Diss. In addition, site observations highlighted the site's visual sensitivity and presence of potentially significant trees. Currently there is no pavement and no possibility to add a pavement without removal of mature trees/hedgerows. It may be difficult to create a safe and appropriate access due to limited visibility. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss at the southern end although remote from existing services. It contributes to the settlement gap between Walcott Green and Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to the potential impacts on the historic, settlement and landscape character / assets, sewerage, local road network capacity, access, ecology and surface water flooding. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since. The site is currently considered for an outline planning application for up to 80 residential dwellings including access. If permission is granted the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation.

## GNLP1003

GNLP1003	
Site Reference	GNLP1003
Site Address	Frenze Hall Lane
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	2.02

<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development
<b>GNLP HELAA Conclusions</b>	
Suitability	<b>Unsuitable</b> - This greenfield site lies on the eastern edge of Walcot Green beyond the edge of Diss, which benefits from a wide range of core services and facilities but the site is at some distance from the town and a limited number of services would be in reasonable walking distance. There are no known constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure or contamination/ ground stability and only small parts of the site and the adjoining roadway are subject to surface water flooding. Anglian Water have not commented specifically on this site in relation to water infrastructure but on the basis of other sites in Diss it is likely that off site mains reinforcement and sewerage upgrades would be necessary. The site adjoins the locally identified Waveney River Valley protection zone and is within 150m of a County Wildlife Site at Frenze Brook: some mitigation is likely to be necessary. Development would not result in the loss of any locally protected open space or high quality agricultural land. There could be potentially harmful impacts on heritage assets in Walcot Green and the setting a Grade I-listed church in nearby Frenze. Particularly in combination with sites 0599 and 1044, and on the basis of current evidence, it appears unlikely that satisfactory highways and footpath improvements are capable of being delivered, due to the constraints imposed by the unsuitable road network. Due to the significant highways constraints, the site is concluded as being unsuitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	A Delivery Statement submitted to the Qualifying Body by the site promoter of GNLP1044 (Land to the south of the site) in March 2021 sets out a range of highways and access solutions proposed and agreed with Norfolk County Highways. Based on the submitted evidence, the proposed measures could possibly improve the highway safety and operational capacity of the surrounding transport network which may potentially benefit GNLP1003 subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority. The proposed measures are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walcot Green Lane (including the junction with Frenze Hall Lane) will be widened to a two lane road with a new 3m shared footway/cycleway provided along the western side of Walcot Green Lane along with a crossing facility on Frenze Hall Lane</li> <li>• Land west of Walcot Green Lane to be served from a new priority junction on Walcot Green Lane</li> <li>• Reserved rights over the residential development immediately to the south for a link to the loop estate road to provide a pedestrian/cycle link and an emergency second point of access to the site</li> <li>• Provisions of footpaths through Orchard Croft to Frenze Hall Lane</li> </ul> The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	No

**In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)**

The site consists of garden land wrapped around an existing dwelling located outside and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site would encroach into the open countryside and have significant impacts on the character and form of the settlement. Development of the site will directly contribute to the coalescence between the hamlet of Walcott Green and Diss, however a strategic gap has not been identified in the adopted or emerging Local Plan. The site is **unsuitable** for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in principle.

Recent evidence suggests that constraints relating to the existing highways and pedestrian network may be potentially improved through potential upgrades proposed as part of the development proposals of GNLP1044, however it is not known whether the relevant highways improvement may accommodate traffic from the site's development to provide for appropriate access. Other constraints identified includes surface water flooding, sewerage, biodiversity and impacts on designated heritage assets and their setting.

## GNLP1044

GNLP1044 Land at Walcot Green Lane	
Site Reference	GNLP1044 (HELAA 2017)
Site Address	Land at Walcot Green Lane, Diss
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	9.55
Proposed Development	Residential (including approximately 120 new homes and 10 self-build plots)
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<p><b>Unsuitable</b> –This greenfield site lies between Diss and Walcot Green. Part of the site is adjacent to the railway line; some noise mitigation may be necessary. The sewerage system would need upgrading, but this would be likely to be achievable. The site lies within one mile of a range of services, including employment opportunities, schools, shops and the railway station.</p> <p>The site could impact on some listed buildings in Walcot Green, and a Grade I-listed church in nearby Frenze. Some mitigation of potential ecological impacts on Frenze Hall County Wildlife Site may be necessary.</p> <p>Particularly in combination with site 599, pressure would be put on the local road network (Frenze Hall Lane and Walcot Green) and on the basis of current evidence, it appears unlikely that satisfactory highways and footpath improvements are capable of being delivered, due to the constraints (narrow roads).</p> <p>Small parts of the site alongside the railway line, that are vulnerable to surface water flooding, at 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 risk. Due to the significant highways constraints, the site is concluded as being unsuitable for the land availability assessment.</p>
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	

<p>Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the SHELAA findings</p>	<p>A Delivery Statement submitted to the Qualifying Body by the site promoter in March 2021 sets out a range of highways and access solutions proposed and agreed with Norfolk County Highways. Based on the submitted evidence, the proposed measures could possibly help overcome the highways concerns highlighted in the previous assessments subject to further Highways Assessment and consultation with Norfolk County Council to confirm that the potential cumulative impacts on highway safety and operational capacity of the surrounding transport network are appropriately mitigated. The measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walcot Green Lane (including the junction with Frenze Hall Lane) will be widened to a two lane road with a new 3m shared footway/cycleway provided along the western side of Walcot Green Lane along with a crossing facility on Frenze Hall Lane</li> <li>• Land west of Walcot Green Lane to be served from a new priority junction on Walcot Green Lane</li> <li>• Reserved rights over the residential development immediately to the south for a link to the loop estate road to provide a pedestrian/cycle link and an emergency second point of access to the site</li> <li>• Provisions of footpaths through Orchard Croft to Frenze Hall Lane</li> </ul> <p>The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.</p>
<p>Are there any concerns that the SHELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b></p>	<p>The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss on the western side and the rest is outside of the settlement boundary. Development of the site will contribute to coalescence between the hamlet of Walcott Green and Diss, however a strategic gap has not been identified in the adopted or emerging Local Plan. Development of the site is likely to impact the form and rural character of Walcott Green which would need to be mitigated.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft Policy 7.2 of the GNLP, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to highways, noise, wastewater, heritage, ecology, flood risk, landscape and the form and character of the settlement. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

