	Site	Sufficient Site Size (Hectares)	Site Location	Accessibility	Greenfield (G)/ Brownfield (B)	In existing defined settled /built-up boundary	Loss of Open Space	Wildlife Impacts	Heritage Impacts	Current Use	Impact on setting of village	Impact on landscape features	Flood Risk Issues	Key Issues/ Comments Not Viable Potentially Viable without any constraints
1	Land east of Grimston Road (B1153)	Yes (Min 1.62 ha's)	Poor / fair (Northeast side of village). Poor in relation to pupil catchment living area.	Poor/Fair (network of roads / footpaths leading to the site)	Greenfield	No – but adjacent to existing defined boundary and existing housing	No	Unlikely Only perimeter hedgerows.	Nearby Listed Buildings (new school unlikely to impact on setting)	Agricultural – Arable (Partial loss would not impact operationally)	Potential	No	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – Not on site, but part of road to frontage. 1 in 1000 chance – No.	Nearby busy Lynn Road junction, but with relatively narrow access & lack of continuous footway on B1153 Grimston Road. Site is positioned remotely from the main residential core of the village. Nearby Listed Buildings – possible design implications? Edge of village location with wider landscape views/potential impact and somewhat remote from main centres of population. The site has been submitted for residential/ mixed use development under the 2016/17 Call for Sites exercise. This effectively makes the site unavailable for anything other than its existing use until such time as the process and the Local Plan itself is complete and approved, which will not be within the immediate future. Conclusion – Some planning issues to address. Site however is considered to be unavailable within timescale for new school provision.
2	Land north of Lime Kiln Road/ west of Grimston Road (B1153)	Yes (Min 1.75 ha's)	Poor (North-east side of village). Poor in relation to pupil catchment living area.	Poor/Fair (network of roads / footpaths leading to the site, although some are poor/or not available)	Greenfield	No – but adjacent to existing defined boundary and existing housing	No	Potential botanical interest & mature hedgerows	Yes. NHE suggests site has archaeology interest. Former limekiln / chalk pit	Agricultural – Grazing. Undulating site.	Unlikely, given enclosed nature of site	Possibly, extensive trees / landscape features on boundary	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – Yes, small areas 1 in 100 chance – Yes, slightly larger than 1 in 30 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, wider parts of site.	Poor location, lack of footway provision on parts of Grimston Road/Lime Kiln Road and narrow nature of both Lime Kiln Road and existing footway provision back to the main village. Site positioned remotely from main residential core of the village. Possible landscape, topographic, ecology and archaeology issues. Parts of the site are shown to be susceptible to surface water flooding. The site has been submitted for residential use under the 2016/17 Call for Sites exercise. This effectively makes the site unavailable for anything other than its existing use until such time as the process and the Local Plan itself is complete and approved, which will not be within the immediate future. Conclusion - Poor location/some planning issues to address. Site however is considered to be unavailable within timescale for new school provision.
3	Land part Jubilee Gardens and part Allotments \$&W of Lime Kiln Road	Yes (Min 1.5 ha's)	Fair (North side of village). Poorly related to existing housing. Poor in relation to pupil catchment living area.	Poor (no direct access off Lynn Rd – only off unmade section of Lime Kiln Road)	Greenfield	No, but adjacent to in part.	Allotment site/ Informal open space?	Possibly – an established hedge bisects identified area	Unknown in terms of archaeology.	Allotment / vacant/ Agricultural - grazing	Unlikely, given enclosed nature of site	Unlikely to be any major impacts	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Floodina 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – No 1 in 1000 chance – No	Poor location particularly for vehicular access with likely congestion issues etc, lack of footway provision on parts of Lime Kiln Road. Access appears to be private track (and PROW) which would not be suitable to serve a school. May result in loss of allotments, unclear whether statutory and removal of long section of hedge. Likely to be more than one landowner involved. Poor location in relation to pupil catchment living area. Conclusion — Some planning issues bul poor location/access and multiple land ownership suggests this is not a viable allerantive school site.

