



# Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

## Site Assessments

### Carleton Rode

## Contents

SN0574REV.....	3
SN2086 .....	11
SN4009 .....	19
SN4067 .....	27
SN4068 .....	35
SN4068SLREV .....	43
SN4080 .....	52
SN5004 .....	60
SN5023SL .....	70

## SN0574REV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN0547REV
Site address	Land north of The Turnpike, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Previous withdrawn and refused applications for new dwelling(s) (most recent 2014/2418)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1 hectare
Promoted Site Use, including (a) Allocated site (b) SL extension	Promoted for 10-15 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 15dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	Access off B1113 unlikely to be acceptable  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School 2km, no footways with particular safety issues along B1113  Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 920 metres. Access would involve walking along B1113 which has no footways and fast moving traffic.	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Carleton Rode village hall and playing field 2.4km away	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water and electricity are all available but the presence of sewerage remains unclear	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Information for site unavailable	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on site and on highway  <b>LLFA</b> – Green. There is a small area of ponding in the centre of the site for the 1:1000 year rainfall event as shown on the Environment Agency's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) maps. No watercourse apparent. Located in Source Protection Zone 3	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B1 Tas Tributary Farmland	
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained in the landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Amber	Remote from main area of settlement. Development would also be backland from existing development along Rode Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed buildings at Poplar Farm to north of site  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained local road network other than B1113 with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would have a poor relationship with existing development. It is remote from the main areas of existing settlement within Carleton Rode and would be to the rear of the existing pattern of settlement along Rode Lane. Also potential impact on listed buildings to north	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is possible from Rode Lane, but further guidance from the Highway Authority would be needed	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential along Rode Lane, agricultural use to west, no compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and tress on boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into site due to boundary treatment	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is remote from main settlement with poor relationship to existing development. Access off B1108 further divorces site from nearby development.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting documents from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible highways improvement works	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has not stated that affordable housing will be provided although contribution would be required due to size of site. Would need to be clarified if the site progresses.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Potential public allotments on strip of land to north of site and possible new bus layby on B1108 with footpath link through site	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is a significant distance from the main settlement and its services. Potential heritage, flooding and highway safety issues have been identified.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Remote site with poor relationship to existing development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and well removed from existing development boundaries.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE**. The site is separated from the main settlement and its services and is considered to be in an unsustainable location. The site is relatively well contained in the wider landscape however highway concerns have been identified, as has the impact of development on designated heritage assets.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 26 Aug 2020

## SN2086

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN2086
Site address	Land south of Flaxlands Road, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Application for 11 dwellings (2012/0863) refused and dismissed on appeal
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.94 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (c) Allocated site (d) SL extension	Allocation – the site has been promoted for up to 10 dwellings, although the site is large enough to accommodate an allocation of 12 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	24 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Green	<p>Site frontage onto highway where access should be achievable</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS -</b> Highway constrained, unlikely to be able to achieve acceptable visibility from site access. Insufficient highway available to construct formal footway. Subject to highway conditions in any planning application.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><i>Part 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Carleton Rode Primary School in close proximity to site</p> <p>Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 1.2km, no footway</p> <p>Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell 1.5km, no footway</p> <p>Local employment?</p>	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Carleton Rode village hall and recreation area 1.5km	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Capacity constraints at Carleton Rode Water Recycling Centre  AW advise sewers crossing the site	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk in south-west corner of site  <b>LLFA</b> - Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Erosion of edge of settlement nature of church setting. No loss of high quality agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Estate development out of character with linear nature of settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	No protected sites in close proximity	Green
Historic Environment	Green	Grade I listed church to north-east and Grade II listed Church Farm to north  <b>Senior Heritage and Design Officer - Red</b>  <b>HES</b> – Green – Trial trenching took place on this site in 2012 and no further archaeological works are required	Red
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained local road network with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Amber. Insufficient highway available to construct formal footway. Subject to highway conditions in any planning application.	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential, with school to east	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would result in loss of rural aspect of listed Church and listed Church Farm. There would be particular harm in views from Rode Lane to the south-west where trees screen other more modern development with only the Church Farmhouse and Church are visible. This site stands directly in front of the listed buildings in this view.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	An access is likely to be achievable, although there would be loss of part or all of the hedgerow on the site frontage. However the local road network is constrained and the views of the highway authority would be needed	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to north and east, along with school to east. Agricultural to south and west. No compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow on highway boundary. Some hedging and trees on western boundary.	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Some habitat in hedgerow and trees	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power lines on highway boundary	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from road and also from public footpath along eastern boundary	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site considered unlikely to be suitable due to impact on heritage assets, however Senior Heritage and Design Officer should be consulted for his views if the site is considered suitable to progress further	Amber

