

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
454	Anmer	Anmer	SVAH	Residential	M	Various sites along Main Street	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
777	Bawsey	Bawsey	SVAH	Factory	B	Land North of Gayton Road	Iron Mountain (UK) Ltd	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
896	Bircham	Bircham Tofts	RV	Pasture	G	Land to the East of 19 Stanhoe Road, Bircham Tofts	Bircham Parish Council	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
897	Bircham	Bircham Tofts	RV	Pasture	G	Land at junction of Church Lane, Bircham Tofts and Stanhoe Road, Bircham Tofts	Bircham Parish Council	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
905	Bircham	Bircham Tofts	RV	Arable	G	Land on the North Side of Stanhoe Road B1155 lying between Trimmingham House and Stocks Close	Bircham Parish Council	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
458	Bircham	Bircham Tofts	RV	Farmland	B	Lower Farm Bircham Tofts (O.S. grid ref. 779326)	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
483	Bircham	Bircham Tofts	RV	none stated	G	Land at Great Bircham	Clients of Ian H Bix & Associates	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Availability			Achievability		Deliverable/Developable						
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
454	Housing		0									0
777	Housing		0									0
896	Housing, 2-3 dwellings	The site has been submitted by the Parish Council. The site cannot be considered available for development without confirmation from the landowner. If the site were to be pursued for allocation in the Site Specific Allocations DPD, confirmation from landowner/s will be sought.	0	H	L	0.2					Site unavailable	0
897	Housing, 2-3 dwellings	The site has been submitted by the Parish Council. The site cannot be considered available for development without confirmation from the landowner. If the site were to be pursued for allocation in the Site Specific Allocations DPD, confirmation from landowner/s will be sought.	0	H	L	0.2					Site unavailable	0
905	Housing, 5 dwellings	The site has been submitted by the Parish Council. Assume landowner to be the same as site 483 (overlapping sites) therefore considered available. If the site were to be pursued for allocation in the Site Specific Allocations DPD, confirmation from landowner/s will be sought.	1	H	L	0.3					Figure already counted (see site 483)	0
458	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	0.8	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
483	not stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.8	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
902	Bircham	Bircham Tofts	RV	Garden	G	Land at Cuckoo Hill Road, Green Hill Lane	Bircham Parish Council	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from the defined settlement to be sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
903	Bircham	Bircham Tofts	RV	Domestic Housing	B	Land to the west of Cuckoo Hill Road, Large Garden at 88 Cuckoo Hill Road	Bircham Parish Council	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from the defined settlement to be a sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
798	Bircham	Great Bircham	RV	Agricultural	G	NG 2080 Stanhoe Road, Great Bircham	Mr Colin Coe	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
898	Bircham	Great Bircham	RV	Arable	G	Land on the North side of Docking Road	Bircham Parish Council	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
899	Bircham	Great Bircham	RV	Waste Land	G	Land lying between Dersingham Lane and Lynn Road,	Bircham Parish Council	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
900	Bircham	Great Bircham	RV	School Playing Field	G	Part of the present school playing field fronting on to Fring Road/Snettisham Road,	Bircham Parish Council	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
906	Bircham	Great Bircham	RV	Farmland	G	Arable land to the north of Stanhoe Road (B1155) lying between Stocks Close and Pond Farm,	Bircham Parish Council	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject		
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land					
902																								0	
903																									0
798	-/+	-	-	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	-/+	-	+	-	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	-		Site 798 is greenfield agricultural land. Development would result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village and if the whole site were to be developed, there would be a negative impact on the landscape. Site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. Visibility is obscured by a bend in the road. Development may result in a loss of some hedgerow and may impact on biodiversity. The site is adjacent to a fast road which may impact on amenity of potential residents. Site is outside built environment boundaries.	Site size would need to be reduced to ensure a sustainable level of development in a rural village. The frontage of the site is considered potentially suitable. Retain some hedgerow for screening. Requirement to consult DEFRA regarding loss of agricultural land and to consult authorities concerning the airfield. An ecology report may be required before development. Requirement to consult Anglian Water regarding Cordon Sanitaire prior to development. An opinion from Norfolk County Councils Highways officer has been sought. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD.	1	
898	+	-	-	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		Site 898 is greenfield land which is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. The site is currently overgrown therefore development will result in a loss of some vegetation which may impact on biodiversity. There is a pylon on the front of the site. Visibility of vehicular access is obscured by a bend in the road. Development would result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Site is outside built environment boundaries.	Retain some hedgerow for screening. Requirement to consult DEFRA regarding loss of agricultural land and to consult authorities concerning the airfield. An ecology report may be required before development. Requirement to consult Anglian Water regarding Cordon Sanitaire prior to development. An opinion from Norfolk County Councils Highways officer has been sought. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD.	1	
899	-/+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-		Site 899 is greenfield land which is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Development would result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Vehicular access from the track off the B1153 is not ideal. Part of the site is currently used as a garden. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. Development may result in a loss of some hedgerow and may impact on biodiversity. There is no footpath to services. Site is outside built environment boundaries.	Retain some hedgerow for screening. Requirement to consult DEFRA regarding loss of agricultural land and to consult authorities concerning the airfield. An ecology report may be required before development. An opinion from Norfolk County Council Highway officer has been sought. Walking/cycling access to services could be improved. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD.	1	
900	+	-	-	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		Site 900 is undeveloped land used as a school playing field. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is adjacent to a possible waste disposal site. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. Development may result in a loss of some hedgerow and may impact on biodiversity. Site is too narrow to provide ideal outdoor space (gardens and parking). Site is outside built environment boundaries.	Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield and with Anglian Water regarding the cordon sanitaire would be required. Site size would need to be enlarged to accommodate garden/parking, however this would result in a greater loss of the area of the school playing field. Requirement to consult Norfolk County Council regarding reduction of school playing field. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD.	1	
906	+	-	-	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	-	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	-		Site 906 is greenfield agricultural land. Development would result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village and is also too narrow to provide ideal outdoor space (gardens and parking). Site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. Visibility is obscured by a bend in the road. Development would result in a loss of mature hedgerow. Development may result in a loss of some hedgerow and may impact on biodiversity. The site is adjacent to a fast road which may impact on amenity of potential residents. Site is outside built environment boundaries.	Site size would need to be reconfigured to ensure a sustainable level of development in a rural village and that potential housing has adequate outdoor space and is in keeping with existing form and character of development. Retain some hedgerow for screening. Requirement to consult DEFRA and to consult authorities concerning the airfield. An ecology report may be required before development. Requirement to consult Anglian Water regarding Cordon Sanitaire prior to development. An opinion from Norfolk County Councils Highways officer has been sought. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD.	1	

Site Ref	Availability			Achievability		Deliverable/Developable						
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
902	Housing, up to 5 dwellings		0									0
903	Housing, 2-3 dwellings		0									0
798	Social Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.9	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
898	Housing, 5 dwellings	The site has been submitted by the Parish Council. The site cannot be considered available for development without confirmation from the landowner. If the site were to be pursued for allocation in the Site Specific Allocations DPD, confirmation from landowner/s will be sought.	0	H	L	0.2					Site unavailable	0
899	Housing, 5 dwellings	The site has been submitted by the Parish Council. The whole site cannot be considered available for development without confirmation from the landowner. However, the landowner has submitted site 457, therefore the overlapping area is available and therefore accepted.	1	H	L	0.8	0.4				Figure already counted (see site 457)	0
900	Housing, 5 dwellings	The site has been submitted by the Parish Council. The site cannot be considered available for development without confirmation from the landowner. If the site were to be pursued for allocation in the Site Specific Allocations DPD, confirmation from landowner/s will be sought.	0	H	L	0.4					Site unavailable	0
906	Housing, up to 5 dwellings	The site has been submitted by the Parish Council. Assume landowner to be the same as site 798 (overlapping sites) therefore considered available. If the site were to be pursued for allocation in the Site Specific Allocations DPD, confirmation from landowner/s will be sought.	1	H	L	0.4					Figure already counted (see site 798)	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
457	Bircham	Great Bircham	RV	Garden	G	Land adjacent to 16 Lynn Road (O.S. grid ref.765320)	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
45	Bircham	Bircham Newton	SVAH			Land adjacent to Monk's Close	Property Services	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from a higher order settlement to be sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
217	Brancaster	Brancaster	KRSC	Farmland	B	Land off the A149,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site is wholly within designated ancient monument and archaeological area.	For sites close to, or within areas scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monument consent will be required. Site is unsuitable unless consent is granted.	0
669	Brancaster	Brancaster	KRSC	none stated	G	Land off Saw Mill Lane	Miss Maggie Warner	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
718	Brancaster	Brancaster	KRSC			South of A149 coast road, between Robin Cottage and Corner Lodge (Hall Lane)	Mr Tom de Winton	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site is wholly within designated ancient monument and archaeological area.	For sites close to, or within areas scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monument consent will be required. Site is unsuitable unless consent is granted.	0
810	Brancaster	Brancaster	KRSC		B	Land at Main Road and Choseley Road	Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
457	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site 457 is greenfield garden land which is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. There is no footpath to services. Development may result in a loss of hedgerow and may impact on biodiversity. Part of site is outside built environment boundaries.	Retain some hedgerow for screening. An ecology report may be required before development. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Walking/cycling access to services could be improved. Part of site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD.	1
45																							0
217																							0
669	+	-	+	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 669 is a greenfield site in the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is surrounded on two sides by open countryside and therefore development could impact on the AONB. The site is greenfield therefore there may be some impact on biodiversity. Development would result in a loss of high quality agricultural land (Grade 2). Site is outside built environment boundaries. Access would need to be made onto Mill Road.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. The site would require screening from the wider countryside (e.g. by establishing a hedgerow) to mitigate the impact on the landscape. An ecology report may be required before development. If allocating, consultation with DEFRA would be required. If the site were to come forward access rights would need to be determined.	1
718																							0
810	+	+	+	+	-/+	-/+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site 810 is a brownfield site comprising a operational garage, an occupied dwelling and various unused buildings. The site houses a viable business therefore it is desirable to safeguard the premises for service provision and employment, in line with emerging Core Strategy policy CS10. Access is currently poor as it is narrow with limited visibility due to existing buildings. The site is potentially constrained by contamination due to previous uses (although this is unknown). The site is partially within Brancaster Conservation Area and wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development.	The site is within the built environment boundary, therefore would not require allocation. Safe access would require demonstration, opinion has been sought from Norfolk County Council highways officer who suggests improvements would need to be made to footway facilities, subject to local improvement schemes and good visibility being made on the A149, they would not object. Development would need to be sensitive to the setting of the Conservation Area and the AONB through quality design, layout and materials. Potential loss of business use would require further consideration at application stage. If the site is contaminated, remediation would be required.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
457	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.2				5	Site accepted	5
45	Mixed Use/Industrial		0									0
217	Housing		0									0
669	none stated	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.6				9	Site accepted	9
718			0									0
810		Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M/H	0.7				9	Site accepted	9