	Site	Sufficient Site Size (Hectares)	Site Location	Accessibility	Greenfield (G)/ Brownfield (B)	In existing defined settled /buitt-up boundary	Loss of Open Space	Wildlife Impacts	Heritage Impacts	Current Use	Impact on setting of village	Impact on landscape features	Flood Risk Issues	Key Issues/ Comments Not Viable Potentially Viable without any constraints
4	Land north of Lynn Road/East of Blacksmiths Row	Yes (Min 1.7 ha's)	Good. Relatively close to pupil catchment living area.	Poor (lack of public access)	Greenfield	No – but adjacent to existing defined boundary and existing housing	No	Potential botanical interest & mature hedgerows	Unknown in terms of archaeology, but unlikely to be serious constraint given extant Outline Planning Permission.	Vacant/grazing.	Unlikely, given enclosed nature of site	Unlikely to be any major impacts	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – Yes 1 in 100 chance – Yes 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, major parts of the site	Although good location the site has poor access, unless additional 3rd party land was acquired. Part of site has benefit of outline planning permission for 29 dwellings (PP15/01776/OM). Parts of the site are shown to be susceptible to surface water flooding. Conclusion – some planning issues including poor accessibility. Part of site has benefit of outline planning permission for 29 dwellings (PP15/01776/OM), therefore unavallable for alternative school use. Parts of the site are susceptible to surface water flooding.
5	Land north of Lynn Road	Yes (1.5 ha's)	Good. Close/within pupil catchment living area.	Poor, particularly for pedestrian / vehicular access	Greenfield	No – but adjacent to existing defined boundary and existing housing	Vacant / grazing	Potential botanical interest & mature hedgerows /trees on boundaries	Unknown in terms of archaeology.	Vacant/grazing.	Unlikely, given enclosed nature of site	Yes	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – No 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, small parts of potential access	Although good location the site has poor access for pedestrians/vehicular use, particularly due to its restricted width. 3rd party land acquisition may be required for access?. Should access be available this may still have unacceptable impact on amenities of neighbouring residential properties given surrounding context. Landscape/ecological implications with loss of landscaping, Although site is of sufficient size, poorly located for educational use/facility given its backland location, and therefore lack of community presence. Conclusion – some planning issues including poor accessibility/impact on neighbouring residential amenity.
6	Land west Gayton / north of Lynn Road B1145	Yes (Min 1.6 ha's)	Fair / Good. North-west side of village, Close/within pupil catchment living area.	Good – directly off Lynn Road	Greenfield	No – but adjacent to existing defined boundary and existing housing	No	Historic meadow habitat with likely botanical interest and mature hedgerows	Yes (Medieval Settlement / Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)	Enclosed land (part of SAM)	Yes, prominent gateway site	Perimeter features	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – Yes, small area within centre of site plus road frontage. 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, lager parts of site and road frontage.	Land forms part of Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) with high potential of heritage conflict. Impact on setting of village, with wildlife and landscape impact. Parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Canclusion—some planning issues, including severe impact on SAM. Not a viable site.

	Sire	Sufficient Site Size (Hectares)	Site Location	Accessibility	Greenfield (G)/ Brownfield (B)	In existing defined settled /built-up boundary	Loss of Open Space	Wildlife Impacts	Heritage Impacts	Current Use	Impact on setting of village	Impact on landscape features	Flood Risk Issues	Key Issues/ Comments Not Viable Potentially Viable without any constraints
7	Land west of Winch Road	Yes (Min 2.6 ha's)	Fair / Good (south western side of village. Close to main school catchment living area	Good / Fair	Greenfield	No, but adjacent to existing residential to east	No	Potentially, given trees that divide the site.	Unknown in terms of archaeology.	Agricultural – Arable,) No	Possibly, including line of trees that splits the site.	Flood Zone 2 (fluvial) – no modelling undertaken Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – Small part of site 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, significant areas of site.	Land appears to be within different ownerships. Site falls within flood zone 2, no modelling undertaken to confirm whether falls within zone 1. Small parts of the site are susceptible to surface water flooding. Vehicular access may give rise to neighbouring residential amenity concerns. Potential landscape concerns. Line of trees within centre and drain may have adverse impact on educational layout. Conclusion – some planning issues to be addressed, but overall not considered a realistically viable site.