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Potential minor improvements may be required; previous application proposed passing bay provision	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is of sufficient size for allocation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is close to Grade I listed church as well as Grade II listed Church Farm and would have detrimental impact on setting of these assets, particularly in views from south.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE**. The site is well contained and relates well to existing development however it is situated within key views of designated heritage assets, including the Grade I listed Church to the north, and development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of these buildings. Surface water flooding within part of the site and highways concerns have also been identified.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 26 Aug 2020

SN4009

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4009
Site address	Land to west of Rode Lane, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.7 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (e) Allocated site (f) SL extension	Residential development – numbers not specified, site potentially large enough to allocate
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 18 dwellings at 25dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Access potentially constrained by nature of road and hedgerow on boundary  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School 1.5km, no footway  Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 2km, largely without footways  Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell just under 2km, with no footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Carleton Rode village hall and recreation area adjacent to site to north-west	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk on eastern half of site  <b>LLFA</b> – Amber. Significant information would be required due to the constraints on the site	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland CHECK	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site relatively constrained in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Amber	<p>Linear development could be accommodated within the existing form and character of the site. However estate development would not reflect the historic character of the village</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage and Design Officer</b> – Amber – The setting of the listed building opposite is localised within the village – it does not retain rural setting to east or west and part of village. Experience of the asset does not rely on fields to south remaining undeveloped.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	<p>No protected sites in close proximity</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Grade II listed building on opposite side of road</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage and Design Officer</b> – Amber - Buildings should be set back from the frontage to maintain building line (also better in relation to listed building opposite.)</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of public open space	Amber
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local highway network is constrained with no footways</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	Agricultural and residential, with recreation area and village hall to north-west	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of a linear nature could be accommodated without having a significant adverse impact on the townscape or on heritage assets on the opposite side of Rode Lane, although there would be harm from the loss of hedgerow. It may also be possible to accommodate some dwellings to the rear of the frontage dwellings served by private driveways without little visual harm although this would result in precedent for further such development.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Safe access should be achievable, but with loss of part or all of the hedgerow on the highway boundary	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield site, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Only potential issues is with recreation space and village hall to north-west, however there is some distance to the hall and is unlikely to make development of the site unacceptable	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedgerow on highway boundary. Boundaries to north and south are well vegetated. Some trees on boundary with recreation area and hedging on western boundary	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line on western boundary but should not affect development. No evidence of contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views limited into site by hedgerow. Some longer views possible from Mill Road to the west	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	If development of site is linear only then it would not be large enough to allocate but could still be a settlement limit extension. If necessary then some development to the rear could be considered to potentially allocate the site, however development would be tight. Will need further views from the Highway Authority, Senior Heritage and Design Officer (re setting of listed building) and Landscape Architect (re loss of hedge). Also will need to get view of Water Management Officer or LLFA about surface water flood risk and whether this can be mitigated	Amber

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None immediately identified but Highway Authority views would be needed	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is suitable in size and position for a settlement limit extension and may be suitable for an allocation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is in gap in development on western side of Rode Lane with a hedge along the site frontage. If the loss of the hedge was acceptable then frontage development would be acceptable. Some development to the rear would be needed in order for the site to be allocated.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

Development of the site is constrained by the presence of heritage assets and natural landscape features, as well as the identified surface water flooding.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 26/08/20