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
183	Brancaster	Brancaster Staithe	KRSC		G	Land on Common Lane,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
267	Brancaster	Brancaster Staithe	KRSC	none stated	G	Land at Town Lane	Mr Large	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
BRS 01	Brancaster	Brancaster Staithe	KRSC	houses and gardens	M	Brentwood Council Houses	Freebridge Community Housing	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
721	Brancaster	Burnham Deepdale	KRSC	House/Paddock	M	Land At Whitehills Farmhouse,	Miss Anne Krish	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
145	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Farmland	G	Land north of North Street	Clients of Strutt & Parker	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
183	-/+	-	+	-/+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 183 is a greenfield site which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. Site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. There are pylons across the site. The site gently slopes south to north. Any development would reduce the size of the field and would impact on the AONB. Development of the site would result in a loss of high quality agricultural land (grade 2). The site is greenfield therefore there may be some impact on biodiversity. Mature hedgerows border site. Access would need to be made onto The Close.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Constraints could be overcome by reducing the site size and ensuring appropriate screening from the wider countryside (e.g. by establishing a hedgerow) to mitigate the impact on the landscape. An ecology report may be required before development. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. If allocating, consultation with DEFRA would be required. Any development would need to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB through quality design, layout and materials.	1
267	-/+	-	+	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 267 is a greenfield site which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The current access to the site is along an unadopted road which is split into two lanes by pylons and therefore increased vehicular use may be an issue. Development of the site would result in a loss of high quality agricultural land (grade 2). The site is greenfield therefore there may be some impact on biodiversity.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. If allocating, consultation with DEFRA would be required. Discussion with Norfolk County Council Highways would be necessary as they intend to object - may require adoption of the road. An ecology report may be required before development. Any development would need to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB through quality design, layout and materials.	1
BRS 01	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	-/+	+	-	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site BRS 01 is a mixed use site comprising houses and gardens which is wholly within the AONB. The site is currently residential development and garden. The site is bounded to the east by a group Tree Preservation Order. Part of the site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Safe access onto A149 required.	The position of the trees should not constrain redevelopment but should be considered. Any redevelopment would need to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB through quality design, layout and materials. Authorities concerning the airfield require consulting.	1
721	-/+	-/+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 721 is a mixed use site comprising a grade 2 Listed Building with garden and undeveloped land. The land is classified as grade 3 agricultural land. The site is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is surrounded by countryside to the south west and therefore development could impact on the landscape. Development may result in a loss of hedgerow and/or impact on biodiversity. Safe access onto A149 required.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. If allocating, consultation with DEFRA and with authorities concerning the airfield would be required. An ecology report may be required before development. Any development would need to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB through quality design, layout and materials. The impact on the landscape could be mitigated by ensuring appropriate screening from the wider countryside (e.g. by	1
145	-/+	-	-	-/+	-/+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 145 is a greenfield site which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is inappropriately large in scale. Access to the western part of the site is established, shared with other development but is not ideal due to poor visibility. The site is moderately sloping. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is immediately adjacent to Burnham Market Conservation Area. Any development would encroach on the countryside and the AONB, however the sloping nature of the site reduces the visual impact on the countryside and the site is bordered to the west, south and east by development. The site is grade 4 agricultural land. Development may result in a loss of hedgerow and/or impact on biodiversity. The site is inappropriately large in scale.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. Minor development on part of the site could be considered. An input from Norfolk County Council highways officer has been sought and they would not object if the whole site were developed with vehicular access onto Bellamy's Lane (pedestrian access to North Street. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Any development would have to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB and the Conservation Area through quality design, layout and materials. An ecology report may be required. A strong landscape buffer to the north would be necessary to mitigate impact on the landscape.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
183		Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.5	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
267	housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.8	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
BRS 01	Housing - affordable, s/o, rent to home buy, possibly open market - 11 dwellings minimum in 6-10 years, 23 maximum in 11-18 years	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	0.4		9			Site accepted	9
721	none stated	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.7	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
145	residential and car park and associated facilities to serve whole village.	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.7	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
673	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Meadow	G	Land at Church Walk / Docking Road	Mr & Mrs C. C. Howell	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
825	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land South of Beacon Hill	Client 2 of Ian Cable	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
826	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Village Playing Field	G	Playing Field, Station Road	Client 3 of Ian Cable	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site partially constrained by fluvial flooding. Roughly 2/3rds of the site in fluvial flood zone 3.	Remaining developable area unconstrained and therefore this part of the site is potentially suitable.	1
827	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Agricultural	M	Crabbe Hall Farm, Joan Shorts Lane	Client 4 of Ian Cable	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site partially constrained by fluvial flooding. Roughly half of the site in fluvial flood zone 3.	Remaining developable area unconstrained and therefore this small part of the site is potentially suitable.	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
673	-/+	-	-	-/+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 673 is a greenfield site which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is at the edge of the existing village, however, there is residential development on the opposite side of Docking Road and the site is bordered by hedgerow which to some extent mitigates the impact on the landscape. Development would result in a loss of grade 4 agricultural land. Development may result in a loss of hedgerow and/or impact on biodiversity. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The impact on highways would depend on the design of the scheme as the site has constraints in terms of visibility and access. The western edge of the site may be too narrow to accommodate development.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Safe access would require demonstration in an application. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Any development would have to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB and the Conservation Area through quality design, layout and materials. An ecology report may be required. The impact on the landscape could be mitigated by ensuring appropriate screening from the wider countryside (e.g. by maintaining the hedgerow).	1
825	-/+	-	-	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 825 is a greenfield site which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. Site is inappropriately large in scale for minor development. The site is surrounded on three sides by open fields therefore any development would encroach on the countryside and the AONB and would extend the settlement to the south. Development is likely to have an adverse impact on the AONB. The site is grade 3 agricultural land. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Development may result in a loss of hedgerow and/or impact on biodiversity.	It is considered that the negative impact on the landscape and AONB can not be mitigated due to the exposed position of the site at the edge of the settlement. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
826	-/+	-	-	+	-	-/+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	Site 826 is a greenfield site used for recreation by the public. The site is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is inappropriately large in scale. The majority of the site is at risk of fluvial flooding and is therefore unsuitable. Housing development on any part of this site would result in a loss of public open space and due to its central position, would be likely to impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	Housing development on the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape and would result in a permanent loss of accessible open space in the heart of the village. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
827	-/+	-/+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 827 comprises agricultural buildings and residential development but the majority of the site is greenfield land (grade 4 agricultural land). The site is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is partially within the Conservation Area. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is inappropriately large in scale. Due to flood risk constraints part of the site is unsuitable. The remaining developable area is a linear strip adjacent to Joan Shorts Lane. Development on this land would encroach on the countryside and have an adverse impact on the AONB as it would be surrounded on three sides by open fields.	It is considered that the negative impact on the landscape and AONB can not be mitigated due to the exposed position of the site at the edge of the settlement. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
673		Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.6	0.4			9	Site partially accepted	9
825	Housing, approx 100 dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.4	0.4				Site unsuitable	0
826	Leisure, Village Hall	Site has not been proposed for housing and therefore is not available for housing.	0	H	L	1.8	0.4				Site unsuitable, unavailable	0
827	Housing, 100 dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	4.7	0.4				Site unsuitable	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
852	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Agriculture	G	Land South of Station Road	Client 4 of Pegasus Planning Group	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
919	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Farm Yard	B	Walkers Yard, Creake Road	Client of Ian Cable	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
920	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Village Hall	B	Village Hall Site, Beacon Hill Road	Client of Ian Cable	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
921	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Allotment Gardens	G	Allotment Gardens, Creake Road,	Client of Ian Cable	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
922	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land South of 18 Walkers Close, Creake Road	Client of Ian Cable	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
852	-/+	-	-	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 852 is a large greenfield site used for agriculture (grade 4) which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is poorly related to existing development as it is situated behind residential areas with two potential minor access points (access has not been identified on plan). Highways Authority note that access is not suitable onto Station Road and that they would object to allocation. The site is partially within the Conservation Area. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Development may result in a loss of hedgerow and/or impact on biodiversity. The site is inappropriately large in scale. The site is surrounded by open countryside to the west and south and any development would encroach on the countryside and have an adverse impact on the landscape and AONB.	It is considered that the negative impact on the landscape and AONB can not be mitigated due to the exposed position of the site at the edge of the settlement. Access has not been identified, and the site would encounter objections by the Highways Authority. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
919	-/+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 919 is wholly within the AONB meaning major development would not be suitable. Site is inappropriately large in scale for minor development. The site contains used and unused agricultural buildings, some with historical and architectural merit. Issue of relocating used agricultural building if surrounding barns were converted. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Possible landscape and biodiversity impact. Small part of site outside built environment boundaries. Possible biodiversity impact (wildlife in unused buildings). Site considered favourably by Highways Authority. Access should be made onto Creake Road. Local improvement works to John Short's Lane need to be undertaken.	Minor development including conversion of existing buildings on the part of the site within built environment boundary considered potentially suitable. Any scheme would need to be sensitive to the landscape/townscape to minimise impact on the wider countryside and AONB by consideration of design, layout, height, shape and screening. Issue with used agricultural building would need to be resolved. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required.	1
920	+	-/+	-	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 920 is a partially developed site which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The Village Hall is currently located on the site. If the site were to be developed for housing this would result in a loss of a community facility.	The site is within the built environment boundary, therefore would not require allocation. If village hall were removed, a community building with similar function would need to be provided within the village. Any development would need to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Access should be made onto Beacon Hill Road. Local improvement works to the footways need to be improved.	1
921	-/+	-	-	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 921 is a greenfield site used for allotments which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. Development of the site would result in a loss of allotments and open land in the village which may have a negative impact on the townscape. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Possible biodiversity impact.	therefore would not require allocation. Part of the land could be retained as open space and/or allotments, this would minimise the impact on the landscape/townscape. Otherwise alternative allotment land would need to be identified within the village. Any scheme would have to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB. Further consultation with Norfolk County Council landscape officer required. An ecology survey may be required. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Access should be made onto Beacon Hill Road. Local improvement works to the footways needed.	1
922	+	-	-	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site 922 is a small greenfield site which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. Site is grade 3 agricultural land. Development on the site would encroach on the AONB, however the site is surrounded by development to the north and west and due to its size and position would only result in a small extension of the frontage along Creake Road, which is not considered a significant intrusion into the landscape. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Any development would have to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB through quality design, layout and materials. An ecology report may be required. The impact on the landscape could be mitigated by ensuring appropriate screening from the wider countryside (e.g. by maintaining the hedgerow on the field boundary). If allocating, consultation with DEFRA required. Subject to safe access.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability			Deliverable/Developable						
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
852	Housing, approx 150-200 houses	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	6.5	0.4				Site unsuitable	0
919	Housing, 10-20 dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	1.2	0.4	9			Site partially accepted	9
920	Housing, 8 dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.2		5				5
921	Housing, 30-40 dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.1	0.4	9			Site partially accepted	9
922	Housing, 4 dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.3			4		Site accepted	4

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
923	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Agriculture	G	Land at junction of Joan Shorts Lane & Creake Road	Client of Ian Cable	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
949	Burnham Norton	Burnham Market	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land at Bellamy's Lane/Friar's Lane	Mr & Mrs John Symington	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1021	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	none stated	M	Land to the South of Sunnymead Whiteway Road	Client of NPS Property Consultants Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1083	Burnham Market	Burnham Market	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land South of Woodview, Creake Road	Client 2 of Ian Cable	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
923	-/+	-	-	+	-/+	+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 923 is a greenfield site which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. Site is inappropriately large in scale for minor development. The site is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area. Any development would encroach into the countryside and the AONB, however, the site is surrounded by development to the north, south and west, therefore it is not considered to be significant intrusion into the countryside. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Possible biodiversity impact. Site considered favourably by Highways Authority. Access should be made onto Creak Road. Local improvement works to John Short's Lane need to be undertaken.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Therefore minor development on part of the site (frontage) is potentially suitable. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Any development would have to be sensitive to the setting of the Conservation Area and AONB through quality design, layout and materials. An ecology report may be required. The impact on the landscape could be mitigated by ensuring appropriate screening from the wider countryside (e.g. by maintaining the hedgerow on the field boundary).	1
949	-/+	-	-	-/+	+	+	+	-	+	-/+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	Site 949 is grade 4 agricultural greenfield land which is wholly within the AONB. Site is inappropriately large in scale for minor development. The site is undulating. Any development would encroach on the countryside and have an adverse impact the AONB as the site is surrounded on three sides by countryside. Possible impact on biodiversity. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	It is considered that the negative impact on the landscape and AONB can not be mitigated due to the exposed position of the site at the edge of the settlement. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
1021	-/+	-/+	-/+	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 1021 is predominantly greenfield grade 4 agricultural land and is wholly within the AONB and therefore unsuitable for major development. Site is inappropriately large in scale for minor development. A bend in the road may obscure visibility from the access point, access would need to be made onto Whiteway Road and not Ringstead Road. Any development would encroach on the countryside and AONB. However, the site is adjacent to the built up area to the south and east and north east corner of the site is developed fronting onto Whiteway Road is already developed, therefore minor frontage development would not significantly intrude into the countryside. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Possible biodiversity issues.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Therefore minor development on part of the site (frontage) is potentially suitable subject to consultation with the Highways Agency. Any scheme would need to be sensitive to the landscape to minimise impact on the wider countryside and AONB by consideration of design, layout, height, shape and screening. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. An ecology report may be required.	1
1083	-/+	-	-	+	+	-/+	+	-	+	-/+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site 1083 is a greenfield site (grade 3 agricultural land) which is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. Site is inappropriately large in scale for minor development. The site is surrounded on three sides by open fields therefore any development would encroach on the countryside and the AONB and would extend the settlement to the south. Development is likely to have an adverse impact on the AONB. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Development may result in a loss of hedgerow and/or impact on biodiversity. Highways Authority would not object to development.	It is considered that the negative impact on the landscape and AONB can not be mitigated due to the exposed position of the site at the edge of the settlement. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
923	Housing (20+ dwellings) / Leisure	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.6	0.4			9	Site partially accepted	9
949	Housing, Mixed Residential with some open space	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	4.2	0.4				Site unsuitable	0
1021	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.8	0.4			9	Site partially accepted	9
1083	Housing, approx 100 dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2	0.4				Site unsuitable	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information						Suitability Stage 1															summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens			
791	Burnham Overy	Burnham Overy Staithe	RV	Agricultural / Dormant	G	Glebe Estate, Burnham Overy Staithe	Mrs P Thompson	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
809	Burnham Overy	Burnham Overy Staithe	RV	none stated	G	Land at Glebe Lane	Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
653	Burnham Overy	Burnham Overy Town	SVAH		none stated	Land at Hill Road	Mr Peter Bickell	-	+	+	+	-	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Site fails the principles of the sequential test and therefore development should be avoided. Constraints cannot be overcome.	No	0
469	Burnham Overy	Burnham Overy Town	SVAH	grassland	G	Mill Road, r/o 'Little Ostrich'	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Site fails the principles of the sequential test and therefore	No	0
917	Burnham Thorpe	Burnham Thorpe	SVAH	Agricultural	G	North of Back Lane, Burnham Thorpe	Client of Ian Cable	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Site fails the principles of the sequential test and therefore	No	0
918	Burnham Thorpe	Burnham Thorpe	SVAH	Paddock	G	The Pightle, Back Lane	Client of Ian Cable	-	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Site fails the principles of the sequential test and therefore development should be	No	0
489	Burnham Thorpe	Burnham Thorpe	SVAH	none stated		Land at Walsingham Road,	Clients of Ian J M Cable	-	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Site fails the principles of the sequential test and therefore development should be avoided. Constraints cannot be overcome.	No	0

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Accept/reject		
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land		Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?
791	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	+	Site 791 is a greenfield site which is wholly within the AONB and therefore unsuitable for major development. Access to the site is poor, along a narrow unadopted road. There are no footpaths to services. Development could impact on the landscape by encroaching into the countryside, however the site is surrounded by development to the north and west and is screened by hedgerow, therefore it is considered that there it would not cause a significant adverse impact on the landscape. The site is within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Potential impact on biodiversity. Site is outside built environment boundaries.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Therefore minor development on the site is potentially appropriate subject to consultation with the Highways Agency. Comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations is required. Any scheme would need to be sensitive to the landscape to minimise impact on the wider countryside and AONB by consideration of design, layout, height, shape and screening. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. An ecology report may be required.	1
809	+	-	-	+	-/+	-	+	-	+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	-/+	+	+	+	+	809 is a combination of three separate site within close proximity. All three sites are within the AONB therefore major development is unsuitable. The north western site is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area. The access to all three sites is poor along a narrow unadopted road. There are no footpaths to services. The sites are currently overgrown and therefore there may be issues relating to the loss of mature trees, hedgerows and impact on biodiversity. The sites are within the Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	The sites are within the current development boundary, therefore minor development is acceptable in principle. Consultation with Highways Agency and airfield authorities required. An ecology report and tree survey may be required. Any scheme would need to be sensitive to the townscape to minimise impact on the Conservation Area and the AONB by consideration of design, layout and height of development.	1
653																							0
469																							0
917																							0
918																							0
489																							0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
791	Housing, 5 dwellings	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.6			9		Site accepted	9
809	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.1		9			Site accepted	9
653	none stated		0									0
469	housing		0									0
917	Housing, approx 10 dwellings		0									0
918	Housing, 5-10 dwellings		0									0
489	none stated		0									0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
1061	Congham	Congham	SVAH	Part Residential / Agricultural / Domestic	M	Land at 4-11 St Andrews Lane,	Clients of Brown & Co	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from a higher order settlement to be sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
1062	Congham	Congham	SVAH	Part Residential / Agricultural / Domestic	M	Land around Little Congham House, St Andrews Lane	Clients of Brown & Co	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from a higher order settlement to be sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
542	Congham	Congham	SVAH	Part Residential / Agricultural / Domestic	M	Land at Manor Farm, St Andrew's Lane,	Clients of Brown & Co	-	-/+	-/+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site constrained due to distance from higher order settlement. Part of the site at risk from fluvial flooding	No	0
287	Congham	Grimston	KRSC	agricultural	G	Land on Station Road,	Clients of Robinson Hall	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
628	Congham	Grimston	KRSC	Cricket Ground & Pasture Land	G	Land to the east of Congham Hall,	Mr I P Mason	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
455	Dersingham	Dersingham	KRSC	Cottages with gardens	M	80 & 80a Manor Road (O.S. grid ref. 693302)	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
456	Dersingham	Dersingham	KRSC	Disused allotments	G	Doddshill Road, north side (O.S. grid ref. 696301)	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Availability			Achievability		Deliverable/Developable						
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
1061	Housing - Up to 10 conventional dwellings		0									0
1062	Housing - Up to 10 conventional dwellings		0									0
542	Housing - Up to 10 conventional dwellings		0									0
287	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	4.3					Site unsuitable	0
628	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	3.7					Site unsuitable	0
455	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.5					Site unsuitable	0
456	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.8			36		Site accepted	36