## GNLP1045

GNLP1045 Land west of Nelson Road and East of Station Road	
Site Reference	GNLP1045
Site Address	Land west of Nelson Road and East of Station Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.94
Proposed Development	Residential development
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Unsuitable</b> - This brownfield site (former industrial and railway land) is proposed for residential development. It lies just east of the railway line and is surrounded by existing industrial development to the north and south, with residential development to the east. Given past uses, there may be some contaminated land on the site, and careful mitigation measures would likely be necessary to manage noise from the railway line and adjoining industrial uses. Some 1-in-100 year surface water flooding risks on the southern part of the site would need to be mitigated, and the sewerage and surface water networks would need to be upgraded (which seems possible). Access to the highways network would be unlikely to cause any difficulties. The site lies close to a range of services, including employment opportunities, schools, shops and the railway station. There would be no impact on any designated heritage assets, although some mitigation of recreational impacts on Frenze Brook County Wildlife Site may be necessary. The site is subject to an existing allocation for employment uses, a form of development different from that which is being proposed. Should this proposal be taken forward it would be subject to acceptance of the loss of the existing committed use. Therefore, the site is not considered to offer additional capacity for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	Yes. The Qualifying Body have confirmed to AECOM (November 2020) that South Norfolk Council have agreed for Site GNLP1045 to be considered for residential use. The site has also been confirmed to be available in 2020. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	No

**In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)**

The site is a previously developed land formerly of industrial and railway uses. The site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan for employment use but South Norfolk Council has agreed for it to be considered for residential use. The site is located within the settlement boundary of Diss. The site is **potentially suitable** for residential development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.2, subject to appropriate demonstration that the possibility of re-using or redeveloping the site for a range of alternative business purposes has been fully explored and that the site is no longer economically viable or practical to retain for employment use in line with adopted Policy DM2.2, as well as mitigation of constraints relating to the biodiversity, potential impacts of the employment and railway context on residential amenity, potential contamination, risks of surface water flooding, sewerage and surface water upgrades and provision of appropriate highways access.

## GNL2067

GNL2067 Victoria Road	
Site Reference	GNL2067
Site Address	Victoria Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.42
Proposed Development	Repair and retail warehouse, business and offices
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This 0.42 ha site is located south of Victoria Road suggested for warehousing, business and offices. The adjacent building is a C2 residential care home which could conflict with the proposed use. The site is wholly within flood zone 2 and the boundary of the site is within flood zone 3. Other environmental considerations are that the site is adjacent to Stuston Common and is within the Waveney river valley. Although the site has constraints it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments. The site is part of the Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor in Diss.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes

**In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)**

The site is adjacent to the built-up area and settlement boundary of Diss. It is however wholly within Flood Zone 2 and therefore a sequential approach should be adopted to identify if alternative sites with lower risk of flooding may be available in line with Paragraph 161 of the NPPF. The site selection process implies that there are reasonable alternative employment sites available in Diss. If detailed sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test is applied and indicates otherwise, the site is **potentially suitable** for employment development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to flooding, potential impacts on surrounding uses and environmental considerations identified. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLNP4049

GNLNP4049 South of Burston Road	
Site Reference	GNLNP4049 (HELAA Addendum III December 2020)
Site Address	South of Burston Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) Addendum III December 2020
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	20.49
Proposed development	Housing with land for education provision (capacity not specified – AECOM calculated capacity = 256 dwellings)
GNLNP HELAA Addendum III Conclusions	
Suitability	<p><b>Suitable</b> – This a 20.49 ha greenfield site east of Heywood Road, south of Burston Road, and north of Walcot Road. The site is promoted for housing with land for education provision and a country park. Initial highways evidence raises concern about the network west and south, but suggests development potential could exist if considered with other sites.</p> <p>The site lies within an accessible distance of services, including employment opportunities, schools, shops and the railway station. For example Diss High School is immediately to the south. The site could impact on some listed buildings in Walcot Green, but these considerations are thought mitigatable. There are no significant areas of flood risk on the site, except for some parts at surface water flood risk (for which an attenuation basin is proposed). Due to the size of the site, there are likely to be townscape and landscape considerations. To facilitate development sewerage upgrades would likely be required, but there are no known constraints from contamination or ground instability, potential loss of open space, or ecological designations. In conclusion, the site is considered as suitable for the land availability assessment.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The site scores <b>green</b> in the following categories of the constraints and impacts analysis as part of the suitability assessment: accessibility to services, utilities infrastructure, contamination and ground stability, market attractiveness, biodiversity and geodiversity, open space and GI and compatibility with neighbouring uses.</p> <p>The site scores <b>amber</b> in the following categories of the constraints and impacts analysis as part of the suitability assessment: site access, utilities capacity, flood risk, significant landscape impacts, sensitive townscapes, historic environment, as well as Transport and Roads.</p>
Availability	<b>Available</b> – The proposer has indicated that the site is likely to be available within 1-5 years (by March 2021).