SN4067

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4067
Site address	Land west of Greenways Lane, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	1.173 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (g) Allocated site (h) SL extension	Allocation – up to 20 dwellings
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	17dph
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Access to site could be constrained by nature of road and hedgerow on boundary  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School 1.2km, no footway  Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 1.5km, largely without footways  Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell 1.3km, no footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Carleton Rode village hall and recreation area 560 metres, no footway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter states that mains water, and electricity are available but unsure about sewerage	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Green	No identified flood risk  <b>LLFA</b> - Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Relatively contained but would not respect linear character of settlement which is an identified feature of this landscape character area. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Would not be in keeping with the linear character of the settlement	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity  <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed cottage to south of site  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Amber	No loss of public open space	Amber
Transport and Roads	Amber	Very constrained local road network with no footways  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would not reflect traditional linear character of settlement. Whilst there are some small cul-de-sacs to the east, development of this to provide 12 dwellings would involve a more substantial divergence from the historic character of the village. It would also have a substantial impact on the rural character of the lane. Views of the Senior Heritage and Design Officer would be needed on impact on setting of listed buildings.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is likely to be a significant constraint given the highly constrained nature of Greenways Lane – the views of the Highway Authority would be needed if the site were to be pursued. Whilst there is a field access to the site, upgrading this to provide a suitable access for 12 dwellings and associated visibility requirements is likely to result in the loss of much of the vegetation on the eastern boundary.	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential to south and agricultural to north, no compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging / trees on highway boundary and northern boundary. More domestic treatment on southern boundary.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential for habitat in hedgerows and trees	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Public views into site restricted to field access, however dwellings to south all overlook site	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development to rear of existing site would not respect linear character of development and would have adverse impact on character of Greenways Lane. Likely that highway authority would not support development of very constrained lane as well	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in single private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Highway improvements likely to be required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is suitable in size for allocation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Site is to the rear of existing development with an existing field access off a narrow country lane. Relatively contained in the landscape with existing vegetation but concerns over impact on character and suitability of access.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE**. Development on this site would not reflect the linear development of the settlement and would represent a divergence from the historical character of the village. Highways concerns have also been identified.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 26 Aug 2020

SN4068

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4068
Site address	Land south of Flaxlands Road, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	No planning history
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.8 hectares
Promoted Site Use, including (i) Allocated site (j) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	15dph – promoted for 12 dwellings
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Access should be achievable from highway  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School 390 metres, no footway  Distance to bus stop with peak time bus service to Norwich service 1.6km, no footway  Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell 1.8km, no footway	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Part 2:</b> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Carleton Rode village hall and recreation area 1km, no footway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Site within an area already served by fibre technology	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Identified surface water flood risk on highway past site which would require further consideration  <b>LLFA</b> - Green	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site would effectively merge two separate settlements within Carleton Rode. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Amber
Townscape	Green	<p>Would continue existing linear development pattern</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage and Design Officer</b> – Amber. The site is too large - townscape terms should keep gap between different parts to retain rural character. Also part of parcel further south would affect setting of church.</p>	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No protected sites in close proximity</p> <p><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Grade II listed building to south</p> <p><b>Senior Heritage and Design Officer</b> – Amber. Part of the parcel further to the south would affect the setting of the church.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Constrained local highway network with no footways</p> <p><b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b></p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Whilst the development would continue the existing linear pattern of development, it would effectively merge the two separate areas of settlement within Carleton Rode. This would be most apparent to users of Flaxlands Road who would no longer experience a break in development with the current sense of openness but would also be apparent in longer views from Rode Lane to the south-west where the existing linear development and the current break in development can clearly be seen. This would have the affect of adversely impacting on the setting of the church which currently reads as an isolated development in the current views. Development would also adversely affect setting of listed building to south of the site.	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	A safe access should be achievable although the views of the Highway Authority would be needed in terms of the standard of the wider highway network	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Allocated site to west with permission for residential development, agricultural on other boundaries. Existing residential relatively close to the east. No compatibility issues.	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries are open.	Not applicable

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No trees or hedgerows and little potential for habitat	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination on or adjacent to the site	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from road, also in longer views from Rode Lane and public footpaths to the south	Not applicable
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development would continue existing linear pattern of development. However, potential for adverse landscape and heritage impact given loss of gap between settlements and on heritage assets. Therefore initial conclusion is not acceptable unless Landscape Architect and Senior Heritage and Design Officer advise that the impact is acceptable.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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



## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	5 – 10 years	Amber

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery. However, promoter has noted delay in delivery to go through the Local Plan process and obtain planning permission. Clarification should be sought as to whether there are any other reasons for this delay if site is to be progressed	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	None identified	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has stated that affordable housing will be provided but has not provided any evidence of viability	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site of a suitable size for allocation.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Development of this would continue the existing linear pattern of development, but would result in the loss of the gap between the two main areas of settlement in Carleton Rode as well as having an adverse impact on heritage assets.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Site is outside development boundary but adjacent to existing allocation.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available, but not immediately which would need to be clarified.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be **UNREASONABLE**. The site appears reasonably well located but has poor connectivity to the main settlement. Development of the site would also result in the coalescence of two distinct areas of the settlement to the detriment to the overall character of Carleton Rode. Potential adverse heritage impacts have also been identified due to its impact on the setting of nearby designated heritage assets.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 26 Aug 2020