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
793	Dersingham	Dersingham	KRSC	Doctors Surgery	B	Dersingham Surgery, Saxonway, Dersingham	Dr A. K Wake	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
DER 08	Dersingham	Dersingham	KRSC	none stated	G	Senter's Road	Christopher Rossiter	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
DER 17	Dersingham	Dersingham	KRSC	none stated	B	Chapel Road	Martyn and Janet Fuller	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
DER 21	Dersingham	Dersingham	KRSC	none stated	B	Hunstanton Road	Martyn D Baverstock	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
687	Docking	Docking	KRSC	Car Park area	M	Car Park land to Pilgrims Reach, High Street	Mr James Lee	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
856	Docking	Docking	KRSC	Arable	G	Land off Stanhoe Road,	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
857	Docking	Docking	KRSC	Arable	G	Land off Woodgate Way,	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
793	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	The entrance to site 793 is bordered by a protected area of trees. The site is a former doctors surgery. The site is currently being redeveloped as a employment site (telecommunications centre) therefore this site is not currently suitable for housing, however the site could come forward for housing in the later part of the plan period.	The site is within the built environment boundary, therefore would not require allocation.	1
DER 08	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site DER 08 comprises a house, garden and paddocks. Access is off an unadopted road which is shared with other households and may be a constraint depending on the size of the scheme. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site is within the built environment boundary, therefore would not require allocation. Opinion from Norfolk County Council highways officer has been sought. An ecology report may be required.	1
DER 17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site DER 17 is a brownfield site which currently operates as a small car sales business. Redevelopment of the site for housing would result in a loss of employment land, although this would be minimal as the operation is small. The site used to be a petrol station and has three underground tanks filled with slurry on site.	The site is within the built environment boundary, therefore would not require allocation. Underground tanks would need to be removed. Redevelopment may be possible considering the viability of the business use.	1
DER 21	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site DER 21 is a brownfield site which currently operates as a small car sales business therefore redevelopment may result in a loss of employment, although this would be minimal as the operation is small. There may be contamination.	The site is within the built environment boundary, therefore would not require allocation. Contamination would require investigation. Redevelopment may be possible considering the viability of the business use.	1
687	+	+/-	-	+	-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 687 is a small site which is currently fenced off and not visible. The site is wholly within the Conservation Area, therefore the impact on the historic environment and townscape would be a key consideration in any application. Access to the site is poor with limited visibility due to existing buildings and a narrow entry which is already used by existing properties. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	The site has potential for housing but this is dependant upon access and policy constraints. An opinion from Norfolk County Council Highways officer has been sought. Development would have to be sensitive to the setting of the Conservation Area. The site is within Built Environment type B and therefore is protected from development at this point.	1
856	+/-	-	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 856 is a greenfield site used for agriculture. The site is large in scale and development of the whole site would have a negative impact on the landscape. Access is not established and obtaining safe access may result in the loss of hedgerow. Local improvement works would need to be carried out including footpath extensions and road widening. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is grade 3 agricultural land.	A small part of the frontage of the site immediately adjacent to existing development could potentially accommodate housing. This would require comparative assessment to determine whether the site is appropriate to allocate in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. Any development must be sensitive to the setting of the Conservation Area. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1
857	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 857 is a greenfield site (grade 3 agricultural land). The site has good access links via an existing residential development in Woodgate Way and from Barn Road. Whilst development will impact on the landscape, the field is small and already enclosed therefore the impact is minimised through effective screening from hedgerows. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site would require comparative assessment to determine whether the site is appropriate to allocate in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. Ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required. The scheme would need to be sensitive to the landscape setting.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable								
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total	
793	Housing, dependant upon planning permission	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	H	0.2					5	Site accepted	5
DER 08	Housing, min 1 - max 7	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.7		15				Site accepted	15
DER 17	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	H	0.1		2				Site accepted	2
DER 21	Housing - min 5, max 8	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	H	0.3		7				Site accepted	7
687	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.1				2		Site accepted	2
856	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	4.8	2		36			Site partially accepted	36
857	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.2			26			Site accepted	26

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
858	Docking	Docking	KRSC	Arable	G	Land off Fakenham Road,	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
859	Docking	Docking	KRSC	Arable	G	Land situated off Pound Lane	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
701	East Rudham	East Rudham	KRSC	none stated	G	Land on Broomsthorpe Road,	Mr & Mrs Mark W Baker	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site partially affected by fluvial flooding.	Part of site adjacent to the settlement is not at risk of flooding. Therefore part of the site may be suitable for housing.	1	
64	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	Vacant		Land adjacent to Meadowvale, Lime Kiln Road	Clients of David Taylor Associates Ltd	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from the defined settlement to be a sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0	
158	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC			Land north of Waterloo Cottage	Gayton Hall Estate	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site constrained due to being within fluvial zones 2 and 3.	The remaining area that is not at risk of flooding is too small to accommodate development.	0	
160	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	paddocks	G	Land north of properties on Lynn Road, bounded to west by Blacksmith's Row and Jubilee Hall Lane to east,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1	

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
858	+/-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 858 is a greenfield site used for agriculture (grade 3). The site is large in scale and development of the whole site would have a negative impact on the landscape. Access is not established and obtaining safe access to Fakenham Road and Woodgate Way may result in the loss of hedgerow. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site would require comparative assessment to determine whether the site is appropriate to allocate in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. Either the frontage of the site immediately adjacent to existing development or the part of the site adjacent to site 857/222 could potentially accommodate housing, however the Highway Authority is likely to object to any development as they consider the site to be too remote. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. An ecology report may be required. Possible to mitigate landscape impact by screening. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1
859	+	-	-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 859 is a greenfield site used as paddocks. The site is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. There is a pond in the centre of the site and domestic pylons running across the site. Access would need to be improved through footpath extensions and road widening of Pound Lane. The site is screened from the village by mature trees and hedgerow. Development would encroach on the countryside. Possible biodiversity issues. Site is grade 3 agricultural land.	Site is outside built environment boundaries and therefore requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocation and Policies DPD. If determined to be a preferred option in that document then the site is potentially suitable for development. Consultation with Highways Agency regarding access would be required. Impact on landscape could be mitigated to some extent by screening, however any development would comprise an extension of the settlement. Opinion from Norfolk County Council landscape officer sought. Possibility to infill pond and move pylons. Ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1
701	+	-	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site 701 is partially developed comprising an occupied house and garden land. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. The site is within both West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Part of the site is at risk of fluvial flooding. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. Development of the garden would have an adverse impact on the form and character of the settlement. There is no footpath which hinders the ability to walk to services and the vehicular access is poor. Highways Authority have indicated they would object on access grounds. Possible biodiversity issues.	The negative impact on the townscape cannot be mitigated. Access is constrained. The site is considered unsuitable for further development.	0
64																							0
158																							0
160	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	-	Site 160 is a greenfield site used as paddocks (designated grade 3 agricultural land). The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. Proposed access to the site is potentially highly constrained as routes are narrow with poor visibility from the main highway. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan on the basis that it is not apparent where an access would be made for this site. Any development on the site is likely to have a negative impact on the form and character of the area and will be overlooked by some existing properties which will impact on the amenity of both current and future residents. Part of the site is low lying. There is a public right of way adjacent to the site. The site is large in scale. Possible biodiversity issues.	Unless suitable access to the site can be demonstrated, constraints cannot be overcome.	0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
858	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	4.8	2		36		Site partially accepted	36
859	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	3.4	2		36		Site partially accepted	36
701	none stated	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	0.2					Site unsuitable.	0
64	Housing		0									0
158			0									0
160	Residential	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L/M	1.7					Site unsuitable	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
164	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	paddocks	G	Land off Lynn Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
557	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land north of St Nicholas' Close,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
665	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	Vacant	B	Gayton Mill, Litcham Road,	Mr Greg Garland	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
743	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	Turkey Sheds	M	Poultry Units, Winch Road,	Mr John Currey	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is almost wholly within fluvial flood zones 2 and 3.	The remaining area that is not at risk of flooding is too small to accommodate development.	0
GAY 01	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	Caravan sales and sales office	B	Lynn Road	Michael A. McDonnell, M.T. McDonnell & Co Ltd.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
GAY 02	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	none stated	M	Lynn Road	Martin Brundle	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
164	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	-	Site 164 is a greenfield site used as paddocks (designated grade 3 agricultural land). The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. Proposed access to the site is potentially highly constrained as routes are narrow with poor visibility from the main highway. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan on the basis that it is not apparent where an access would be made for this site. Any development on the site is likely to have a negative impact on the form and character of the area and will be overlooked by some existing properties which will impact on the amenity of both current and future residents. Part of the site is low lying. There is a public right of way adjacent to the site. Possible biodiversity issues.	Unless suitable access to the site can be demonstrated, constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
557	+/-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	-	Site 557 is a greenfield site which is grade 3 agricultural land, although it is currently left fallow. Part of the site has unobstructed views towards the church. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. The site is bordered to the east and west by a public right of way. The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. The site is greenfield and therefore there may be issues relating to biodiversity. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan on the basis that it is not apparent where an access would be made for this site.	Unless suitable access to the site can be demonstrated, constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
665	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	-	Site 665 is a mixed site containing mainly previously developed land and some greenfield land (grade 3 agricultural land). The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. There is no footpath to local services from the site entrance. Possible biodiversity issues. Site is at edge of village and therefore development would encroach on the countryside.	Part of the site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Walking/cycling access could be improved. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. An ecology report may be required. Screening required to mitigate impact on landscape. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1	
743																								0
GAY 01	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site GAY 01 is developed land which currently is occupied by a caravan sales business. Site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. The site is potentially contaminated. Development of the site would result in a loss of employment land. The neighbouring petrol station shares access to the site and would have an adverse affect on residential amenity. Redevelopment would result in a loss of employment land in Gayton but not in the Borough. Access to Winch Road is unsuitable and access to Lynn Road is dependent upon a legal agreement. Highways Authority would prefer access onto Winch Road with good visibility.	This site is potentially suitable for residential use long term depending upon the viability of the existing employment use would require the landowner to demonstrate viability or suitable alternative site. Landowner would also need to demonstrate access on to Lynn Road/Winch Road can be achieved. Land would require remediation if contaminated.	1	
GAY 02	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site GAY 02 comprises an occupied dwelling and gardens. The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. Edge of village location which lacks footpath and is not well integrated with adjacent residential area. Possible biodiversity issues. Owner is not proposing redevelopment of existing building.	Site is within the existing development boundary therefore the site is generally suitable for development. Any intensification of the site would require detailed examination of the scheme particularly the impact on amenity and vehicular and pedestrian access. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required.	1	

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable								
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total	
164	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L/M	0.4						Site unsuitable	0
557	Housing, approx 50	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	2.6						Site unsuitable	0
665	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	1.9		20	16		Site accepted	36	
743	Housing		0									0	
GAY 01	Housing/possible mixed use	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	0.9			19		Site accepted	19	
GAY 02	Housing 1-2	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.9		2			Site accepted	2	

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
GAY 04	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	none stated	B	Back Street	J Boon	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
GAY 05	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	none stated	M	Lynn Road	Dr & Mrs D.A.C Barter	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
GAY 08	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	none stated	M	Back Street	Mr Julian Romney, Gayton Estate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
GAY 09	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	none stated	M	Lynn Road	Greg Garland	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
GAY 10	Gayton	Gayton	KRSC	none stated	G	North of Waterloo Cottage	Mr Julian Romney, Gayton Estate	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site constrained due to mostly being within fluvial zones 2 and 3.	The remaining area that is not at risk of flooding is too small to accommodate development.	0
66	Gayton	Gayton,	KRSC	paddocks	G	Land curtilage rear of Rosemary Cottage, Rosemary Lane,	Clients of David Taylor Associates Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
719	Great Massingham	Great Massingham	KRSC	none stated	G	3 pieces of land at Great Massingham	Client 1 of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
GAY 04	-	+	-	-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site GAY 04 was formally part of a larger site submitted for the 2008 SHLAA. Other landowners have not expressed interest in retaining their land in the SHLAA and consequently the site is small and the amenity of residents would be affected by the location on a site full of agricultural buildings. Highways Authority would object to development without full details of access.	Unless neighbouring landowners are willing to put forward the site for development, constraints cannot be overcome	0
GAY 05	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	Site GAY 05 comprises occupied dwellings, gardens and a small patch of undeveloped land. There is a public right of way running to the east of the site but this should not constrain development on site. There are mature trees protected by TPO's on the border of the site. The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. Access to the site has not been demonstrated. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site is within the built environment boundary, therefore would not require allocation. The site is potentially suitable subject to owners demonstrating safe access to the site. Consultation with authorities regarding the airfield is required. Ecology report may be required.	1
GAY 08	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site GAY 08 comprises a mixture of former agricultural buildings and grade 3 agricultural greenfield land. An outline planning application for conversion of existing buildings and erection of new buildings to provide 29 dwellings was approved in March 2010.	Constraints have been addressed through planning application.	1
GAY 09	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	-	Site GAY 09 is a mixed site containing mainly previously developed land and some greenfield land (grade 3 agricultural). The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. There is no footpath to local services from the site entrance. Possible biodiversity issues. Site is at edge of village and therefore development would encroach on the countryside.	Part of the site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Walking/cycling access could be improved. Consultation with authorities concerning the airfield will be required. An ecology report may be required. Screening required to mitigate impact on landscape. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1
GAY 10																							0
66	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 66 is greenfield paddocks (grade 3 agricultural land). Development is likely to result in a loss of some mature hedgerows, therefore there may be an impact on biodiversity. The proposed access to the site is too narrow with poor visibility due to the presence of existing buildings. Highways Authority state that it would be inappropriate to access onto Rose Maryl and would object to development on this site. The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area.	Unless suitable access to the site can be demonstrated, constraints cannot be overcome.	0
719	+/-	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 719 is a greenfield site (agricultural grade 3) which is used for paddocks, agricultural land and a small business. Development on the entire site would be unsuitable as it is inappropriately large in scale for the village. The access to the site is obscured by a bend and the pedestrian access to the village centre is not ideal (narrow footpaths). There are telephone pylons across part of the site and is adjacent to the Conservation Area, although this is screened by hedgerow. Potential biodiversity issues.	The site is outside the built environment boundaries and would therefore require comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Site size would need to be reduced to ensure a sustainable level of development in a village. Requirement to consult DEFRA regarding loss of agricultural land. An ecology report may be required before development. An opinion from Norfolk County Councils Highways officer has been sought. The site would require a design scheme that is sensitive to the setting of the Conservation Area taking into account quality design and layout. Retain some hedgerow for screening.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
GAY 04	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	0.03					Site unsuitable.	0
GAY 05	housing	There is a covenant on the land specifying only one dwelling on the plot. This is not within the landowners control.	0	M	L	0.5					Site unavailable	0
GAY 08	Housing	none	1	H	L	1.2		29			Site accepted	29
GAY 09	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	1.9					Figure already counted (see site 665)	0
GAY 10	Housing- min 1, max 3		0									0
66	Residential	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.9					Site unsuitable.	0
719	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	3.3	2		36		Site partially accepted	36

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
730	Great Massingham	Great Massingham	KRSC	none stated		3 pieces of land at Great Massingham	Client 1 of Brown & Co	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from the defined settlement to be sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
731	Great Massingham	Great Massingham	KRSC	none stated	G	3 pieces of land at Great Massingham	Client 1 of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
1024	Great Massingham	Great Massingham	KRSC	Agricultural / Shrub Land	G	Land adjacent to 37 Weasenham Road,	Diocese of Norwich client of Savills (L&P) Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
820	Grimston	Grimston	KRSC	Arable	G	Land to the South of Lynn Road	Client 12 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site partially constrained by fluvial flood zones 2 and 3.	Part of site potentially suitable.	1

Suitability Stage 2																							
Site Ref	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land	Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
730																							
731	+/-	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 731 is greenfield land used for agriculture (agricultural grade 3). Development on the entire site would be unsuitable as the site is inappropriately large in scale for the village. The site is partially within the Conservation Area and has a prominent position immediately adjacent the village pond, therefore development of this site would disrupt the radial pattern of the settlement. The site has two possible access points, one of which is off a narrow lane. Potential biodiversity issues.	The site is outside the built environment boundaries and would therefore require comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Site size would need to be reduced to ensure a sustainable level of development in a village. Requirement to consult DEFRA regarding loss of agricultural land. An ecology report may be required before development. An opinion from Norfolk County Councils Highways officer has been sought. The site would require a design scheme that is sensitive to the setting of the Conservation Area taking into account quality design and layout. Retain some hedgerow for screening.	1
1024	+	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1024 is grade 3 agricultural greenfield land. There is a pylon on part of the frontage of the site. The frontage is covered by a mature hedgerow. The site is wholly within the Conservation Area. The site is on the outskirts of the village and therefore any development would encroach on the countryside.	Development of the site for housing would result in a relatively isolated development which would have an adverse impact on the form and character of the area. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
820	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	Site 820 is a greenfield site which is a mixture of grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. There are two public rights of way across the site. The east part of the site is within fluvial flood zone 3. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a village and development of the whole site would have a negative impact on the landscape. Site 820 is within the Gaywood River Catchment Project Area. North-east access to site has limited visibility splays and there are pylons across the north east of site.	The south eastern part of the site opposite Chapel Close is potentially suitable, and preferred by County Council Highways Authority. This area is within walking distance of community facilities and has good access to footpath. Alternatively the north east part of the site could be considered subject to overcoming highways constraints and consultation with Norfolk County Council. Consultation with DEFRA required. Ecology report may be required. Impact on landscape could be mitigated by screening. A site specific flood risk assessment would be advisable.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
730	Housing		0									0
731	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.6	2		36		Site partially accepted	36
1024	Housing, 2 semi detached dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	0.06					Site unsuitable	0
820	Housing, not specified / community facilities	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	41.2	2		36		Site partially accepted	36