Achievability	<b>Available</b> – The proposer has indicated that the site is likely to be available within 1-5 years (by March 2021).
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	<b>No</b>
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the SHELAA findings?	Further comments provided to the LPA by consultees (published as part of the Site Assessment Booklets in January 2021) <sup>34</sup> should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA): The site is affected by a minor extension of a flow path</li> <li>• Highways: Network below required standard to support development traffic</li> <li>• Development Management: Concerns about setting of Walcot Green Hamlet.</li> </ul>
Are there any concerns that the SHELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	<b>No but further considerations are identified:</b> The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss and in close proximity to the rural hamlet of Walcot Green. The two settlements of varying character are currently separated by existing fields to the south and west of Walcot Green, including the site in concern. There are no strategic gaps identified in the adopted or emerging Local Plan around Diss or Walcot Green but full development of the site is likely to lead to coalescence between the two settlements. It is also likely to impact the rural character, identity and settlement form of Walcot Green, although this could be potentially mitigated through the provision of green or landscape gaps.  The site is currently proposed to be accessed through the north of Burston Road but secondary accesses is likely to be required considering the size of the site. Its relationship to the existing frontage development would need to be carefully designed.
Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?	Yes
In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)	The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site would be <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to access and highways, heritage, surface water flood risk, townscape, landscape, utilities capacity and the form and character of settlements. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP0104

GNLP0104 Sandstone Way	
Site Reference	GNLP0104
Site Address	Sandstone Way
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.48
Proposed Development	Residential Development (Proposed for 6-10 residential dwellings)

<sup>34</sup> [https://www.gnlp.org.uk/sites/gnlp/files/2021-01/Diss%20Booklet\\_0.pdf](https://www.gnlp.org.uk/sites/gnlp/files/2021-01/Diss%20Booklet_0.pdf)

<b>GNL P HELAA Conclusions</b>	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This greenfield site is proposed for 6-10 residential dwellings and is sandwiched between existing residential development to the south and the A1066 to the north. If highways access can be secured to Sandstone Way, then the highways impacts maybe acceptable; but if a direct access to the A1066 was needed instead, it would be more problematic. Either way, noise mitigation measures may be necessary as the A1066 is a 40mph zone adjacent to the site. Given its location not far from the town centre, the site is well-located to shops, with employment opportunities, public transport, and schools close by too. There are no flooding constraints, and as a relatively small site adjacent to existing development, some modest sewerage upgrades are likely to be deliverable. No heritage assets would be affected adversely. The site is fairly close to the River Waveney, and within 200m of Roydon Fen Local Nature Reserve; some mitigation measures may be necessary. A number of constraints are identified but subject to being able to overcome these the site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is partially within and adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss and relates well to the settlement. While the site is located in between Roydon and Diss, it is unlikely to contribute to the coalescence between Roydon and Diss as it does not extend beyond the existing form of the settlement and is relatively small in size. Its development would be in keeping with the linear nature of southwestern Diss along Tottington Lane. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include the whole site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account emerging GNL P Policy 7.2, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to achieving appropriate access, mitigating noise impacts along the A1066, landscape, biodiversity and sewerage upgrades. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include the whole site as an allocation, development may be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5 of the GNL P once adopted. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP0119

GNLP0119 Shelfanger Road	
Site Reference	GNLP0119
Site Address	Shelfanger Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.68
Proposed Development	Residential Development (15-20 dwellings)
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This is a current residential garden, proposed for 15-20 dwellings. So long as the site was to be developed alongside site 0291 (immediately to the south), and an appropriate footway could be provided, there would not be any localised highways concerns. Especially if developed alongside other nearby sites, however (such as 0250 and 0349 to the east), additional traffic pressure could be put on Shelfanger Road and the surrounding area; some wider traffic mitigation measures may be necessary. This greenfield site is located close to Diss Cemetery (which is a County Wildlife Site and non-designated heritage asset); mitigation measures may be needed. As a location within the Waveney Valley landscape area, development would be need to be designed sensitively. No designated heritage assets would be affected by the development of the site. Enhancements to the sewerage and water supply network would be needed. The site is relatively close to the town centre, and has good access to shops, public transport, employment opportunities and schools. Subject to being developed alongside adjacent site 0291, the site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is a residential garden adjacent but not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site without GNLP0291 immediately to the south would not be supported by a safe and appropriate pedestrian access. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2 and the settlement character of Diss following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site may be <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints relating to achieving appropriate access (including pedestrian access potentially

through a comprehensive development along with GNL0291), traffic pressures, wildlife, landscape, heritage and the sewerage and water supply network. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft Policy 7.4 and 7.5 once adopted. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP0291

GNLP0291	
Site Reference	GNLP0291
Site Address	Land north of Shelfanger Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.93
Proposed Development	Residential development
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This greenfield site is located close to Diss Cemetery (which is a County Wildlife Site and non-designated heritage asset); mitigation measures may be needed. As a location within the Waveney Valley landscape area, development would be need to be designed sensitively. There may be a need to protect some of the boundary trees and hedges, which are likely to be of some ecological value. So long as the site was to be developed alongside site 0119 (immediately to the north), and an appropriate footway could be provided, there would not be any localised highways concerns. Especially if developed alongside other nearby sites, however (such as 0250 and 0349 <sup>35</sup> to the east), additional traffic pressure could be put on Shelfanger Road and the surrounding area; some wider traffic mitigation measures may be necessary. No designated heritage assets would be affected by the development of the site. Enhancements to the sewerage and water supply network would be needed. The site is relatively close to the town centre, and has good access to shops, public transport, employment opportunities and schools. Subject to being developed alongside adjacent site 0119, the site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. However, along with GNL0342 and GNL0250, the site is submitted for planning application (pending consideration as of April 2022 for a comprehensive residential development up to 179 dwellings (2021/2782). The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No

<sup>35</sup> Assuming this refers to GNL0342 instead as GNL0349 is located in Burston and Shimpling.