8	Land corner of Back Street / Winch Road	Yes (Min 1.6 ha's)	Fair / Good (south western side of village. Close to main school catchment living area.	Fair. Provision of access from Winch Road would appear feasible. Pedestrian improvement likely to be required along Back Street.	Greenfield	No, but adjacent residential on north and west sides	No	Unlikely, although note drains on boundaries of the site.	No. Archaeologi cal evaluation indicates the site has low interest.	Agricultural - Arable	Limited	Unlikely, other than on boundaries of site.	Flood Zone 3 (fluvial), although modelling indicates site within Flood Zone 1 Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – Yes within site and parts of Winch Road 1 in 100 chance – Yes, larger area within site and parts of Winch Road. 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, significant areas of site.	Good location, minimal wider landscape impacts given contained nature of site. Site shown as falling with Flood Risk Area 3, but modelling undertaken indicates that site falls within flood zone 1. Site susceptible to surface water flooding. Conclusion – some planning issues to be addressed, including surface water flooding. Modelling undertaken indicates site within flood zone 1, therefore removing this constraint.
9	Land to far north of Back Street and west of St Nicholas Close	Yes (Min 2.6 ha's)	Good, central location. Close to main school catchment living area.	Good / Fair No direct access off Back Street. Access could be made available from allocated site which has benefit of OPP or from St Nicholas Close	Greenfield	No, but adjacent to boundary and existing residential	No	Unlikely	Possibly, from information submitted as part of extant planning permission to south.	Agricultural – Arable & Paddocks	No	Unlikely	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – Yes, small parts of site. 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, significant areas.	Land to south has benefit of extant outline planning permission (15/01888/OM) for 40 dwellings and estate road. Land may have archaeological interest. Previous refusal of permission on site (16/00444/OM) stated that loss of open land would cause harm to character of the area. The site has been submitted for residential/mixed use development under the 2016/17 Call for Sites exercise. This effectively makes the site unavailable for anything other than its existing use until such time as the process and the Local Plan itself is complete and approved, which will not be within the immediate future. Permitted road width from site to south would not be capable of serving a school without improvements, which may have implications for extant permission. Canciusion – Given previous planning history and current submission for call for sites, site is not considered to be available within timescale for new school provision.

	Site	Sufficient Site Size (Hectares)	Site Location	Accessibility	Greenfield (G)/ Brownfield (B)	In existing defined settled /buitt-up boundary	Loss of Open Space	Wildlife Impacts	Heritage Impacts	Current Use	Impact on setting of village	Impact on landscape features	Flood Risk Issues	Key Issues/ Comments Not Viable Potentially Viable without any constraints
10	Land to north of St Nicholas Close	Yes (2.67 ha's)	Good, central location	Poor. Vehicular access would not appear to be available without 3rd party land acquisition.	Greenfield	No, but adjacent to boundary and existing residential	No	Unlikely	Unknown in terms of archaeology. Nearby Listed Buildings (new school unlikely to impact on setting)	Agricultural – Arable	No	Unlikely	Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – Yes, western portion of site.	Previous refusal of permission on site (16/006474/OM) stated that loss of open land would cause harm to character of the area. Vehicular access would not appear to be available without 3rd party land acquisition. Conclusion – Some planning issues. However, given previous planning history and reasons for refusal and lack of available access the site is not considered to be available/viable.
11	Playing field and part of land north of St Nicholas Close	Yes (1.5 min ha's)	Good, central location	Good / Fair Access off Lynn Road	Greenfield (Part existing school playing field)	Existing school playing within development boundary. That part outside is adjacent to boundary and existing residential.	Yes (loss of existing school playing field). \$77 issues.	Possibly, given presence of existing trees along southern boundary of the playing field site.	Unknown in terms of archaeology.	School playing field and enclosed arable land.	No	Passibly, substantial trees along the southern boundary of the existing playing field.	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – No 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, major parts of the southern site	Initial investigations indicate that southern boundary of the playing fields had a history of contamination that was considered risk prohibitive. Possible landscape issues, Possible S77 issues with building on existing playing field. Previous refusal of permission on the southern part of the site (16/006474/OM) stated that loss of open land would cause harm to character of the area. Conclusion – Some planning issues. However, given previous planning history and reasons for refusal the sile is not considered to be available.