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
821	Grimston	Grimston	KRSC	Arable	G	Land to the South of Vong Lane	Client 12 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site constrained due to roughly half of site being within fluvial zones 2 and 3.	Portion of site not at risk of flooding suitable for further assessment.	1
1054	Grimston	Grimston	KRSC	none stated	G	Land East of 17 Masingham Road, Grimston	Client of Parsons & Whitley	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
GRM 05	Grimston	Grimston	KRSC	none stated	B	Lynn Road	S.R.V Motors	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
GRM 06	Grimston	Grimston	KRSC	none stated	G	Lynn Road	Mr Basil Whiting and Mrs Pamela Whiting	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
GRM 17	Grimston	Pott Row	KRSC	Agricultural	B	Land north of Blake Close, Pott Row	D J Taylor	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
GRM 19	Grimston	Pott Row	KRSC	garden/allotments/unused	G	Vong Lane	Mr Jeremy Mason, Freebridge Community Housing	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
62	Grimston	Pott Row	KRSC	provides access to nursery	G	Land opposite Holly Barn, Cliffe-En-Howe Road	Clients of David Taylor Associates Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
646	Grimston	Pott Row	KRSC	countryside - not used for agriculture	G	Land in between Nos. 21 and 31 Leziate Drove	Mr & Mrs J. W. Rudd	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Partially within flood zones 2 & 3 fluvial.	Yes. Unconstrained area may be suitable.	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
821	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 821 is a greenfield site which is Grade 2 agricultural land. The portion of the site which is not at risk of flooding is an awkward shape. Despite falling within the flood zone there are no obvious signs of flooding. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required. Ecology report may be required.	1
1054	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 1054 is a small site within the built environment boundary. Outline application for 3 terrace houses and 1 detached house was permitted in January 2010.	Constraints have been addressed in planning application. Site is considered suitable.	1
GRM 05	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site GRM 05 is mixed site comprising a car business and the adjacent dwelling and garden land. Planning permission has been granted on part of the site for 6 dwellings. The remainder of the site is likely to have contamination issues.	Redevelopment of the car business may be possible but the viability of the business use should be considered. Other constraints have been addressed in the planning application.	1
GRM 06	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site GRM 06 is a mixed site comprising a dwelling with garden and paddocks with outbuildings. The site is adjacent to a public right of way. May impact on the form and character. Possible biodiversity issues.	Impact on form and character of the townscape should be a key consideration of any scheme. Ecology report may be required.	1
GRM 17	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site GRM 17 is a brownfield site comprising 2 large agricultural building and a grade 2 listed barn constructed with local materials which is in a dilapidated state. Redevelopment would result in a loss of land for agricultural buildings. Possible biodiversity issues. Part of the site is surrounded by countryside on three sides, therefore development could have a negative impact on the landscape. The site is distant from services. Highways Authority concerned that the site is remote from the settlement and indicate they would object.	The frontage of the site is within the built environment boundary and is potentially suitable for housing (potential for converting the barn for residential use subject to planning permission). Potentially require removal/relocation of the buildings at the back of the site. An ecology report may be required. Further discussion with Highways Authority would be required to identify whether constraints could be overcome.	1
GRM 19	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site GRM 19 is unused greenfield land at the back of a row of properties. Would likely impact adversely on amenity of dwellings to north. Out of form with character of village. Possible biodiversity issues. Distant from services. Highways Authority would object to development because the surrounding highway is very narrow and the proposed access is not appropriate.	Landowner working to resolve issues following discussion with planning office. As yet it is not known whether constraints can be overcome.	0
62	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site 62 is a greenfield site which is within the Gaywood River Catchment Project Area. Grade 4 agricultural land. Provides the only vehicular access to adjacent nursery. Would extend village into open countryside. Distant from services. Possible biodiversity issues. Norfolk County Council Highways would object to development on this site due to the surrounding highway being very narrow.	Part of the site may be suitable subject to overcoming shared access issue, however further discussion with Highways Authority is necessary to determine whether access constraints can be overcome. Site would have to be screened to mitigate impact on landscape. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Ecology report may be required.	1
646	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site 646 is a greenfield site which is at the edge of the village and outside built environment boundary. Site screened from wider countryside by hedgerow. Loss of grade 4 agricultural land. Lies outside of 30mph speed restriction. Distant from services. Would reinforce linear pattern of settlement. Possible biodiversity issues. Visibility an issue which would cause Highways Authority to object.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Ecology report may be required. Further discussion would be necessary with Highways Agency to determine whether constraints could be overcome.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
821	Housing, not specified / community facilities	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	1.3	0.6		13		Site partially accepted	13
1054	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.1		3			Site accepted	3
GRM 05	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	H	0.2		5			Site accepted	5
GRM 06	Housing - 10 min, 15 max	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.6		13			Site accepted	13
GRM 17	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	H	1.2			26		Site accepted	26
GRM 19	Housing, 3 min - 6 max	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.3					Site unsuitable.	0
62	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.9			19		Site accepted	19
646	none stated	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.7			15		Site accepted	15

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
674	Grimston	Pott Row	KRSC	countryside - not in agricultural use	G	Land off Back Lane, Pott Row	Mrs Rachel Hodginson	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
175	Grimston	Pott Row	KRSC	Countryside - not in agricultural use	G	Land to the rear of White House Farm, Chapel Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
459	Grimston	Pott Row	KRSC	countryside - not used for agriculture	G	Land south of Stave Farm, 3 Chapel Road, Pott Row, (grid ref. TF7045 2180)	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
468	Grimston	Grimston	KRSC		B	Grimston - Lodge Farm, Chequers Road,	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified severe constraints.	N/A	1
797	Grimston	Pott Row	KRSC	Part Garden/Part waste land	G	At the rear of 11 Back Lane, Pott Row	Mr John Missing	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
169	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Arable	G	Land off Westgate Street,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
674	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site 674 is a greenfield site set behind residential development. Access is too narrow with poor visibility. TPO near site access. Possible biodiversity issues. Distant from services.	Improvement of the access will require the demolition of one of the dwellings to either side of the proposed access point. Potential for an alternative access point to the east of residential development joining Back Lane. However, there is no evidence that either of these access solutions are possible. Highways Authority have confirmed they would object on the basis that the surrounding highway is very narrow and the proposed	0
175	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	Site 175 is a greenfield site which is classed as grade 3 and 4 agricultural land. There is a public right of way and protected trees which run along the southern part of the site. Potential for the site to be accessed by vehicle from the south (as inferred in submission), however land in uncertain ownership and TPO near access point. Access directly onto Chapel Street desirable but not indicated in submission. Potential biodiversity issues. Distant from services.	Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether site is appropriate for allocation. Access to the site requires further investigation, Highways Authority would object on the basis that there is no apparent access to the site. Ecology report may be required. DEFRA would need to be consulted.	1
459	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site 459 is a greenfield site which is grade 4 agricultural land. Site lies within centre of village. Frontage development would be in keeping with form and character of village. Visibility splayed restricted in 30mph zone. Access would require configuration. Development screened from wider landscape by established hedgerow. Possible biodiversity issues. Distant from services.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Ecology report may be required. Highways Agency consulted, subject to safe access they would not object.	1
468	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site 468 is a brownfield site comprising 2 large agricultural buildings and a grade 2 listed barn constructed with local materials which is in a dilapidated state. Redevelopment would result in a loss of land for agricultural buildings. Possible biodiversity issues. Part of the site is surrounded by countryside on three sides, therefore development could have a negative impact on the landscape. The site is distant from services. Highways Authority concerned that the site is remote from the settlement and indicate they would object.	The frontage of the site is within the built environment boundary and is potentially suitable for housing (potential for converting the barn for residential use subject to planning permission). Potentially require removal/relocation of the buildings at the back of the site. An ecology report may be required. Further discussion with Highways Authority would be required to identify whether constraints could be overcome.	1
797	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site 797 is a greenfield site set behind residential development. Access is too narrow with poor visibility. TPO near site access. Possible biodiversity issues. Distant from services.	Improvement of the access will require the demolition of one of the dwellings to either side of the proposed access point. Potential for an alternative access point to the east of residential development joining Back Lane. However, there is no evidence that either of these access solutions are possible. Highways Authority have confirmed they would object on the basis that the surrounding highway is very narrow and the proposed access is inappropriate. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
169	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 169 is greenfield land. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is adjacent to a bus stop therefore an increase in residents could help to sustain this service. The site is surrounded on three sides by residential development. Possible biodiversity impact.	The site is generally suitable for infill development. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Consultation with authorities regarding the airfields will be required. An ecology assessment may be required.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
674	none stated	Site in more than one ownership. Site proposed by landowners therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.4					Site unsuitable.	0
175	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.9			19		Site accepted	19
459	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	1.5			32		Site accepted	32
468	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	H	1.2					Figure already counted (see site GRM 17)	0
797	Housing, 3-4 dwellings	Site in more than one ownership. Site proposed by landowners therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.6					Site unsuitable.	0
169	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.2			5		Site accepted	5

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
171	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Arable	G	Land on Back Street, (Site 2)	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
172	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Arable	G	Land on Short Lane, (Site 3)	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
228	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Garden	G	Land at Lower Farm, Back Street,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
303	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Garden	M	Land behind Manor Farmhouse, just off the A 148,	Mr W. Radford	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
460	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Grazing	G	Blacksmith's Pasture, Cross Street, (grid ref. TF7910 2633)	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
461	Harpley	Harpley	RV	grain store	B	Nethergate Street/ School Lane,	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
171	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 171 is greenfield land. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. There is a TPO on the site. Site is surrounded by countryside to the east and west and garden land to the south and therefore development could have a negative impact on the landscape and would encroach on the countryside. Possible biodiversity impact.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. The TPO is on the edge of the site and therefore should not constrain development on site. Screening would be required to mitigate the impact on the landscape. An ecology assessment may be required.	1
172	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 172 is a greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site is too large in scale to constitute an appropriate level of growth for a rural village. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Site is surrounded by countryside on three sides and therefore there could be a negative impact on the landscape. Four new dwellings have been added to the frontage of the site recently. Possible biodiversity impact.	Site size would need to be reduced. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Screening would be required to mitigate the impact on the landscape. An ecology assessment may be required.	1
228	+	-	-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 228 is greenfield garden land, classified grade 3 agricultural land. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site may be of historic interest as there is a wall on the boundary of the site which appears to be associated with the grade 2 Listed Building (possibly a walled garden). The site is screened from the wider countryside by the wall which minimises the impact on the wider countryside to the north and east, however, the site appears entirely isolated from existing development and therefore development would disrupt the form and character of the area. Possible biodiversity impact.	Development of the site for housing would result in an isolated development which would have an adverse impact on the form and character of the area. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
303	+	+/-	-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 333 is a partially developed site comprising a house and gardens. Further development on the site would reduce the garden size of the property which would adversely affect the amenity of residents. It would also disrupt the form and character of the area. The site is constrained by a TPO (group) at the north west corner of the site but there are further mature trees on the border. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Possible biodiversity impact.	Further intensification of site for housing would have an adverse impact on amenity and on the landscape/townscape. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
460	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	Site 460 is a greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Possible biodiversity impact. The site is constrained by both a TPO and a TPO (group) in the middle of the site and a public right of way. There is a pond on the site and mature hedgerows. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site is surrounded by residential development to the east, south and west, therefore development of the site is not considered to have a negative impact on the landscape.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Incorporating the protected trees and maintaining the public right of way is likely to reduce the potential capacity of the site, however would not constrain development entirely. Safe access would require demonstration, and the site would require screening. Consultation with authorities regarding the airfields would be required. An ecology assessment may be required.	1
461	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 461 is a brownfield site comprising a grain store surplus to landowners requirements. Possible biodiversity impact. The site is screened by mature hedgerow. Access has already been developed for two new properties to the east of the site. The site is opposite a primary school and has good access to services. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Consultation with authorities regarding the airfields would be required. An ecology assessment may be required.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
171	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.6				9	Site accepted	9
172	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.1	0.4			9	Site partially accepted	9
228	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.1					Site unsuitable.	0
303	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.4					Site unsuitable.	0
460	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	0.6				9	Site accepted	9
461	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.2				5	Site accepted	5