<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	<p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include the site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to access and local highways network, biodiversity, landscape sensitivity, impacts on heritage assets, landscape, ecology and the sewerage and water supply network. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5 once adopted.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and is currently subject to a pending planning application for 179 dwellings (along with GNLP0342 and GNLP0250). If permission is granted the site would not need to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan although support for development at this location could be demonstrated through an allocation.</p>

## GNLP0362

### GNLP0362 Sturgeons Farm, off Farm Close, Louie's Lane, Shelfanger Road

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0362
<b>Site Address</b>	Sturgeons Farm, off Farm Close, Louie's Lane, Shelfanger Road
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	13.81
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential led mixed use development of approximately 413 dwellings
<b>GNLP HELAA Conclusions</b>	
Suitability	<p><b>Suitable</b> - This is a large greenfield site proposed for about 400 dwellings. Enhancements to the sewerage and water supply network would be needed, perhaps including the closest Water Recycling Centre. Particularly in combination with nearby sites, additional traffic pressure would be put on Shelfanger Road and the surrounding area; some wider traffic mitigation measures may be necessary. Development of the scale of this site would also add to the traffic pressure along the A1066 through Diss. A suitable highways access to the site to Shelfanger Road is probably achievable. A small watercourse runs along the northern boundary of the site, and parts of the site close to this are affected by 1:100-year surface water flooding. There would not be any negative impacts on heritage assets or townscapes from the site's development, although given its current location within the Waveney Valley landscape policy, development would need to be designed appropriately. There are several nearby County Wildlife Sites which might require some mitigation. The watercourse and a small copse in the site would also need protection. Although the site is on the north-west edge of Diss, it still has reasonable access to shops, public transport, employment opportunities and schools. The site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>

### How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?

Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. However, it is observed that the site is of medium visual sensitivity. Full development of the site is likely to impact the character of the settlement and encroaches into the open countryside. Therefore partial allocation adjacent to the existing dwellings in the south/east of the site, complemented with the provision of soft settlement edge, is recommended. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is a large greenfield adjacent and connected to the settlement boundary of Diss at the northwestern edge. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to settlement and landscape character, visual sensitivity, ecology, biodiversity, access and local road network capacity, surface water flooding and sewerage and water supply network. As full development of the site is likely to negatively impact the settlement character encroaching into the open countryside, partial allocation adjacent to the existing dwellings in the south/east of the site, complemented with the provision of soft settlement edge, is recommended. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP0606

### GNLP0606 Boundary Farm on Shelfanger Road

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0606
<b>Site Address</b>	Boundary Farm on Shelfanger Road
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	3.08. Note that only a small part of the site falls within the Neighbourhood Area.
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development

### GNLP HELAA Conclusions

Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This is a greenfield site immediately north of site 0362, to the north of Diss. It lies opposite Diss Sports Ground to the east. Although the site is on the north-west edge of Diss, it still has reasonable access to shops, public transport, employment opportunities and schools. Enhancements to the sewerage and water supply network would be needed, perhaps including the closest Water Recycling Centre. Parts of the site close to this are affected by 1:100-year and 1:30-year surface water flooding, including the current access (which serves the farm). Particularly in combination with nearby sites (and especially the large site 0362 to the south), additional traffic pressure would be put on Shelfanger Road and the surrounding area; wider traffic mitigation measures would likely be necessary. Development of this site would also add to the traffic pressure along the A1066 through Diss. There would not be any negative impacts on heritage assets or
-------------	--

	townscapes from the site's development, although given its current location within the Waveney Valley landscape policy, development would need to be designed appropriately. The site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>

**How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?**

Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	The site is outside and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. It does not relate well to the existing settlement form. Development of the site will represent an illogical extension of the settlement to the north, encroaching into the open countryside. However, the site is partly previously developed with two dwellings. The rest of the site consists of temporary structures in agricultural and waste recycling uses.
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	No

**In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)**

The site is predominantly greenfield in agricultural use outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site will represent an illogical extension of the settlement to the north, encroaching into the open countryside. A small part of the site is previously developed with two residential dwellings formed through subdivision, and is unlikely to be capable of accommodating additional dwellings. The site is therefore **unsuitable** for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other constraints identified includes ecology, biodiversity, visual sensitivity, landscape, local road network capacity, risk of surface water flooding and sewerage and water supply upgrades. The majority of the site falls outside of the Neighbourhood Area, which cannot be allocated in the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. If the Qualifying Body wish to allocate this site, it will need to be discussed with the relevant plan-making bodies (including South Norfolk Council and potentially Heywood Parish Council), who may wish to allocate it in their plan. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP1038

GNLP1038 Brewers Green	
Site Reference	GNLP1038
Site Address	Brewers Green
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1.06
Proposed Development	Residential development of approximately 8 to 12 dwellings
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<p><b>Suitable</b> - This greenfield site adjoins existing residential development to the north, and Diss Football Club's floodlit ground to the east. There is potential for noise and light nuisance from the ground, but this is probably capable of being mitigated. Some overhead cables cross the middle of the site, which are a constraint. There are two listed buildings close to the west of the site, which would need consideration. Development of the site would also "close the gap" between the built-up parts of Diss and Roydon, which would have negative townscape impacts. In terms of access, an appropriate visibility splay appears achievable although both potential access roads are narrow and could be a constraint and mitigation would be required. Some surface water flooding on parts of Brewers Green and Factory Lane may affect access decisions. Enhancements to the sewerage and water supply network would be needed, but given the proximity to existing connected areas, this should not be a problem. Some mitigation may be required due to the proximity of Brewers Green County Wildlife Site 25m to the west. The site is relatively close to the town centre, and has good access to shops, public transport, employment opportunities and schools. There are constraints that will require mitigation however, based on current evidence, the site is concluded as being suitable for the land availability assessment.</p>
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	Yes, the site is located outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site will lead to coalescence of Diss and Roydon and have significant impacts on their settlement character.
Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?	No
In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)	The site is a greenfield outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site will lead to coalescence of Diss and Roydon, and have significant impacts on their settlement character. The site is therefore <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other constraints identified includes access, potential noise and light impacts from surrounding uses on residential amenity, the presence of overhead power lines,

heritage, risk of surface water flooding and the sewerage and water supply network. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP2104