12	Land at end of cul- de-sac at east end of Springvale and Rowan Drive	Yes (2.6 ha's)	Good—central. Close to main school catchment living area.	Fair/Poor. Cul-de-sac location with restricted width to serve a school, Public footpath bisects part of site. Access from Rowan Drive would appear to be constrained due to ransom.	Greenfield	No, but adjacent and with residential to north, west and part east.	No	Number of existing trees within the site. Site not positively managed at present, therefore could be wider biodiversity interest.	Possibly from initial discussions/ investigations as part of allocation process.	Paddock/ informal habitat	No – but forms access link through central part of village	Yes. A number of the existing trees are subject to a TPO.	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Floodina 1 in 30 chance – No, apart from small part of access track through site 1 in 100 chance – No, apart from small part of access track through site and surrounding highway approaching site 1 in 1000 chance – Yes, small parts of site and track and roads approaching site	Possible heritage implications in the form of archaeology. Public right of way bisects the site, time delays with formal stopping up procedure and relocation would probably be required. Overhead cables would need to be re-routed. Cul-de-sac not favoured by NCC planners for school locations and initial highway view is that site would not be suitable due to access off residential cul-de-sac which does not appear suitable by virtue of its width to serve an alternative school site. Layout issues re position of adjacent housing and amenity implications. Access would not appear possible from Rowan Close. Part of the site has been submitted for residential development under the 2016/17 Call for Sites exercise. This effectively makes the site unavailable for anything other than its existing use until such time as the process and the Local Plan itself is complete and approved, which will not be within the immediate future. Conclusion – Some planning issues that are not likely to be resolved within the timescale/delivery of the new school. Highway/access doncerns. Not therefore a reasonably available site.

	Site	Sufficient Site Size (Hectares)	Site Location	Accessibility	Greenfield (G)/ Brownfield (B)	In existing defined settled /built-up boundary	Loss of Open Space	Wildlife Impacts	Heritage Impacts	Current Use	Impact on setting of village	Impact on landscape features	Flood Risk Issues	Key Issues/ Comments Not Viable Potentially Viable without any constraints
ı	Land east of B1153 East Walton Road and south of B1145	Yes (3.1 ha's)	Poor (On eastern edge of village). Furthest away from school catchment living area.	Poor. No footway provision along B1153 East Walton Road.	Greenfield	No, but adjacent.	No	Possibly, given presence of existing trees along southern boundary of site.	Not known.	Arable/paddock	Yes, highly visible site Gateway site to village.	Unlikely.	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial) Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No 1 in 100 chance – No 1 in 1000 chance – No	Serious landscape impact given open nature of site. Lack of footpath provision along B1153 East Walton Road. Remote from main centre of school catchment population. Site has been submitted for residential development under the 2016/17 Call for Sites exercise. This effectively makes the site unavailable for anything other than its existing use until such time as the process and the Local Plan itself is complete and approved, which will not be within the immediate future. Conclusion – Not a viable or reasonably available site.
	4 Former Works site	Yes	Poor (On eastern edge of village).	Poor. No	Part brownfield/	In part.	No	Possible given	Not known.	Part of site	Yes – former	Unlikely.	Flood Zone 1 (fluvial)	Brownfield site – demolition required and possible
	South of Lynn Road	(1.7 ha's)	Furthest away from school catchment living area.	provision along B1145.	Part Greenfield		1	existing trees within the site and existing vacant/ poor condition of buildings.		redundant industrial units. Part Agricultural - Arable	works site adjacent to listed mill and other buildings on B1153 junction		Surface Water Flooding 1 in 30 chance – No. 1 in 100 chance – No. 1 in 1000 chance – No.	contamination issues. Adjacent listed building, issues with setting/impact. Poor location due to lack of footpath provision. Recent refusal of permission on part of site on grounds of conflict with national and local countryside protection policies. Part of site has been submitted for residential development under the 2016/17 Call for Sites exercise. This effectively makes the site unavailable for anything other than its existing use until such time as the process and the Local Plan itself is complete and approved, which will not be within the immediate future.
	*	-	1 2		e a		* **	*	n 3		- ·	a .	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Conclusion – Given previous planning history and current submission for call for sites, site is not considered to be viable or available within timescale for new school provision.