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
625	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Agriculture	G	Land at Brickyard Lane,	Mrs Lucy Mountain	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
764	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Paddocks	G	Land East of Nethergate Street	Client of TAWN Landles	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified severe constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1025	Harpley	Harpley	RV	Agricultural	G	Land west of Nethergate Street,	Diocese of Norwich client of Savills (L&P) Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1053	Harpley	Harpley	KRSC	Paddock	G	Land on Park Field, opposite St Lawrence Church,	Mr T Price	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
128	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Grassland	G	Land to the South of Park Lodge, Hunstanton Road,	Miss S Boyd	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is further than 25m from existing settlement boundary.	Constraint cannot be overcome.	0
184	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Grassland / Arable	G	Land off Cheney Crescent,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
195	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Arable land	G	Land south of South Beach Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
205	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land north of Cedar Springs,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site wholly within tidal flood zone 2 and 3 and hazard zone	Site fails the principles of a sequential approach to development outlined in PPS25. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
625	+/-	-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	-	Site 625 is a greenfield site used for agriculture. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Possible biodiversity impact. The site is large in scale. Development of the site would encroach on the countryside, however there is development to the north and east of the site. Access to the site is off a narrow track. There is a public right of way running across the western edge of the site. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Site is behind existing development.	therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Only part of the site close to the settlement would be considered in order to minimise the impact on the landscape. The public right of way is at the edge of the site and therefore should not be an absolute constraint to development, however highways issues may be a key constraint - the opinion of Norfolk County Council highways officer has been sought. Consultation with authorities regarding the airfields would be required. An ecology assessment may be required.	1	
764	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 764 is a greenfield site used for paddocks. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Development of the site would continue the frontage development along Nethergate Street, but would result in a loss of mature hedgerow with a potential impact on biodiversity. Site is within West Raynham and Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Consultation with authorities regarding the airfields would be required. An ecology assessment may be required.	1	
1025	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1025 is a greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Possible biodiversity impact. The site is currently used for agriculture and is large in scale. The frontage of the site is an area of thick mature hedgerow, shrubs and trees which could have biodiversity value and would have to be removed to enable frontage development. The site is at the southern edge of the settlement and therefore development would continue the residential frontage of Nethergate Street, however it could have a negative impact on the landscape.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. An ecology assessment will be required. The site would require screening from the wider landscape.	1	
1053	+	-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1053 is a greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Possible biodiversity impact. There is a group TPO adjacent to the site and the site is poorly overlooked. The site is isolated from residential development in the village. Access is via a narrow track. Development of the site would encroach on the countryside and have an adverse impact on the landscape/townscape.	Due to the isolation from existing development, the site is an inappropriate location for development. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
128																								0
184	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 184 is a greenfield site used for agriculture. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Access may need to be achieved through adjacent landowners sites. The site is large in scale but is surrounded by development on all sides. Development would alter the existing landscape/townscape but the location is close to the built up residential area of Heacham and to existing services. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Subject to adequate access onto the highway network. Surrounding landowners have submitted sites for assessment, therefore it is likely access could be achieved as part of a larger development scheme. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation.	1	
195	+/-	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 195 is a greenfield site used for agriculture. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Only one access point. Long way from the centre of Heacham, lack of local services or footway link. Poor public transport availability. The site is within a cordon sanitaire which would have an impact on amenity. The site is fairly isolated behind existing development and is surrounded on two sides by countryside, therefore development is likely to have an adverse impact on the landscape. Possible impact on biodiversity.	The site is poorly related to the settlement, with limited access links. Development would likely have an adverse impact on the landscape. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
205																								0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
625	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.8	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
764	Housing, 4 detached houses	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.3			7		Site accepted	7
1025	Housing, 5-6 dwellings affordable and market orientated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.7	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
1053	Housing, 1 dwelling for private use	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.1					Site unsuitable.	0
128	Housing, 10 dwellings		0									0
184	Residential	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner. Part of site overlaps with site 441 which is being promoted by a different agent.	1	M/H	L	8.3	2		36		Site partially accepted	36
195	None stated	Site proposed by 2 agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.2					Site unsuitable.	0
205	None stated		0									0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
206	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land east of School Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
207	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land south west of School Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is further than 25m from existing settlement boundary.	Constraint cannot be overcome.	0
292	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Cattle Grazing	M	Land of School Road	Mr Colin Needham	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
333	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Grassland		Land to the South of Park Lodge, Hunstanton Road,	Miss Samantha Boyd	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is further than 25m from existing settlement boundary.	Constraint cannot be overcome.	0
441	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land off Cheney Hill	Clients 3 of Pegasus Planning Group	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
476	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	M	Land to the rear of 45 Broadway	Clients of Ian H Bix & Associates	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
482	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	none stated	G	Land south and west of Stainsbury Garage, Lynn Road,	Clients of Ian H Bix & Associates	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
536	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land south of Folgate Road,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site partially constrained by fluvial flood zone 3, most of site constrained by fluvial flood zone 2. Small part of site unconstrained.	The north eastern corner of the site is not at risk of flooding and is therefore potentially suitable.	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
206	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 206 is a greenfield site used for agriculture. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site is large in scale. Development would have an impact on the landscape. Possible impact on biodiversity.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Subject to adequate access onto the highway network at School Road. Development required to contribute towards visibility enhancements at the School Road / The Broadway / Lords Lane junction.	1
207																							0
292	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+/-	-	Site 292 is a large site. The majority of the site is used for agriculture and smaller parts of the site have had various uses in the past such as a coal depot, agricultural buildings, small business uses and a livestock farm. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site as a whole is inappropriately large in scale for growth in a village. Any development on greenfield land will have an impact on the landscape. A public right of way runs through the site. Possible contamination issues on brownfield part of the site. Possible impact on biodiversity.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Subject to adequate access onto the highway network at School Road. Development required to contribute towards visibility enhancements at the School Road / The Broadway / Lords Lane junction	1
333																							0
441	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 441 is a greenfield site used as paddocks. The site has three possible access points although one is currently blocked by a wall and is close to another junction. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Development would alter the existing landscape/townscape but the location is close to the built up residential area of Heacham and to existing services.	The site is outside the development boundary and would therefore require allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. If determined to be a preferred option in that document, constraints could be mitigated. Subject to adequate access onto the highway network.	1
476	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 476 is a predominantly greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The present site access (narrow track between houses) is considered unsuitable for major development. Possible biodiversity issues. Any development will begin to encroach on the countryside and may impact on the landscape (although site is well screened by hedgerow).	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Access would require widening by demolishing adjacent dwelling. The site would have greater potential for development if land to the west were developed providing an alternative access to the site. Consultation with DEFRA required. Ecology report may be required.	1
482	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	Site 482 is a greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site is isolated from the main built up area of Heacham and is surrounded by countryside, therefore development may have an adverse impact on the landscape. Access onto A149 undesirable due to the safety issues and the cost of junction. Amenity would be adversely affected by noise of the road. Walking/cycling to services would be constrained by lack of footpath. Possible biodiversity issues.	Access to the site is a key constraint to development. Highways Agency have been consulted, have indicated access onto the A149 would be required. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Site may have greater potential for development if land to the west were developed providing an alternative access to the site. Consultation with DEFRA required. Ecology report may be required.	1
536	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 536 is a greenfield site which is mostly at risk of flooding. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The part of the site not at risk of flooding is too small to accommodate housing and would prevent access to the land behind. Distance from the centre and local services, could be constraints in achieving access onto the highway network.	There is no overriding need to develop greenfield land which is at risk of flooding. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable						total	
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years		Result
206	None stated	Site proposed by site owner and by more than one agent agent on landowners behalf therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	M	5					Figure already counted as site 883	0
207	None stated		0									0
292	Residential	Site proposed by site owner and by more than one agent agent on landowners behalf therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	M	40.6					Figure already counted as site 883	0
333	Housing, 10 dwellings		0									0
441	Housing, 70-110 dwellings mixed use	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner. Part of site overlaps with site 184 which is being promoted by a different agent.	1	M/H	L	2.8			36		Site accepted	36
476	Residential	Site proposed by site owner and by more than one agent agent on landowners behalf therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	M	1.7					Figure already counted (see site 883)	0
482	None stated	Site proposed by site owner and by more than one agent agent on landowners behalf therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	M	4					Site unsuitable.	0
536	Housing, approx 30 plots	Site proposed by more than one agent agent on landowners behalf therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	H	1.4					Site unsuitable.	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
654	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	none stated	M	Land at School Road	Mr Peter Bickell	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	Portion of site not at risk of flooding suitable for further assessment.	1
706	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Fallow	G	Land to west of A149 opposite Caley Mill (Field references 3756 & 3947)	Norfolk Lavender	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Almost entire site within fluvial flood zones 2 and 3	Remaining unconstrained part of site too small for development.	0
860	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Unknown		Land situated North of Bankside, (Cedar Springs)	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site wholly within tidal flood zone 2 and 3 and hazard zone	Site fails the principles of a sequential approach to development outlined in PPS25. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
883	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land either side of School Road,	Ingleton Wood	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	5 different sites within close proximity. Only 2 sites are within 25m of the existing settlement boundary.	Two of the 5 sites are potentially suitable.	1
884	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC		M	Land at Folgate Road,	Thomas Construction	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site partially constrained by fluvial flood zone 3, most of site constrained by fluvial flood zone 2. Small part of site unconstrained.	Part of site potentially suitable.	1
943	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Arable Farmland	G	Land at Hunstanton Road	Client of King Sturge	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Entire site within fluvial flood zones 2 and 3	Site fails the principles of a sequential approach to development outlined in PPS25. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
965	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land between Beach Farm and 68 South Beach Road	Clients of Brown & Co	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is further than 25m from existing settlement boundary. Site partially within flood zones 2 and 3.	Constraint cannot be overcome.	0
1006	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Open Paddock	G	Land South of St. Mary's Close, Heacham, PE31 7HL	Client of STRATA architectural ltd	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Portion of site within 25m of settlement. Small part of site within fluvial flood zones 2 and 3.	Portion of site not at risk of flooding suitable for further assessment.	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
654	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+/-	-	Site 654 is a large site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The majority of the site is used for agriculture and smaller parts of the site have had various uses in the past such as a coal depot, agricultural buildings, small business uses and a livestock farm. The site as a whole is inappropriately large in scale for growth in a village. Any development on greenfield land will have an impact on the landscape. A public right of way runs through the site.	The north and west part of the site are potentially suitable as they are closer to the existing built up area of Heacham and to local services. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Impact on the landscape could be mitigated to some extent by screening. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Subject to adequate access onto the highway network at School Road. Development required to contribute towards visibility enhancements at the School Road / The Broadway / Lords Lane junction.	1
706																							0
860																							0
883	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	Site 883 is a large site. The majority of the site is used for agriculture and smaller parts of the site have had various uses in the past and some previously developed land remains. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site as a whole is inappropriately large in scale for growth in a village. Any development on greenfield land will have an impact on the landscape. A public right of way runs through the site.	The north and west part of the site are potentially suitable as they are closer to the existing built up area of Heacham and to local services. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Impact on the landscape could be mitigated to some extent by screening. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Norfolk County Council highways officer state: subject to adequate access onto the highway network at School Road. Development required to contribute towards visibility enhancements at the School Road / The Broadway / Lords Lane junction.	1
884	+	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 884 is a greenfield site which is mostly at risk of flooding. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The part of the site not at risk of flooding is too small to accommodate housing and would prevent access to the land behind. Distance from the centre and local services, could be constraints in achieving access onto the highway network.	There is no overriding need to develop greenfield land which is at risk of flooding. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
943																							0
965																							0
1006	+	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1006 is a greenfield site which is a sparsely wooded open space. The site is well screened from the A149 by an embankment and is easily accessible. The site is partly constrained by flood risk zones. Norfolk County Council indicate site is part of historic parkland and is unsuitable in landscape terms. Part of the site is within the Conservation Area. Mature trees and hedgerow may also present a constraint to development. Possible biodiversity issues. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Subject to adequate access onto St Mary's road. Fair distance to centre and local services.	The site is unsuitable for development as this would result in a loss of historic parkland which is likely to have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
654	None stated	Site proposed by site owner and by more than one agent on landowners behalf therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	M	40.6					Figure already counted (see site 883)	0
706	Residential		0									0
860	Housing		0									0
883	Housing (up to 540) & Leisure	Site proposed by site owner and by more than one agent on landowners behalf therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	M	29.7	2		36		Site partially accepted	36
884	Residential	Site proposed by more than one agent on landowners behalf therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	H	1.4					Site unsuitable.	0
943	Housing/Employment/Retail/Leisure/Community/Other		0									0
965	Housing - up to 40 dwellings, conventional/affordable		0									0
1006	Housing, 15-20 units private / affordable	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M/H	H	1.3					Site unsuitable.	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
1007	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Open Paddock		Land East of Hunstanton Road, , PE31 7HH	Client of STRATA architectural ltd	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Portion of site within 25m of settlement. Almost entire site within fluvial flood zones 2 and 3.	Consider remaining unconstrained part of site unsuitable for development because of limitations in access.	0
1063	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land at Long Acres Caravan Park, South Beach Road	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1064	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land at Mount Pleasant Farm, 25 Lamsey Lane,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1065	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land at Heacham Bottom Farm, Lamsey Lane,	Clients of Brown & Co	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is further than 25m from existing settlement boundary.	Constraint cannot be overcome.	0
HEA 28	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC		B	Cheney Crescent	Mr J. A. Hazel, Geoffrey Collings & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
1008	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Open park land	G	Land West of Hunstanton Road, Heacham Park, PE31 7HH	Client of STRATA architectural ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1009	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Open Paddock	G	Land West of Hall Close, Hunstanton Road, PE31 7JT	Client of STRATA architectural ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1010	Heacham	Heacham	KRSC	Open field / some woodland		Land West of A149, North of Hunstanton Road, PE31 7HH	Client of STRATA architectural ltd	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is further than 25m from existing settlement boundary.	Constraint cannot be overcome.	0
819	Hillington	Hillington	RV	Permanent Pasture	G	Land situated West of Pasture Close,	Client 11 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
1007																								0
1063	+/-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1063 is a greenfield site used for agriculture. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Only one access point. Long way from the centre of Heacham, lack of local services or footway link. Poor public transport availability. The site is within a cordon sanitaire which would have an impact on amenity. The site is fairly isolated behind existing development and is surrounded on two sides by countryside, therefore development is likely to have an adverse impact on the landscape. Possible impact on biodiversity.	The site is poorly related to the settlement, with limited access links. Development would likely have an adverse impact on the landscape. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
1064	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	Site 1064 is a greenfield site used for paddocks at the edge of the built up area of Heacham. It is a fair walking distance to services and there is no footpath. Possible biodiversity issues. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Development could have an adverse impact on the landscape as it is surrounded by countryside on two sides. Distance from the centre and lack of adequate footway provision	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Impact on the landscape could be mitigated to some extent by screening. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Footpath could be provided.	1	
1065																								0
HEA 28	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	Site HEA 28 is currently used for industrial units therefore any development would result in a loss of available units.	The site is within the built environment boundary, therefore would not require allocation. Change of use should be a consideration in any redevelopment. Constraints can be overcome.	1	
1008	+	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	Site 1008 is a greenfield site. The site is landscaped parkland used as pasture. Norfolk County Council indicate site is part of historic parkland and is unsuitable in landscape terms. There is a TPO (group) on the site. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. The site is at the northern edge of the settlement and fairly distant from services (walking/cycling).	The site is unsuitable for development as this would result in a loss of historic parkland which is likely to have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
1009	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	Site 1009 is a greenfield site. The site is currently used as paddocks. Access is poor via a narrow track with poor visibility. The site is surrounded by trees therefore there may be issues regarding biodiversity. The site is at the northern edge of the settlement and fairly distant from services (walking/cycling). Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Possible adverse impact on the landscape, however site is screened by woodland. Access to the highway network is poor. Highways Authority indicated they would object to development on this site.	Access to the site is a key constraint to development. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
1010																								0
819	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 819 is a greenfield site. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village and if the whole site were to be developed this would have a negative impact on the landscape. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. There is a pond on the site. Possible biodiversity issues. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Part of the site fronting Pasture Close may be suitable for accommodating minor development although the pond may reduce the amount of dwellings that could be provided. Consultation with Anglian Water would be required to determine whether further minor development in the cordon sanitaire is possible. Screening required. Ecology assessment may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1	