GNLP2104 West of Shelfanger Road	
Site Reference	GNLP2104
Site Address	West of Shelfanger Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2018 Addendum
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	50.51. Note that part of the site falls outside of the Neighbourhood Area.
Proposed Development	Residential development
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This 50.51 ha site is located west of Shelfanger Road. Initial highway evidence suggests that the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road or junction capacity and lack of footpath provision, therefore, mitigation would be required. The centre of the site is at risk of surface flooding, and the northern border of the site is within flood zone 3, which would require mitigation. Other environmental constraints include the adjacent Brewer's Green County Wildlife Site and the southern portion of the site being within the Waveney River valley. The site is also near to numerous Grade II listed buildings, which would need consideration. Although the site has constraints it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	Yes. The site is outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. It crosses the soft eastern settlement edge of Diss encroaching into the open countryside. Full development of the site will significantly change the size and character of the settlement, and lead to perceived coalescence of Diss and Roydon.
Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?	No
In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)	The site is a greenfield outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Diss. It crosses the soft eastern settlement edge of Diss encroaching into the open countryside. Full development of the site will significantly change the size and character of the settlement, and lead to perceived coalescence of Diss and Roydon. The site is therefore <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present. Other constraints identified includes access, local road network capacity, risk of fluvial and surface water flooding, landscape and

visual sensitivity, ecology and impacts on designated heritage assets.  
Part of the site falls outside of the Neighbourhood Area and cannot be allocated in the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan. If the Qualifying Body wish to allocate this site, it will need to be discussed with the relevant plan-making bodies (including South Norfolk Council and potentially Heywood Parish Council), who may wish to allocate it in their plan.  
The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GMLP4010

GMLP4010 Tottington Lane	
Site Reference	GMLP4010 (HELAA Addendum III December 2020)
Site Address	Tottington Lane
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) Addendum III December 2020
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1.07
Proposed Development	10+ dwellings
GMLP HELAA Addendum III Conclusions	
Suitability	<p><b>Suitable</b> – This is a 1.07 ha site off Tottington Lane and Potash Lane that is promoted for a minimum of 10 homes. Although the site benefits from an edge of Diss location, the distance to services and facilities is generally at least a kilometre, and footpath connections along Tottington Lane are incomplete. Initial highways evidence raises concern over the network and the site’s remoteness for pedestrians. A significant constraint of the site is the proximity of Roydon Fen County Wildlife Site, which the western boundary of GMLP4010 appears to encroach upon. The site is also within the 1 km impact zone of Wortham Ling SSSI. The distance of less than 40 metres from the Grade II Listed cottage ‘By the Potash’ is another factor. However, there are no known constraints from flood risk, utilities infrastructure, contamination or ground instability. Although the site has some constraints, it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The site scores <b>green</b> in the following categories of the constraints and impacts analysis as part of the suitability assessment: utilities capacity, utilities infrastructure, contamination and ground stability and market attractiveness</p> <p>The site scores <b>amber</b> in the following categories of the constraints and impacts analysis as part of the suitability assessment: site access, accessibility to services, flood risk, significant landscape impacts, sensitive townscape, historic environment and transport and roads</p> <p>The site scores <b>red</b> in the following categories of the constraints and impacts analysis as part of the suitability assessment: biodiversity and geodiversity</p>
Availability	<b>Available</b> – The proposer has indicated that the site is likely to be available within 1-5 years (by March 2021).
Achievability	<b>Available</b> – The proposer has indicated that the site is likely to be available within 1-5 years (by March 2021).

### How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?

Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	<b>No</b>
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the SHELAA findings?	<b>No, but additional information identified should be considered:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The western part of the site is identified as a Priority Habitat (Deciduous Woodland)</li> <li>The site is crossed by overhead electricity poles in the middle of the site which might impact the developable area / viability of the site</li> <li>The site falls outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments</li> </ul>
Are there any concerns that the SHELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	<b>No but further considerations are identified:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Diss. Development of the site is likely to elongate the settlement pattern of Diss, however, it is unlikely to significantly increase the risks of coalescence between Diss and Roydon due to its location and the potential gap provided by Roydon Fen County Wildlife Site.</li> <li>This part of Diss is not served by a continuous pedestrian network and Tottington Lane is generally narrow with limited scope for widening (approximately 5.5m wide). The site is not in a very sustainable location for development at present.</li> </ul>
Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?	<b>Yes</b>
In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)	The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary but in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development at present. If the settlement boundary of Diss was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, taking into account draft GNLP Policy 7.2, the site would be <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan subject to mitigation of constraints related to access and highways, heritage, biodiversity, townscape, landscape, utilities infrastructure and the form and character of settlements.

## GNLP0339

### GNLP0339 Land at Street Farm, west of Low Road

Site Reference	GNLP0339
Site Address	Land at Street Farm, west of Low Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.34
Proposed Development	Residential development of approximately 10-15 dwellings with landscaping and open space

### GNLP HELAA Conclusions

Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This is a greenfield site off Low Road which is a narrow road in close proximity to the A140. It is situated between two properties, therefore well related to the form and character of the village. Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that the possibility of creating suitable access to the site is severely constrained. Also, the local road network is considered to be unsuitable either in terms of road capacity, or lack of footpath provision. There are no concerns over contamination, ground stability, loss of high quality agricultural land, loss of open space or ecological impacts. The site is within Waveney River Valley and
-------------	--

	conservation area and other constraints include proximity to scheduled ancient monument, listed buildings, and potential noise from the A140. There are number of constraints but as these may be possible to mitigate the site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>

#### How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?

Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is partly adjacent to the settlement boundary of Scole and relates well with the existing settlement form. If the settlement boundary of Scole was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to achieving appropriate access, heritage and archaeology, landscape and potential noise impacts from the A140. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP0511

### GNLP0511 Land to the east of Norwich Road, South of Ransom Avenue

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0511
<b>Site Address</b>	Land to the east of Norwich Road, South of Ransom Avenue
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	1.02
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential development of up to 35 dwellings

#### GNLP HELAA Conclusions

Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This is a large greenfield site currently allocated in the adopted local plan for housing. It is well related to services and character of the village. The proposal is to increase the density from 15 to 35 dwellings. Initial highway evidence has indicated that there are potential access constraints on the site, but these could be overcome through development. There are no concerns over contamination, ground stability, loss of open space, or landscape character issues other than scale of development proposed. There are number of constraints but these may be possible to mitigate. However, the site is subject to an existing
-------------	--

	allocation for a similar form of development, consequently it will not contribute any additional development capacity for the purposes of the HELAA analysis
Availability	<b>Available</b>
Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	This is a large greenfield site within the settlement boundary of Scole. It is currently allocated in the adopted local plan for housing but the allocation has not been carried forward in the draft GNLP. It is well related to services and character of the village and is relatively free from constraints other than utilities capacity and potential impacts on the local road networks. The site is therefore <b>suitable</b> for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## GNLP0527

### GNLP0527 Land to the south of Bungay Road

<b>Site Reference</b>	GNLP0527
<b>Site Address</b>	Land to the south of Bungay Road
<b>Site Source</b>	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2017
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	1.75
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Residential Development of approximately 53 dwellings
<b>GNLP HELAA Conclusions</b>	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - This is a large greenfield site south of Bungay Road in close proximity to the A143. It is adjacent to the built up area therefore, well related to services and character of the area. Initial highway evidence has highlighted concerns that the possibility of creating suitable access to the site is severely constrained. However subject to suitable footpath provision, any potential impact on the functioning of local roads could be reasonably mitigated. Other constraints include proximity to sewerage works, where odour may be an issue. There are number of constraints but as these may be possible to mitigate the site is concluded as suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>

Achievability	<b>Achievable</b>
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is a paddock partially within and adjacent to the settlement boundary of Scole. If the settlement boundary of Scole was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to achieving appropriate access and proximity to sewerage works. The site boundary as proposed does not front the street network and may negatively impact the townscape character which would need to be mitigated. The site is adjacent to the Scole Conservation Area. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLP Policy 7.4 and 7.5.

## GNLP2066

GNLP2066 1 Bridge Road	
Site Reference	GNLP2066
Site Address	1 Bridge Road
Site Source	Greater Norwich Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2018 Addendum
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.5
Proposed Development	Residential Development
GNLP HELAA Conclusions	
Suitability	<b>Suitable</b> - The site lies to the south of Scole, adjacent to the built up area and taking a narrow access off Bridge Road. Being close to the village, the site is accessible to bus services, employment, retail and Scole Primary School, but is also close to listed buildings and adjacent to the conservation area. Initial evidence from the Highway Authority suggests that a suitable access cannot be achieved. The eastern part of the site is at risk of surface water flooding, and at 1:1000 extent this covers approximately half the site. There is a scheduled ancient monument within 400m of the site, and the site is in the designated river valley. However, there are no concerns over biodiversity, contamination, ground stability or loss of open space. The site has some constraints but subject to being able to achieve satisfactory access, it is considered suitable for the land availability assessment.
Availability	<b>Available</b>

Achievability	Achievable
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments. The site also contains a number of mature trees which would need to be retained and preserved as appropriate.
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	<p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Scole. The site relies on a narrow access of Bridge Road which may not be suitable to support the proposed capacity. It is likely that development of the site would only be possible in combination with GNLPO527 or if the boundary is revised to provide suitable access.</p> <p>If the settlement boundary of Scole was extended to include this site following discussions with South Norfolk Council, the site is <b>potentially suitable</b> for development allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, subject to mitigation of constraints related to access, impacts on the significance and character of designated heritage assets and the Conservation Area, risk of surface water flooding, archaeology, ecology and biodiversity. If the settlement boundary was not extended to include this site as an allocation, development here would be limited in line with draft GNLPO Policy 7.4 and 7.5. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2019 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

## SS0827

### SS0827 Land south of Rectory Road

<b>Site Reference</b>	SS0827
<b>Site Address</b>	Land south of Rectory Road
<b>Site Source</b>	BMSJLP SHELAA
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	1.28
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Not specified in the published version of the SHELAA. This assessment therefore considers the site's suitability for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan for residential development.

### BMSJLP SHELAA Conclusions

BMSJLP SHELAA Conclusion	<b>Excluded</b> – Site has poor access to core services and facilities and has poor connectivity to the existing settlement
--------------------------	---

### How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?

Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No, however additional constraints are identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is in a remote location outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Brome</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While a suitable access may be achieved subject to consultation with the relevant Highways Authority, the site is not connected to a safe pedestrian network</li> <li>• The site is crossed by overhead power lines</li> <li>• The site is a greenfield located in the open countryside with medium to high visual and landscape sensitivity</li> <li>• A number of semi-mature and mature trees are located within or adjacent</li> <li>• The site is in close proximity to Grade II* and Grade II listed buildings</li> <li>• The site is located within the Minerals Safeguarding Area but the proposed development is under 5 Ha</li> <li>• The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments</li> </ul>
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	The site is a greenfield in the open countryside, outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Brome. Development of the site will reinforce ribbon development along Brome Street, contrary to Policy LP01 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy and Policy CS1 and SB2 of the draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan. Therefore the site is <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Other constraints identified includes access, the presence of overhead power lines, visual and landscape sensitivity, potential impacts on designated heritage assets and ecology. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.

## SS0068

### SS0068 Land north of Upper Rose Lane

<b>Site Reference</b>	SS0068
<b>Site Address</b>	Land north of Upper Rose Lane
<b>Site Source</b>	BMSJLP SHELAA
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	2.9
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Not specified in the published version of the SHELAA. A relevant transport modelling of the SHELAA report <sup>36</sup> indicates that the site is proposed for 15 dwellings.
<b>BMSJLP SHELAA Conclusions</b>	
BMSJLP SHELAA Conclusion	<b>Excluded</b> – No possibility of creating suitable access to the site and has poor connectivity to the existing settlement
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. However additional constraints are identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is adjacent though only partially connected to the settlement boundary of Palgrave. Palgrave is a secondary village that is defined as generally unsuitable for growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and</li> </ul>

<sup>36</sup> Available at <https://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Current-Evidence-Base/Transport-Modelling/Transport-Modelling-Methodology-Report-January-2019.pdf>