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
1007	Housing, 6 private residential units		0									0
1063	None stated	Site proposed by 2 agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.2					Site unsuitable.	0
1064	Housing - up to 6 dwellings, conventional/affordable	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.4			9		Site accepted	9
1065	Housing - up to 40 dwellings, conventional/affordable		0									0
HEA 28	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	0.3		7			Site accepted	7
1008	Housing, executive housing, 6 units	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	4.7					Site unsuitable.	0
1009	Housing, Social/Affordable. Potentially retirement development	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.8					Site unsuitable.	0
1010	Housing, Less than 10 units		0									0
819	Housing - affordable & market / open space for recreation	Land submitted more than once by one agent on behalf of landowner.	1	H	M	3.6	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
187	Hillington	Hillington	RV	Agriculture (permanent pasture)	G	Land west of Pasture Close,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
188	Hillington	Hillington	RV	Agriculture (arable land)	G	Land south of Pasture Close,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
230	Hillington	Hillington	RV	Agricultural purposes	G	Land to west of Wheatfields estate (4.42acres)	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1071	Hillington	Hillington	RV	Permanent Pasture	G	Land situated South of Pasture Close,	Client 11 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
1094	Hillington	Hillington	RV		B	Land to the rear of 30 & 31 Station Road	Client of NPS Group Property Consultants	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
136	Ingoldisthorpe	Ingoldisthorpe	RV	Fields	G	Land behind houses on Lynn Road	Mr & Mrs AJ Smith	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
187	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 187 is a greenfield site. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village and if the whole site were to be developed this would have a negative impact on the landscape. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. There is a pond on the site. Possible biodiversity issues. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Part of the site fronting Pasture Close may be suitable for accommodating minor development although the pond may reduce the amount of dwellings that could be provided. Consultation with Anglian Water would be required to determine whether further minor development in the cordon sanitaire is possible. Screening required. Ecology assessment may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1
188	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 188 is a greenfield site. The site is large in scale. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. There is access through the site to a pumping station. The frontage of the site is covered by mature trees/hedgerow. Possible biodiversity issues. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with Anglian Water would be required. Part of the site fronting Pasture Close could potentially be developed providing access to the pumping station could be maintained. Consultation with Anglian Water would be required to determine whether further minor development in the cordon sanitaire is possible. Screening required. Ecology assessment may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1
230	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 230 is a greenfield site. The site is large in scale. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. Possible biodiversity issues. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with Anglian Water would be required. Part of the site fronting Wheatfield could potentially be developed. An ecology assessment may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1
1071	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1071 is a greenfield site. The site is large in scale. The site is within a cordon sanitaire. There is access through the site to a pumping station. The frontage of the site is covered by mature trees/hedgerow. Possible biodiversity issues. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. Consultation with Anglian Water would be required. Part of the site fronting Pasture Close could potentially be developed providing access to the pumping station could be maintained. Consultation with Anglian Water would be required to determine whether further minor development in the cordon sanitaire is possible. Screening required. Ecology assessment may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required.	1
1094	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site 1094 is a brownfield site. The site is large in scale. Access is via a narrow road which already serves two dwellings. The site is quite far from the main services. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site is inside the built environment boundary therefore could come forward for development immediately. Part of the site could potentially accommodate minor development. However further consultation with the Highways Agency is required. Ecology assessment may be required.	1
136	+/-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	Site 136 comprises the access to a bungalow and greenfield land currently used as a garden. The site is inappropriately large in scale. The site is directly adjacent to a designated County Wildlife Site. Although the site is adjacent to existing residential development, the site is removed from the main built up area of Ingoldisthorpe therefore it is a fair walking distance to services. The proposed access is too narrow for major development and Highways Authority would object to allocation, based on the following grounds: the site is remote from the settlement, the surrounding highway network is poor and visibility would be very difficult to achieve. Possible impact on biodiversity	The site is unsuitable for development due to poor access. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
187		Land submitted more than once by one agent on behalf of landowner.	1	H	M	3.6					Figure already counted (see site 819)	0
188		Land submitted more than once by one agent on behalf of landowner.	1	H	L	2.2	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
230	Residential	Site proposed by agent on behalf of all landowners therefore considered to be available		H	L	1.7	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
1071	Housing - affordable & market / open space for recreation	Land submitted more than once by one agent on behalf of landowner.	1	H	L	2.2					Figure already counted (see site 188)	0
1094	Housing / Community building	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.7		9			Site accepted	9
136	Residential	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	3.2	0.4				Site unsuitable	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
297	Ingoldisthorpe	Ingoldisthorpe	RV	Static Caravan & Storage	G	Land on Lynn Road,	Mr & Mrs J.M. Kidman	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
794	Ingoldisthorpe	Ingoldisthorpe	RV	Paddock/Garden/2 properties	G	Land at 'Raylvu', Lynn Road, Ingoldisthorpe	Mrs Linda Newland	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
862	Ingoldisthorpe	Ingoldisthorpe	RV	Agricultural	G	Land situated opposite 143-161 Lynn Road	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
113	Leziate	Ashwicken	RV	Grassland		Property development at The Lodge Well Hall Lane	Mr Dale Hamblton	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from the defined settlement to be sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
305	Leziate	Ashwicken	RV	none stated	G	Land at Wildwood, East Winch Road,	Mr Tony Crane	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	Part of site potentially suitable.	1
180	Leziate	Ashwicken	RV	Agriculture (arable and grazing purposes)	G	Land at Ashwicken & Leziate Site 1 - Land around All Saint's Church Church Lane Ashwicken, (north side to Park Cottage, south to The Old Rectory)	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from the defined settlement to be sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
181	Leziate	Ashwicken	RV	Agriculture (arable and grazing purposes)		Site 2 - Land south of No.39 & west of Hall Farm Church Lane	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site is too far from the defined settlement to be sustainable location for development. Constraint cannot be overcome.	No	0
182	Leziate	Ashwicken	RV	Agriculture (arable and grazing purposes)	G	Site 3 - Land north side Church Lane between Glosthorpe House and 102 Church Lane	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject		
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land					
297	+	-	+	+	+	-	+/-	+	-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	Site 297 is a greenfield site. The whole site is in an area designated Tree Preservation Order (woodland) although some parts of the site are cleared of trees. Although the site is adjacent to residential development, the site is removed from the main built up area of Ingoldisthorpe, therefore it is a fair walking distance to services. Amenity may be affected by busy road. The site is immediately adjacent to a County Wildlife Site. Possible impact on biodiversity. Highways Authority would object to allocation, based on the following grounds: the site is remote from the settlement, the surrounding highway network is poor and visibility would	Mature trees and hedge prevent a continuation of frontage development along Lynn Road. The designated protection order prevents clearing of trees, therefore constraints cannot be overcome. The site is also unsuitable for development due to poor access.	0		
794	+/-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 794 is greenfield land used for paddocks and outbuildings. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. The greatest constraint to development is the access point, which is considered too narrow to accommodate further development. The site is set behind existing houses which could create issues for the amenity of residents such as overlooking and could also affect the form and character of the settlement. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity.	Consider access renders site unsuitable for residential development. Highways Agency have been consulted for confirmation, awaiting response. Adjacent dwelling would need to be demolished to widen access.	0		
862	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 862 is a greenfield site. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. The site is adjacent to a busy road which would impact on amenity. Possible biodiversity impact. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation.	1		
113																									0
305	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site 305 is a partially developed site. Part of the site is a County Wildlife Site (designated plantation) by the Norfolk Wildlife Trust. The site is within walking distance of a primary school but there is no footpath, therefore services cannot be accessed safely on foot. Development of the site would potentially have an adverse impact on biodiversity as any intensification of the site would require the removal of trees and encroach further into the woodland area. The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area.	The frontage of the site is already being intensified with further dwellings, therefore there is limited scope to develop the site without further encroachment into the woodland with potential negative impact on biodiversity.	0		
180																									0
181																									
182	+/-	-	-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	Site 182 is a greenfield site. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. The site slopes upwards from south to north. The site is too far from services to be a sustainable location for development and there is no access by footpath to the bus stop or the school. The site is within Marham airfield safeguarding area. Development of the site would encroach on open countryside. Possible biodiversity impact. Partial loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is a large, open, undulating agricultural field, therefore it is difficult to mitigate the impact on the landscape even if developing only part of the site. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0		

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
297	Housing, Affordable up to 20 dwellings	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	0.2					Site unsuitable	0
794	Housing, mixed	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	H	1.2					Site unsuitable	0
862	Housing, mixed	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	2.3	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
113	Residential		0									0
305	none stated	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	M	1.1					Site unsuitable	0
180	Housing		0									0
181	Housing		0									0
182	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available		H	L	5.4					Site unsuitable	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1														summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject			
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens						
720	North Creake	North Creake	SVAH	none stated		Land off West Street,	Althorp Estate	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site further than 25m from higher order settlement.	Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
NCR 01	North Creake	North Creake	SVAH	none stated		Dunns Lane	Freebridge Community Housing	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site further than 25m from higher order settlement.	Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
712	North Wootton	North Wootton	SAKLO TMT		G	Land rear of 12 The Green,	Miss Sue Richards	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
NWT 08	North Wootton	North Wootton	SAKLO TMT	none stated	B	Nursery Lane	David Roythorne, Roythorne & Son	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.	N/A	1
288	Roydon	Roydon	SVAH	none stated		Land on Low Road,	Clients of Robinson Hall	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
92	Roydon	Roydon	SVAH	none stated		Land off Hall Lane	Mr Peter Godfrey	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
146	Roydon	Roydon	SVAH	Grazing		Land at Home Cloisters Farm, Station Road	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
208	Roydon	Roydon	SVAH	Arable production	G	Land on Church Lane,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
481	Roydon	Roydon	SVAH	none stated		Land off Hall Lane,	Clients of Ian H Bix & Associates	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
757	Roydon	Roydon	SVAH	Arable	G	Land East of Station Road, Roydon	Client 3 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
1022	Roydon	Roydon	SVAH	Former machinery store, old concrete footings	B	Land, East of Birch Road (PE32 1AL)	Client of Tower Consultancy	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0

Suitability Stage 2																							
Site Ref	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land	Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
720																							0
NCR 01																							0
712	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 712 is a greenfield site. The site is wholly within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. Possible impact on biodiversity. Access to the site is unclear, further information on access is required.	Highways Agency have been consulted and would object to allocation of the site as it is not apparent where an access would be made for the site.	0
NWT 08	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site NWT is a small garage site therefore brownfield land. The garage is currently in use. Development would result in a loss of employment land. Possible contamination issues. Highway Authority note it would be desirable for a pedestrian and cycle route to be made to All Saints Drive.	If the site ceases to be viable employment land, residential use could be considered.	1
288																							0
92																							0
146																							0
208																							0
481																							0
757																							0
1022																							0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
720	Housing		0									0
NCR 01	Housing min - 20 to max 50 dwellings		0									0
712	Disagrees with status as 'open countryside' in the Local Plan. Wants the site to be included in the village boundary.	Site not proposed for development therefore the site is unavailable for housing.	0	H	L	0.4					Site unsuitable, unavailable.	0
NWT 08	Housing - 4 min - 9 max	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	H	0.2		5	0		Site accepted	5
288	none stated		0									0
92	none stated		0									0
146	Housing		0									0
208	Residential		0									0
481	none stated		0									0
757	Housing		0									0
1022	Housing - approx 9-11 dwellings		0									0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
26	Sedgeford	Sedgeford	RV	none stated	G	Land at Jarvie Close,	Property Services	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.		1
194	Sedgeford	Sedgeford	RV	Agricultural land	G	Land west of Goodmins Estate,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.		1
554	Sedgeford	Sedgeford	RV	Agricultural	G	Land west of Goodmins Estate,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.		1
768	Sedgeford	Sedgeford	RV	Paddock	G	Land south of Docking Road,	Mr & Mrs Cedric Hipkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
882	Sedgeford	Sedgeford	RV	Last known use farmland		Land West of Jarvie Close	Sedgeford Parish Council	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site wholly within the AONB.	Yes. Not major development	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																			Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land				Agricultural land
26	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 26 is a greenfield meadow site. The site is within the AONB and therefore unsuitable for major development. There is existing residential development to the north, east and south of the site therefore development on this site would constitute infill development. There are domestic pylons across the site. Potential impact on biodiversity. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. An ecology report may be required before development. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. If allocating, consultation with DEFRA would be required. Any development would need to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB through quality design, layout and materials.	1
194	+/-	-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	-	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 194 is a greenfield site. Development would result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site is within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is too large in scale for a sustainable level of development in a rural village. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. Any development would be visually intrusive in the landscape and have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area and AONB particularly because the site is sloping and therefore development would be elevated and highly visible in the landscape. The access point leads onto a fast road. There are mature hedgerows on the boundary of the site and domestic pylons running across the site.	The sloping nature of the site makes it difficult to mitigate the impact on the AONB and Conservation Area, even if any part of the site were developed. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
554	+/-	-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	-	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 554 is a greenfield site. Development would result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site is within the AONB and is therefore unsuitable for major development. The site is too large in scale for a sustainable level of development in a rural village. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. Any development would be visually intrusive in the landscape and have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area and AONB particularly because the site is sloping and therefore development would be elevated and highly visible in the landscape. The access point leads onto a fast road. There are mature hedgerows on the boundary of the site and domestic pylons running across the site.	The sloping nature of the site makes it difficult to mitigate the impact on the AONB and Conservation Area, even if any part of the site were developed. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
768	+/-	-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 768 is a greenfield site used for paddocks. Site is large in scale. Site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. The site is surrounded by countryside on three sides. The site is behind the existing frontage of houses, accessible via a narrow track which slopes upward making the site prominent in the landscape (although it is screened by hedgerow). Development behind housing in this location would not be in keeping with the form and character of the settlement. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Possible biodiversity issues.	Site size would need to be reduced and site would need to be well screened. Access may prove a constraint, opinion of Norfolk County Council Highways officer has been sought. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation.	1
882	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 882 is a greenfield meadow site. The site is wholly within the AONB and therefore unsuitable for major development. Development would encroach on the AONB however there is existing residential development to the north, east and south of the site therefore development on this site would constitute infill development. There are domestic pylons across the site.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Constraints could be overcome by reducing the site size and ensuring appropriate screening from the wider countryside (e.g. by establishing a hedgerow) to mitigate the impact on the landscape. An ecology report may be required before development. Site requires comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. If allocating, consultation with DEFRA would be required. Any development would need to be sensitive to the setting of the AONB through quality design, layout and materials.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
26	Residential	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.6				9	Site accepted	9
194	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.4					Site unsuitable	0
554	Housing, Approx 40 conventional / affordable	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.4					Site unsuitable	0
768	Residential	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.1	0.4			9	Site partially accepted	9
882	Housing, 20 plus	Site proposed by Parish Council and landowner therefore considered to be available.	1	H	L	0.6					Figure already counted (see site 26)	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
1137	Sedgeford	Sedgeford	RV		G	Land between the B1454 & Fring Road, Sedgeford	Sustainable Village Enterprise & Sustainable Village Housing	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. However very large site with majority well outside 25m buffer.		1
32	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	none stated	G	Land at Saffronside	Property Services	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
189	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Grazing pasture	G	Land south of Common Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
190	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Arable production and is growing under licence Lavender reflecting the free draining low quality soil.	G	Land at Home Farm, north of Common Road	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.		1
191	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Former Allotments	G	Land adjacent Allotment Plantation, Common Road	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.		1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
1137	+/-	-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1137 is a greenfield site used for agriculture. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. There is a 35m difference between the lowest and highest point of the site therefore development on the higher parts of the site would be highly visible due to the elevated position and therefore would have an adverse impact on the AONB. The most suitable parts of the site for minor development of affordable housing would be close to the main built up area of Sedgeford. However, access and visibility is an issue for any entry onto Docking Road and mature trees and hedgerow border this part of the site making it unfavourable for frontage development. The most western part of the site adjacent to Fring Road is also constrained as any development would impact on the Conservation Area because this part of the site is highly visible and vehicular access and visibility is not ideal. Possible biodiversity issues. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The location is generally unsuitable for development due to the size and the relief of the site. Any development would encroach into the countryside and would have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area and AONB. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
32	+	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	Site 32 is a greenfield site. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. The site is located behind a small group of houses which front onto Church Road. Further development behind existing houses would be out of keeping with the character of the area. The access point is narrow. Loss of allotments. The site is removed from the main built up area of Snettisham therefore access to services is not ideal as there are no footways to the main settlement. Highway Authority have indicated they would object. Part of the site is grade 3 agricultural land. Possible biodiversity impact.	The site is within the built environment boundary therefore would not require allocation. However, the potential for housing on the site is constrained by the impact on the access, and on the form and character of the area. The site is located away from the main residential area of Snettisham, and therefore is not considered a suitable location for further housing.	0
189	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	Site 189 is a greenfield site. The site is adjacent to the AONB but not within it. The eastern part of the site has now been developed for residential use, and there is development to the north and south of the site. Possible biodiversity impact. Part of the site is grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Subject to safe access and safe visibility being achieved onto Common Road.	1
190	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	+	+	Site 190 is a predominantly greenfield site used for agriculture. Part of the site has already been developed providing 15 affordable dwellings. The site is wholly within the AONB therefore only minor development would be appropriate. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. There is a public right of way across the site. The amenity of potential residents may be affected by vehicular noise from the A149. Potential impact on biodiversity.	Part of the site is potentially suitable. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Noise could be reduced through screening. Public right of way should be maintained. Subject to safe access and safe visibility being achieved onto Common Road.	1
191	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+/-	+	-	Site 191 is wholly within the AONB and therefore only minor development is possible. Part of the site is greenfield and is currently meadow, a small part of the site has been previously developed. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. There is a public right of way across the north edge of the site. The site is distant from the main built up area of the village and would require crossing the busy A149 to reach key services. Development of this site would encroach on the countryside to the north and west. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Possible biodiversity issues. Site is a possible waste disposal site. Norfolk County Council indicate site is remote from the settlement and would therefore be subject to objection from the Highway Authority and unsuitable in landscape terms.	Although the site is adjacent to development at the eastern edge, the site is located separated from the village centre and services by the A149, and therefore it is not considered an appropriate location for housing. Furthermore, only minor development is potentially acceptable in the AONB which is unlikely to warrant necessary infrastructure to provide a safe crossing of the A149. Impact on the landscape cannot be justified. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
1137	Residential/Care Home	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	139.4					Site unsuitable	0
32	Residential	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.5					Site unsuitable	0
189	Residential	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.3			20		Site accepted	20
190	Residential	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	8.2	2		36		Site partially accepted	36
191	Residential	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	3.6					Site unsuitable	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
192	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Allotment & Meeting Hall	M	Land at Church Road/Manor Lane,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
193	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	agricultural land	G	Land adjoining Sedgford Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
549	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Grazing/Agricultural	G	Land south of Common Road,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
550	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Grazing/Agricultural	G	Land at Home Farm, north of Common Road,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
551	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Agricultural	G	Land adjacent Allotment Plantation, Common Road,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
552	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Allotment & Meeting Hall	M	Land at Church Road/Manor Lane,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
192	+	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	Site 192 is used for small allotments and a meeting hall for the Royal British Legion, therefore, development on the site would result in a loss of a community facility, allotments and would alter the landscape/townscape. The site is wholly within the Conservation Area. There are domestic pylons on the site. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Impact on the Conservation Area and loss of community facilities would be a key consideration in determining whether appropriate for allocation. The local highway network is very narrow and will need some local improvements.	1
193	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site 193 is a greenfield site. Development of the site would result in a loss of significant views to and from the church and would have an adverse impact on the landscape as development would encroach into the countryside and be highly visible. Norfolk County Council state site is not suitable in landscape terms. The site is away from the main built up area of Snettisham and as such would not be an ideal walking/cycling distance to services. The Highway Authority would object to this site. Loss of productive grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity.	The site is located away from the main residential area of Snettisham, and therefore is not considered a suitable location for further housing. Adverse impact on the landscape cannot be justified. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
549	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	Site 549 is a greenfield site. The site is adjacent to the AONB but not within it. The eastern part of the site has now been developed for residential use, and there is development to the north and south of the site. Possible biodiversity impact. Part of the site is grade 3 agricultural land.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Subject to safe access and safe visibility being achieved onto Common Road.	1
550	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	+	+	Site 550 is a predominantly greenfield site used for agriculture. Part of the site has already been developed providing 15 affordable dwellings. The site is wholly within the AONB therefore only minor development would be appropriate. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. There is a public right of way across the site. The amenity of potential residents may be affected by vehicular noise from the A149. Potential impact on biodiversity.	Part of the site is potentially suitable. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Noise could be reduced through screening. Public right of way should be maintained. Subject to safe access and safe visibility being achieved onto Common Road.	1
551	+/-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+/-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+/-	+	-	Site 551 is wholly within the AONB and therefore only minor development is possible. Part of the site is greenfield and is currently meadow, a small part of the site has been previously developed. The site is inappropriately large in scale for a rural village. There is a public right of way across the north edge of the site. The site is distant from the main built up area of the village and would require crossing the busy A149 to reach key services. Development of this site would encroach on the countryside to the north and west. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Possible biodiversity issues. Site is a possible waste disposal site. Norfolk County Council indicate site is remote from the settlement and would therefore be subject to objection from the Highway Authority and is unsuitable in landscape terms.	Although the site is adjacent to development at the eastern edge, the site is located separated from the village centre and services by the A149, and therefore it is not considered an appropriate location for housing. Furthermore, only minor development is potentially acceptable in the AONB which is unlikely to warrant necessary infrastructure to provide a safe crossing of the A149. Impact on the landscape cannot be justified. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
552	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	Site 552 is used for small allotments and a meeting hall for the Royal British Legion, therefore, development on the site would result in a loss of a community facility, allotments and would alter the landscape/townscape. The site is wholly within the Conservation Area. There are domestic pylons on the site. Possible biodiversity issues.	The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Impact on the Conservation Area and loss of community facilities would be a key consideration in determining whether appropriate for allocation.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
192	Residential	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.2				5	Site accepted	5
193	Residential	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.8					Site unsuitable	0
549	Housing, Approx 20 Conventional / Affordable	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.3					Figure already counted (see site 189)	0
550	Housing, Approx 100 Conventional / Affordable	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	8.2					Figure already counted (see site 190)	0
551	Housing, Approx 60 conventional/affordable	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	3.6					Site unsuitable	0
552	Housing, Approx 4 Conventional / Affordable	Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.2					Figure already counted (see site 192)	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
553	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC		G	Land adjoining Sedgeford Road,	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
700	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Builders Merchants	B	Land on School Road,	Ridgeons	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
854	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Former Halls Foundation Quarry. Still used for storage of recycled materials. Office & weighbridge still in use.		Frimstone Quarry, Norton Hill,	Halls Exhibition Foundation	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	Site wholly within SSSI & AONB.	Constraint cannot be overcome.	0
1098	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC	Grazing/Agricultural	G	Land North of Hall Farm, bordering Half Moon Plantation	Clients of Brown & Co	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
SNE 12	Snettisham	Snettisham	KRSC		B	School Road	A.R. Greavett, Ridgeons Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
155	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	none stated	G	Land north of Edward Benefer Way,	Mrs Rita Nixon	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Partially within flood zones 2 tidal.	Yes. Unconstrained area.	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
553	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site 553 is a greenfield site. Development of the site would result in a loss of significant views to and from the church and would have an adverse impact on the landscape as development would encroach into the countryside and be highly visible. Norfolk County Council consider site is not suitable in landscape terms. The site is away from the main built up area of Snettisham and as such would not be an ideal walking/cycling distance to services. The Highway Authority would object to this site. Loss of productive grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity.	The site is located away from the main residential area of Snettisham, and therefore is not considered a suitable location for further housing. Adverse impact on the landscape cannot be justified. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
700	+	+	+	+	-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site 700 is brownfield land and is currently used for a building supply business. Residential development on this site would result in a loss of employment land in the centre of the village. The site is wholly within the Conservation Area and adjacent to Listed Buildings. Possible contamination due to previous use. Potential amenity issues - parking and overlooking. Visibility may be an issue.	The site is within the built environment boundary and therefore would not require allocation. This site is potentially suitable for residential use depending upon the viability of the existing employment use. Any development would have to sensitive considering layout, materials, design and access to minimise impact on Conservation Area and mitigate impact on amenity.	1	
854																								0
1098	+/-	+/-	+	+	-	-	+	+/-	+	+/-	-	+	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	Site 1098 is a partially developed site. The site is adjacent to the AONB and Carstone Quarry SSSI and wholly within the Conservation Area. The site is large in scale. Part of the site is outside the built environment boundary. Possible biodiversity impact. Mature trees on site. Within boundary of a possible waste disposal site. Access is via an unadopted road which would be unsuitable for increased traffic, consequently the site would face objection from the Highways Agency. The site is far removed from the built up area of Snettisham and would result in development which encroached into the countryside. Norfolk County Council consider site unsuitable in landscape terms.	The site is located away from the main residential area of Snettisham, and therefore is not considered a suitable location for further housing. Adverse impact on the landscape cannot be justified. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	
SNE 12	+	+	+	+	-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site SNE 12 is brownfield land and is currently used for a building supply business. Residential development on this site would result in a loss of employment land in the centre of the village. The site is wholly within the Conservation Area and adjacent to Listed Buildings. Possible contamination due to previous use. Potential amenity issues - parking and overlooking. Visibility may be an issue.	The site is within the built environment boundary and therefore would not require allocation. This site is potentially suitable for residential use depending upon the viability of the existing employment use. Any development would have to sensitive considering layout, materials, design and access to minimise impact on Conservation Area and mitigate impact on amenity.	1	
155	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 155 is a greenfield site. The site is within Gaywood Valley project area. The site is partially constrained by flood zone 2. Access would need to be configured. Highways Authority state that if the site was brought forward with adjacent sites development would be well located with good public transport links to Kings Lynn. Development will result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land and will impact on the current landscape and encroach on the countryside. Possible impact on biodiversity.	The site is outside the built environment boundary but is located in the wider strategic direction of growth to King's Lynn identified in the Core Strategy for the Borough. The site will undergo more detailed comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether part or the whole site is suitable for allocation. No absolute constraints to development have been identified, although development in the flood zone would have to be assessed in line with PPS25 and consultation with the Environment Agency would be required. Norfolk County Council indicate a strong landscape buffer to the west would be required.	1	