	<p>development for local needs according to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities</li> <li>• The northern part of the site is located within the designated Special Landscape Area and is visually open. Policy CL2 of the saved Mid Suffolk Local Plan states that particular care will be taken to safeguard landscape quality within special landscape areas, and where development does occur it should be sensitively designed, with high standards of layout, materials and landscaping</li> <li>• The site is crossed by overhead power lines at the access point. It is not clear how suitable access could be provided.</li> <li>• The site falls within the Network Expansion Zone</li> </ul>
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	<p>The site is a greenfield adjacent though not connected to the settlement boundary of Palgrave. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs. The site is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities.</p> <p>The site is located within the designated Special Landscape Area and is visually open.</p> <p>The site is also crossed by overhead power lines at the access point. It is not clear how suitable vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access could be provided at present.</p> <p>The site is therefore <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present.</p> <p>The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

## SS0412

### SS0412 Land south of Upper Rose Lane

<b>Site Reference</b>	SS0412
<b>Site Address</b>	Land south of Upper Rose Lane
<b>Site Source</b>	BMSJLP SHELAA
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	4.17
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Not specified in the published version of the SHELAA. This assessment therefore considers the site's suitability for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan for residential development.
<b>BMSJLP SHELAA Conclusions</b>	
BMSJLP SHELAA Conclusion	<b>Excluded</b> – Site has poor connectivity to the existing settlement and is not consistent with the settlement pattern
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No

Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	<p>No. However additional constraints are identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is adjacent to and connected to the settlement boundary. Development of the site is likely to extend the settlement form of Palgrave towards the east and south, negatively impacting the settlement character and reducing the gap between Diss and Palgrave</li> <li>• The site is relatively contained from key views</li> <li>• Development of the site may have some impact on designated Grade II listed buildings in proximity</li> <li>• The site falls within the Network Expansion Zone and is adjacent to priority habitats</li> <li>• The site is not served by an existing access although suitable access could be potentially created subject to further consultation with the relevant Highways Authority</li> </ul>
Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?	No
<b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b>	Yes
<b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b>	<p>The site is a greenfield adjacent to and connected to the settlement boundary of Palgrave. However, development is likely to extend the settlement form of Palgrave towards the east and south, negatively impacting the settlement character and reducing the gap between Diss and Palgrave. The site is in a relatively remote and less sustainable location for development outside of the walking distance to key services and facilities. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs. The site is therefore <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>


## SS0693

### SS0693 Land east of Crossing Road

<b>Site Reference</b>	SS0693
<b>Site Address</b>	Land east of Crossing Road
<b>Site Source</b>	BMSJLP SHELAA
<b>Gross Site Area (Hectares)</b>	1.32
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Not specified in the published version of the SHELAA. This assessment therefore considers the site's suitability for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan for residential development.
<b>BMSJLP SHELAA Conclusions</b>	
BMSJLP SHELAA Conclusion	<b>Excluded</b> – Site has poor connectivity to the existing settlement
<b>How can these conclusions be applied to the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment?</b>	
Has the site been excluded or assessed as unsuitable due to size?	No
Does more recent or additional information now exist which could change the HELAA findings?	No. The site is outside and not connected to the settlement boundary of Palgrave. The site is outside of the SSSIs subject to nutrient neutrality strategy and their catchments. It falls within the Network Expansion Zone.

<p>Are there any concerns that the HELAA conclusion is reasonable and defensible?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Are the HELAA conclusions reasonable to be carried forward to the Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>In the Neighbourhood Plan context, is the site suitable (Y/N); is the site available (Y/N); is the site achievable (Y/N)</b></p>	<p>The site is a greenfield outside of and not connected to the settlement boundary of Palgrave. Development of the site will adversely change the settlement pattern of Palgrave by crossing over the existing railway which borders the southern boundary of the settlement. The site forms part of a wider field and is highly visible. Development of the site will be contrary to Policy CS1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy which defines Palgrave as a secondary village generally unsuitable for growth and only capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development for local needs. The site is therefore <b>unsuitable</b> for development and allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan at present. The site was confirmed as available for development in 2020 and no information to the contrary has been received since.</p>

# Appendix C Site Assessment Conclusions Map (2022 Consolidated Report)



THIS DRAWING IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ISSUE THAT IT WAS ISSUED FOR AND IS SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT

- Parish Boundary
- Proposed Allocation in the draft GNLP
- Alternative Site Boundary
- Red
- Amber
- Green

Copyright  
Contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown Copyright and database right 2020.

Purpose of Issue  
SITE ASSESSMENT

Client  
DISS TOWN COUNCIL

Project Title  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
SITE OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

Drawing Title  
SITE ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS  
(2022 CONSOLIDATED REPORT)  
OVERVIEW

Drawn YT	Checked YT	Approved YT	Date
AECOM Internal Project No.		Scale @ A3	


THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO AND SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF AECOM'S APPOINTMENT BY ITS CLIENT. AECOM ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY FOR ANY USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OTHER THAN BY ITS ORIGINAL CLIENT OR FOLLOWING AECOM'S EXPRESS AGREEMENT TO SUCH USE, AND ONLY FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH IT WAS PREPARED AND PROVIDED.

AECOM  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Leman Street  
London, E1 8FA, United Kingdom

**AECOM**

Drawing Number \_\_\_\_\_ Rev \_\_\_\_\_

Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2020  
Contains data from OS Zoomstack



THIS DRAWING IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ISSUE THAT IT WAS ISSUED FOR AND IS SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT

- Parish Boundary
- Proposed Allocation in the draft GNL0
- Alternative Site Boundary
- Red
- Amber
- Green

Burston and Shimpling

Copyright  
Contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown Copyright and database right 2020.

Purpose of Issue  
SITE ASSESSMENT

Client  
DISS TOWN COUNCIL

Project Title  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
SITE OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

Drawing Title  
SITE ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS  
(2022 CONSOLIDATED REPORT)  
BURSTON AND SHIMPLING

Drawn YT	Checked YT	Approved YT	Date
AECOM Internal Project No.		Scale @ A3	


THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO AND SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF AECOM'S APPOINTMENT BY ITS CLIENT. AECOM ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY FOR ANY USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OTHER THAN BY ITS ORIGINAL CLIENT OR FOLLOWING AECOM'S EXPRESS AGREEMENT TO SUCH USE, AND ONLY FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH IT WAS PREPARED AND PROVIDED.

AECOM  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Leaman Street  
London, E1 8FA, United Kingdom



Drawing Number	Rev
----------------	-----

Maxar, Microsoft



THIS DRAWING IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ISSUE THAT IT WAS ISSUED FOR AND IS SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT

- Parish Boundary
- Proposed Allocation in the draft GNL
- Alternative Site Boundary
- Red
- Amber
- Green

Copyright  
Contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown Copyright and database right 2020.

Purpose of Issue  
SITE ASSESSMENT

Client  
DISS TOWN COUNCIL

Project Title  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
SITE OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

Drawing Title  
SITE ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS  
(2022 CONSOLIDATED REPORT)  
DISS

Drawn YT	Checked YT	Approved YT	Date
AECOM Internal Project No.		Scale @ A3	

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO AND SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF AECOM'S APPOINTMENT BY ITS CLIENT. AECOM ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY FOR ANY USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OTHER THAN BY ITS ORIGINAL CLIENT OR FOLLOWING AECOM'S EXPRESS AGREEMENT TO SUCH USE, AND ONLY FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH IT WAS PREPARED AND PROVIDED.

AECOM  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Lemn Street  
London, E1 8FA, United Kingdom


**AECOM**

Drawing Number

Rev

Maxar, Microsoft  
Stuston

SS0068



THIS DRAWING IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ISSUE THAT IT WAS ISSUED FOR AND IS SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT

- Parish Boundary
- Proposed Allocation in the draft GNLP
- Alternative Site Boundary
- Red
- Amber
- Green

Copyright  
Contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown Copyright and database right 2020.

Purpose of Issue  
SITE ASSESSMENT

Client  
DISS TOWN COUNCIL

Project Title  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
SITE OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

Drawing Title  
SITE ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS  
(2022 CONSOLIDATED REPORT)  
ROYDON

Drawn YT	Checked YT	Approved YT	Date
AECOM Internal Project No.		Scale @ A3	

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO AND SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF AECOM'S APPOINTMENT BY ITS CLIENT. AECOM ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY FOR ANY USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OTHER THAN BY ITS ORIGINAL CLIENT OR FOLLOWING AECOM'S EXPRESS AGREEMENT TO SUCH USE, AND ONLY FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH IT WAS PREPARED AND PROVIDED.

AECOM  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Leman Street  
London, E1 8FA, United Kingdom


**AECOM**

Drawing Number	Rev
----------------	-----

Maxar, Microsoft



THIS DRAWING IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ISSUE THAT IT WAS ISSUED FOR AND IS SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT



-  Parish Boundary
-  Proposed Allocation in the draft GNLP
-  Alternative Site Boundary
-  Red
-  Amber
-  Green

Copyright  
Contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown Copyright and database right 2020.

Purpose of Issue  
SITE ASSESSMENT

Client  
DISS TOWN COUNCIL

Project Title  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
SITE OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

Drawing Title  
SITE ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS  
(2022 CONSOLIDATED REPORT)  
SCOLE

Drawn YT	Checked YT	Approved YT	Date
AECOM Internal Project No.		Scale @ A3	

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO AND SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF AECOM'S APPOINTMENT BY ITS CLIENT. AECOM ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY FOR ANY USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OTHER THAN BY ITS ORIGINAL CLIENT OR FOLLOWING AECOM'S EXPRESS AGREEMENT TO SUCH USE, AND ONLY FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH IT WAS PREPARED AND PROVIDED.

AECOM  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Lemn Street  
London, E1 8FA, United Kingdom



Drawing Number	Rev
----------------	-----

Maxar, Microsoft



THIS DRAWING IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ISSUE THAT IT WAS ISSUED FOR AND IS SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT

-  Parish Boundary
-  Proposed Allocation in the draft GNLP
-  Alternative Site Boundary
-  Red
-  Amber
-  Green

Copyright  
Contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown Copyright and database right 2020.

Purpose of Issue  
SITE ASSESSMENT

Client  
DISS TOWN COUNCIL

Project Title  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
SITE OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

Drawing Title  
SITE ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS  
(2022 CONSOLIDATED REPORT)  
BROME AND OAKLEY

Drawn YT	Checked YT	Approved YT	Date
AECOM Internal Project No.		Scale @ A3	


THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO AND SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF AECOM'S APPOINTMENT BY ITS CLIENT. AECOM ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY FOR ANY USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OTHER THAN BY ITS ORIGINAL CLIENT OR FOLLOWING AECOM'S EXPRESS AGREEMENT TO SUCH USE, AND ONLY FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH IT WAS PREPARED AND PROVIDED.

AECOM  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Lemn Street  
London, E1 8FA, United Kingdom

**AECOM**

Drawing Number

Rev



THIS DRAWING IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ISSUE THAT IT WAS ISSUED FOR AND IS SUBJECT TO AMENDMENT

-  Parish Boundary
-  Proposed Allocation in the draft GNLP
-  Alternative Site Boundary
-  Red
-  Amber
-  Green

Copyright  
Contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown Copyright and database right 2020.

Purpose of Issue  
SITE ASSESSMENT

Client  
DISS TOWN COUNCIL

Project Title  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
SITE OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

Drawing Title  
SITE ASSESSMENT CONCLUSIONS  
(2022 CONSOLIDATED REPORT)  
PALGRAVE

Drawn YT	Checked YT	Approved YT	Date
AECOM Internal Project No.		Scale @ A3	

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO AND SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF AECOM'S APPOINTMENT BY ITS CLIENT. AECOM ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY FOR ANY USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OTHER THAN BY ITS ORIGINAL CLIENT OR FOLLOWING AECOM'S EXPRESS AGREEMENT TO SUCH USE, AND ONLY FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH IT WAS PREPARED AND PROVIDED.

AECOM  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Leaman Street  
London, E1 8FA, United Kingdom

**AECOM**

Drawing Number	Rev
----------------	-----