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
553		Site proposed by two agents on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.8					Site unsuitable	0
700	Housing TBC	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	0.4		9			Site accepted	9
854	Housing/ Employment/ Leisure		0									0
1098	Housing, Approx 40 Conventional / Affordable	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	2.1					Site unsuitable	0
SNE 12	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	0.4					Figure already counted (see site 700)	0
155	none stated	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	4.2					Figure already counted (see broad location for development: Kings Lynn North)	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
157	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	none stated	G	Land at Nursery Lane,	Mr David CA Allberry FRICS	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
415	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Agriculture	G	Land at South Wootton	Clients of Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A small section of the site is unconstrained by flood zones 2 and 3.	Yes only area of site not affected by flood zones.	1
446	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Bare Arable	G	Land at Gap Farm,	Clients of Adrian Parker Planning	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site wholly within the AONB.	Yes. Not major development	1
568	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT		G	Land at Grimston Road,	Clients of Parsons & Whitley	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
789	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Grassland/Agricultural	G	Land at 150 Grimston Road	Clayland Consulting	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
817	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Arable	G	Land adjacent to Cedar Lodge, Grimston Road	Client 10 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site wholly within the AONB.	Yes. Not major development	1
818	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Arable	G	Land Opposite Sandy Lane, Grimston Road	Client 10 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site wholly within the AONB.	Yes. Not major development	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
157	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	Site 157 is a greenfield site within the built up area of South Wootton. There is a public right of way running across the southern edge of the site. There is a woodland TPO on part of the site. Development would have an impact on the existing townscape and would result in a loss of green space in the urban area. Formally appeal upheld by inspector against development on the site due to its significance as open land separating two villages from joining together. However, the site is ideally located for access to services and open space and development would not encroach on the wider countryside. To create access to the site some hedgerow would be lost. Potential biodiversity impact.	The site was formally protected land designated as Built Environment Type A in the Local Plan. The built environment boundaries are due to be reviewed in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and the potential for housing will be considered in that document. The public right of way would need to be maintained. Although there would be a loss of open land, the site is immediately adjacent to extensive publicly accessible open space. An ecology report may be required. Area around protected trees would be safeguarded.	1
415	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 415 is greenfield land. The site is large in scale. The site is within the Gaywood Valley project area. The western half of the site is within tidal flood zone 2. Access would need to be configured. Highways Authority state that if the site was brought forward with adjacent sites development would be well located with good public transport links to Kings Lynn. Development will result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land and will impact on the current landscape and encroach on the countryside. Possible impact on biodiversity.	The site is outside the built environment boundary but is located in the wider strategic direction of growth to King's Lynn identified in the Core Strategy for the Borough. The site will undergo more detailed comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether part or the whole site is suitable for allocation. No absolute constraints to development have been identified, although development in the flood zone would have to be assessed in line with PPS25 and consultation with the Environment Agency would be required. Norfolk County Council indicate a strong landscape buffer to the west would be required. Tree survey and ecology survey may be required	1
446	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	Site 446 is greenfield agricultural land. The site is large in scale. The site is wholly within the AONB therefore is unsuitable for major development. The site is fairly distant from convenience services and fronts onto a busy road. Potential impact on biodiversity. Any development will impact on the landscape and AONB.	There is potential for minor development on a small part of the site, provided this is well screened. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required.	1
568	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	Site 568 is greenfield land. The site is distant from services and accessible open space. Possible biodiversity issues and impact on the landscape.	The site is outside the built environment boundary but is located in the wider strategic direction of growth to King's Lynn identified in the Core Strategy for the Borough. The site will undergo more detailed comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether the site is suitable for allocation. No absolute constraints to development have been identified, and access to services and open space could be improved through developer contributions as part of a comprehensive development scheme.	1
789	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	Site 789 is greenfield land. The site is distant from services and accessible open space. Development. Possible biodiversity issues and impact on the landscape.	The site is outside the built environment boundary but is located in the wider strategic direction of growth to King's Lynn identified in the Core Strategy for the Borough. The site will undergo more detailed comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether the site is suitable for allocation. No absolute constraints to development have been identified, and access to services and open space could be improved through developer contributions as part of a comprehensive development scheme. Tree survey and ecology survey may be required	1
817	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	Site 817 is greenfield agricultural land. The site is wholly within the AONB therefore is unsuitable for major development. The site is fairly distant from convenience services and fronts onto a busy road. Potential impact on biodiversity. Any development will impact on the landscape and AONB.	There is potential for minor development on the site, provided this is well screened. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required.	1
818	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	Site 818 is greenfield agricultural land. The site is large in scale. The site is wholly within the AONB therefore is unsuitable for major development. The site is fairly distant from convenience services and fronts onto a busy road. Potential impact on biodiversity. Any development will impact on the landscape and AONB.	There is potential for minor development on a small part of the site, provided this is well screened. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required.	1

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable						total		
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years		Result	
157	none stated	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	3.6				65		Site accepted	65
415	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	37.3						Figure already counted (see broad location for development: Kings Lynn North)	0
446	Housing, TBC	Site proposed by more than one agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	38.6						Figure already counted (see site 817)	0
568		Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	3.3						Figure already counted (see broad location for development: Kings Lynn North East)	0
789	Housing, Approx 60-80 dwellings	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	3.3						Figure already counted (see broad location for development: Kings Lynn North East)	0
817	Housing/Employment/Leisure	Site proposed by agent more than once on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	4	0.4			9		Site partially accepted	9
818	Housing/Employment/Leisure	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	33.9						Figure already counted (see site 817)	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
928	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Agricultural	G	Land lying to the West of Nursery Lane, off Meadow Road	Mr J.B Anderson	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Partially within flood zones 2 tidal.	Yes. Unconstrained area.	1
559	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	none stated	G	Land at Whistle Wood, Grimston Road,	Clients of Januarys	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified severe constraints. Site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
944	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Currently overgrown. Small private chicken coop	G	Land off Ullswater Avenue	Mr W Bromwich	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints. Portion of site within 25m of settlement.	N/A	1
996	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Garden land	G	Land at the Manor House, Low Road (PE30 3NW)	Client of Carter Jonas	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
1014	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT			Land North of Edward Benefer Way on west side of	Client of Maxey & Son	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Partially within flood zones 2 tidal.	Yes. Unconstrained area.	1
1104	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	Agricultural	G	Land to the North of Edward Benefer Way	Client of Carter Jonas	+	+	+	-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Wholly within Flood zone 2 tidal, partial flood zone 3 tidal.	No	0
SWT 26	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT	none stated		Castle Rising Road	Mr Harry Wilkin and Mrs Susan Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
928	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 928 is a greenfield site. The site is partially within Gaywood Valley project area. The site is partially constrained by tidal flood zone 2. Potential to access site from Meadow Way. Highways Authority state that if the site was brought forward with adjacent sites development would be well located with good public transport links to Kings Lynn. Development will result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land and will impact on the current landscape and encroach on the countryside. Possible impact on biodiversity.	The site is outside the built environment boundary but is located in the wider strategic direction of growth to King's Lynn identified in the Core Strategy for the Borough. The site will undergo more detailed comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether part or the whole site is suitable for allocation. No absolute constraints to development have been identified, although development in the flood zone would have to be assessed in line with PPS25 and consultation with the Environment Agency would be required. Norfolk County Council indicate a strong landscape buffer to the west would be required. Tree survey and ecology survey may be required	1	
559	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site 559 is a large greenfield site. The site is adjacent to the AONB. There is a gas pipeline near the eastern edge of the site. Part of the site is within the Gaywood Valley project area. The site is gently sloping which could make development more visually prominent. At present vehicular access is not established and the site is far from services and facilities. Development on the site will impact on the existing landscape. Amenity of potential residents could be affected by vehicular noise from the A149. Potential impact on biodiversity.	The site is outside the built environment boundary but is located in the wider strategic direction of growth to King's Lynn identified in the Core Strategy for the Borough. The site will undergo more detailed comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether the site is suitable for allocation. No absolute constraints to development have been identified, and access to services and open space could be improved through developer contributions as part of a comprehensive development scheme. Site would require landscape buffer to mitigate impact on landscape and amenity. Consultation with Highways Agency required. Tree survey and ecology survey may be required	1	
944	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Site 994 is a greenfield site. Part of the site is within the Gaywood Valley project area. Development would result in a loss of trees and greenfield land. The site is distant from services. Potential access via Ullswater Avenue. Potential impact on biodiversity.	The site is outside the built environment boundary but is located in the wider strategic direction of growth to King's Lynn identified in the Core Strategy for the Borough. The site will undergo more detailed comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether the site is suitable for allocation. No absolute constraints to development have been identified, and access to services and open space could be improved through developer contributions as part of a comprehensive development scheme. Site would require landscape buffer to mitigate impact on landscape. Tree survey and ecology survey may be required	1	
996	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 996 is partly developed and comprises a house and large front garden. There are mature trees on site. The site is well screened from surrounding areas. Intensification may affect the amenity of existing residents, and layout and design will require careful consideration. The site is within the Gaywood Valley project area. Possible biodiversity issues.	Tree survey and ecology survey may be required. Site is within development boundary therefore does not require allocation. Impact on amenity and form and character of settlement will be considered at application stage. Subject to safe access being provided.	1	
1014	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1014 is greenfield land. The site is large in scale. The site is within the Gaywood Valley project area. The western half of the site is within tidal flood zone 2. Access would need to be configured. Highways Authority state that if the site was brought forward with adjacent sites development would be well located with good public transport links to Kings Lynn. Development will result in a loss of grade 3 agricultural land and will impact on the current landscape and encroach on the countryside. Possible impact on biodiversity.	The site is outside the built environment boundary but is located in the wider strategic direction of growth to King's Lynn identified in the Core Strategy for the Borough. The site will undergo more detailed comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to determine whether part or the whole site is suitable for allocation. No absolute constraints to development have been identified, although development in the flood zone would have to be assessed in line with PPS25 and consultation with the Environment Agency would be required. Norfolk County Council indicate a strong landscape buffer to the west would be required. Tree survey and ecology survey may be required	1	
1104																								0
SWT 26	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	Site SWT 26 is a greenfield site developed as a nursery. Housing development would result in a loss of employment land.	If the site ceases to be viable employment land, residential use could be considered, subject to safe access.	1	

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable						total	
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years		Result
928	Housing, 150 dwellings, mixed use	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	6.2					Figure already counted (see broad location for development: Kings Lynn North)	0
559	none stated	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	19.6					Figure already counted (see broad location for development: Kings Lynn North East)	0
944	Housing - approx 130 -190 dwellings of mixed use	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	3.8					Figure already counted (see broad location for development: Kings Lynn North East)	0
996	Housing, 10-14 dwellings, market housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.4		9			Site accepted	9
1014		Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	13.7					Figure already counted (see broad location for development: Kings Lynn North)	0
1104	Housing		0									0
SWT 26	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	M	0.9		19				19

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
590	South Wootton	South Wootton	SAKLO TMT			Garden land to the rear of 87 Nursery Lane,	Mr Carlo Newson	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
478	Stanhoe	Stanhoe	SVAH			Land fronting Docking Road,	Clients of Ian H Bix & Associates	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
218	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural (Arable)	G	Land on the west side of Tattersett Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
219	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural (Arable)	G	Land on the east side of Tattersett Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
220	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural (Arable)	G	Land off Lancaster Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a defined settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
224	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural (Arable)	G	Land east of Tattersett Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
225	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural (Arable)	G	Land west of Tattersett Road, south of The Stores,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
226	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural (Arable)	G	Land west of Tattersett Road,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Small area of the site situated in the SSSI	No	0
748	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	none stated	G	Land East of St Mary's Church	Clients of Adrian Parker	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land			
590	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site 590 is a greenfield site. Further development on the site would not be in keeping with the form and character of the area and would impact on the amenity of existing residents through overlooking and loss of garden. Potential impact on biodiversity.	Location considered unsuitable for development. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
478																							0
218	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 218 is a greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity. The site is too large in scale for a rural village and site size would need to be reduced. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Development would encroach on the countryside. Loss of hedgerow. Close to the primary school.	Part of the site is potentially suitable. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Frontage development may be appropriate subject to appropriate screening from the west. Consultation with airfield authorities required.	1
219	+/-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 219 is a greenfield site. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. The site is too large in scale for a rural village. The site has been proposed for extension to existing gardens and is unsuitable as potential land for housing due the awkward shape of the site which would cause issues regarding amenity, access and the effect on the form and character of the settlement.	Location considered unsuitable for development. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0
220																							0
224	+/-	-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 224 is a greenfield site, is too large and development would encroach into the countryside. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity. Mature trees and hedge exist on the front boundary. Access to the site is very poor - one track, poor quality road. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	Potential for frontage development. Screening required to mitigate impact on landscape. Ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA and airfield authorities required. Opinion of NCC Highways officer has been sought. Site outside built environment boundaries and would require comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocation and Policies DPD to determine if appropriate for allocation.	1
225	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 225 is a greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity. The site is too large in scale for a rural village and site size would need to be reduced. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Development would encroach on the countryside. Loss of hedgerow. Close to the primary school.	Part of the site is potentially suitable. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Frontage development may be appropriate subject to appropriate screening from the west. Consultation with airfield authorities required.	1
226																							0
748	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	Site 748 is a greenfield site. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. The site has poor access – one track, poor quality road which is a public right of way. There is a public right of way across the site. Mature trees exist on the front boundary. Any development would encroach into the countryside, but this could be screened.	Screening required to mitigate impact on landscape. Ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA and airfield authorities required. Access is potentially a key constraint to development. Opinion of NCC Highways officer has been sought. The site is outside the built environment boundaries and would require comparative assessment separately in the Site Specific Allocation and Policies DPD to determine if appropriate for allocation.	1

Site Ref	Availability			Achievability		Deliverable/Developable						
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
590		Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	M	L	0.1					Site unsuitable	0
478	Housing		0									0
218	residential	Site proposed by agent several times on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.2	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
219	Extensions to gardens	Site proposed for alternative use therefore considered unavailable for housing.	0	H	L	0.5					Site unsuitable, unavailable	0
220	residential		0									0
224	Housing	Site proposed by agent several times on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.7	0.4		9		Site partially accepted	9
225	Housing	Site proposed by agent several times on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.2	0.4				Figure already counted (see site 218)	0
226	Housing		0									0
748	residential	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.3			7		Site accepted	7

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
753	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	none stated	G	Land West of 26, The Street	Clients of Adrian Parker	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
873	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural	G	Land East of Tattersett Road,	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
874	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural	G	Land West of Tattersett Road, South of the Stores	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
875	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural	G	Land West of Tattersett Road	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Small area of the site situated in the SSSI	No	0
876	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural	G	Land off Lancaster Road	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
1026	Syderstone	Syderstone	RV	Agricultural	G	Land to the East of Creake Road	Diocese of Norwich client of Savills (L&P) Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No identified stage 1 constraints.		1
186	Thornham	Thornham	RV		G	Land at Stable Field,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site completely within AONB.	Yes if not a major application.	1
377	Thornham	Thornham	RV	none stated	G	Land adjoining Appletree Cottage,	V S Hardy & S R Grout	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site completely within AONB.	Yes if not a major application.	1

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																				Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land				
753	+	-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 753 is a greenfield site. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Site 753 is bordered by mature trees and is within an area designated possible waste disposal site. Any development would encroach into the countryside, however, it would mirror existing development to the south and therefore would mirror frontage development on the other side of The Street.	Screening required to mitigate impact on landscape. Ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA and airfield authorities required. The site is outside built environment boundaries and would require comparative assessment separately in the Site Specific Allocation and Policies DPD to determine if appropriate for allocation.	1	
873	+/-	-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 873 is a greenfield site, is too large and development would encroach into the countryside. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity. Mature trees and hedge exist on the front boundary. Access to the site is very poor - one track, poor quality road. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area.	Potential for frontage development. Screening required to mitigate impact on landscape. Ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA and airfield authorities required. Opinion of NCC Highways officer has been sought. Site outside built environment boundaries and would require comparative assessment in the Site Specific Allocation and Policies DPD to determine if appropriate for allocation.	1	
874	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 874 is a greenfield site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity. The site is too large in scale for a rural village and site size would need to be reduced. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Development would encroach on the countryside. Loss of hedgerow. Close to the primary school.	Part of the site is potentially suitable. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Frontage development may be appropriate subject to appropriate screening from the west. Consultation with airfield authorities required.	1	
875																								0
876																								0
1026	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 1026 is a greenfield site. The site is too large in scale for a rural village and would intrude into the landscape and harm the landscape setting. The site is within Sculthorpe airfield safeguarding area. Mature hedgerow, mature trees and some pylons present on the border of site. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity. Part of the site designated possible waste disposal site.	Potential to develop part of the frontage to mirror development on Creake Road, subject to screening. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Consultation with airfield authorities required.	1	
186	+/-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 186 is a predominantly greenfield site. The site is too large in scale for a rural village. The site is within the AONB therefore major development is inappropriate. Part of the site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. Part of the site is used for playing fields. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Potential to extend the existing frontage development on Green Lane to accommodate minor development, however, this may constrain access by agricultural vehicle to field behind. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation.	1	
377	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 377 is a predominantly greenfield site. The site is within the AONB therefore major development is inappropriate. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. No identified access has been provided. Any development would have a visible impact on the landscape/townscape affecting the AONB. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential biodiversity impact.	No identified access. Constraints cannot be overcome.	0	

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable								
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total	
753	residential	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.2				5		Site accepted	5
873	Housing	Site proposed by agent several times on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.6						Figure already counted (see site 224)	0
874	Housing	Site proposed by agent several times on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.2	0.4					Figure already counted (see site 218)	0
875	Housing		0										0
876	Housing		0										0
1026	Housing, 10-15 dwellings / Open Space	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	1.8	0.4			9		Site partially accepted	9
186	Housing	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner as well as a separate submission from the landowner, therefore site considered to be available	1	H	L	8.4	0.4			3		Site partially accepted	3
377	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.9	0.4					Site unsuitable	0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
645	Thornham	Thornham	RV	none stated	G	Oldfield Green	Professor J. M. B. Hughes	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site completely within AONB.	Yes if not a major application.	1
886	Thornham	Thornham	RV	Redundant Farm Buildings	M	Buildings at Manor Farm, Ringstead Road	Thornham Farms Norfolk Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site completely within AONB.	Yes if not a major application. Further consideration required for proposed uses.	1
887	Thornham	Thornham	RV	Agricultural Land	G	Land North of Thornham Primary School	Thornham Farms Norfolk Ltd	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site completely within AONB.	Yes if not a major application. Further consideration required for proposed uses.	1
888	Thornham	Thornham	RV	Agricultural Storage Buildings / Farmhouse	B	land at Lyng Farm, Thornham	Thornham Farms Norfolk Ltd	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a defined settlement to be considered suitable for residential development. Site completely within AONB.	Not for residential. Further consideration required for proposed uses.	0
199	Titchwell	Titchwell	SVAH	Arable	G	Land fronting the A149 east of 'The Cabin',	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Situated in the AONB	No	0
200	Titchwell	Titchwell	SVAH	Arable	G	Land west of the junction of Chalk Pit Road and A149,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Situated in the AONB	No	0
201	Titchwell	Titchwell	SVAH	Countryside	G	Land east of the junction of Chalk Pit Road and A149,	Clients 8 of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Situated in the AONB	No	0

Site Ref	Suitability Stage 2																			Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject	
	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land				Agricultural land
645	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	Site 645 is a greenfield site. The site is within the AONB therefore major development is inappropriate. Any development will have a visible impact on the existing landscape/townscape affecting the AONB. Access is likely to be an issue due to the narrow entrance to the site, and the narrow road it leads onto (The Green). There is no established footpath to nearby services, and services are fairly distant from the site. Potential biodiversity impact. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Access may be a key constraint to development, opinion from Norfolk County Council highways officer has been sought. The site would require landscape screening. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation.	1
886	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 886 is a predominantly greenfield site. The site is within the AONB therefore major development is inappropriate. The site is large in scale and the shape of the submitted site would reduce the area of the field size. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Development would result in a loss of large agricultural storage buildings, which may require relocation if still in use. Possible contamination and potential asbestos removal. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. Development in this location would begin to extend the settlement to the south.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Potential to develop the previously developed part of the site for housing, if agricultural buildings are no longer required. However, site has been proposed for retail/employment use therefore site will be further considered for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation. Landscape screening required to mitigate impact on AONB and countryside.	1
887	+/-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	Site 887 is a predominantly greenfield site. The site is too large in scale for a rural village. The site is within the AONB therefore major development is inappropriate. Part of the site is adjacent to the Conservation Area. Part of the site is used for playing fields. Loss of grade 3 agricultural land. Potential impact on biodiversity.	The Core Strategy identifies sustaining existing services in rural villages as a priority, this includes some minor development (small-scale infilling or affordable housing) in settlements within the AONB. Potential to extend the existing frontage development on Green Lane to accommodate minor development, however, this may constrain access by agricultural vehicle to field behind. The site is outside the built environment boundary therefore requires comparative assessment to determine whether appropriate for allocation in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. An ecology report may be required. Consultation with DEFRA required prior to allocation.	1
888																							0
199																							0
200																							0
201																							0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
645	Housing	Site proposed by landowner therefore considered to be available	1	H	L	0.6				9	Site accepted	9
886	Employment / Retail	Site proposed by landowner for employment/retail uses therefore considered unavailable for housing.	0	H	M	0.2					Site unavailable	0
887	Housing/Retail/Community Health Facility	Site proposed by agent on behalf of landowner as well as a separate submission from the landowner, therefore site considered to be available	1	H	L	8.4	0.4				Figure already counted (see site 186)	0
888	Visitor Centre - lecture facilities, office administration, café/restaurant, accommodation		0									0
199	Residential		0									0
200	Residential		0									0
201	Residential		0									0

Site Ref	Basic Site Information							Suitability Stage 1																
	Parish	Town/Village	CS02 Designation	Current or last known land use	Brownfield/ Greenfield	Site Description	Site submitted by:	25m of settlement boundary	SFRA Fluvial Zone 2	SFRA Fluvial Zone 3	SFRA Tidal Zone 2	SFRA Tidal Zone 3	SFRA Hazard Zone	NNTR	Ramsar	SPAC	SPRA	SSSI	Stone Curlew	Ancient monument	Historic Parks and gardens	summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
877	Titchwell	Titchwell	SVAH	Arable	G	Land fronting A149(Main Road), Titchwell- East of the Cabin	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Situated in the AONB	No	0
878	Titchwell	Titchwell	SVAH	Arable	G	Land West of the junction of Chalk Pit Road & A149 Titchwell	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Situated in the AONB	No	0
879	Titchwell	Titchwell	SVAH	Arable	G	Land East of the junction of Chalk Pit Road & A149	Client of Cruso & Wilkin	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development. Situated in the AONB	No	0
356	West Rudham	West Rudham	SVAH	none stated		Land at Houghton Road	Clients of Logan Architecture	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0
708	West Rudham	West Rudham	SVAH	none stated		Land at Lynn Road, West Rudham	Mr Clifford John Fuller	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Site considered too far from a higher order settlement to be considered suitable for development.	No	0

Suitability Stage 2																							
Site Ref	Scale of development	Brownfield/Greenfield	Safeguarded areas	Height/Shape	Historic environment	Impact on highways	Major utilities	Environmental designations	TPO	Biodiversity	Landscape/townscape	HSE Hazard	Proximity to pollution	Amenity	community facility/open	cycling access to services	Access to open space	Public Right of Way/Bridleway	employment land	Agricultural land	Summary of constraints	Can constraints be overcome?	Accept/reject
877																							0
878																							0
879																							0
356																							0
708																							0

Site Ref	Availability		Achievability		Deliverable/Developable							
	Proposed use (owner/agent)	Availability	Accept/reject	Market assessment	cost assessment	Gross area	Net area	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Result	total
877	Housing, mixed affordable housing		0									0
878	Housing, mixed affordable housing		0									0
879	Housing, mixed affordable housing		0									0
356	none stated		0									0
708	none stated		0									0