## SN4068SLREV

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4068SLREV
Site address	Land south Flaxlands Road, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Partly outside development boundary. Adjacent to previous allocation CAR2; 2017/2096/O for 6 dwellings on west of site approved 01/05/2017. 2019/2210/D approved 09/01/2020, construction underway.
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.4
Promoted Site Use, including (k) Allocated site (l) SL extension	Settlement Limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 5-6 dwellings (10 dwellings at 25dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Green	Road frontage onto Flaxlands Road, Access should be achievable from highway as for adjacent site.  Previous NCC Highways comments for SN4068 - Green	Green
Accessibility to local services and facilities  Part 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School 490 metres, with no footway  Distance to bus stop with peak time bus service to Norwich service 1,700m, no footway  Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell 1,900m, no footway	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Distance to Carleton Rode village hall and recreation area 900m, no footway	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Available to adjacent site.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues but unlikely given that it is undeveloped agricultural land.	Green
Flood Risk	Green	Flood Zone 1  A drainage ditch crosses the frontage of the site, some surface water flooding to north on Flaxlands Road 1:100.  <i>Previous LLFA comments for SN4068 - Green</i>	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	E1 - Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	A gap would still be retained between the two separate settlements within Carleton Rode but this would significantly lessen the gap to the detriment of the landscape. Visually it would not be a sufficient gap to maintain a clear separation between the separate areas of the settlement and the impact could not be adequately mitigated.	Red
Townscape	Red	Would continue existing linear development pattern which is characteristic of the settlement. But in townscape terms it would encroach upon the existing gap this should be avoided so that a gap between the different parts is maintained to retain the rural character. The impact could not be adequately mitigated.  <b>Previous Senior Heritage and Design Officer comments for SN4068</b> – Amber. The site is too large - townscape terms should keep gap between different parts to retain rural character. Also part of parcel further south would affect setting of church	Red
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity.  Water voles are known to be present in the ditch along the frontage and mitigation would be necessary as for 2017/2096.  <b>Previous NCC Ecology comments for SN4068</b> - Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Historic Environment	Green	<p>Grade II listed building to south, Carleton Manor. Grade II Church Farm, and Grade I church further on.</p> <p>No direct impact on these heritage assets or their settings as they are not adjacent. The site is not visible from the church. However, the separation is significantly reduced with Carleton Manor and because of the open landscape development of this site would impact on its setting.</p> <p>Previous Senior Heritage and Design Officer comments for SN4068 - Senior Heritage and Design Officer – Amber. Part of the parcel further to the south would affect the setting of the church.</p> <p>Previous HES comments for SN4068 - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Constrained local highway network with no footways.</p> <p>Previous NCC Highways comments for SN4068 - NCC highways concerns about the highway network</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>New residential to west. Fields on all other boundaries. Compatible uses.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2011)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Whilst the development would continue the existing linear pattern of development and it has been reduced in size. However a gradual erosion of this gap between the two separate areas of settlement within Carleton Rode is to the detriment of the landscape and townscape as well as the setting of the listed building.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	A safe access should be achievable although the views of the Highway Authority would be needed in terms of the standard of the wider highway network.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Allocated site to west with permission for residential development and is currently being built, agricultural on other boundaries. Existing residential relatively close to the east. No compatibility issues.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is relatively level.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Boundaries are open although there will be development to the west.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	No trees or hedgerows and little potential for habitat. Ditch to the front – water vole habitat.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination on or adjacent to the site.	N/A



Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2011)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views across site from road, also in longer views from Rode Lane and public footpaths to the south.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Development would continue existing linear pattern of development. However, still require adequate gap between the two separate areas of settlement within Carleton Rode and consideration of the impact on the setting of the listed building.	Amber

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	None

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Unknown	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	No	Red
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is of a suitable scale for a settlement limit extension site and is adjacent to previous allocation site CAR2 which has been incorporated into the settlement limit. The site has been reduced in size to seek to address some of the earlier concerns about SN4068. Access to the site is considered to be achievable and there are no identified ecological constraints however the impact of development on local heritage assets has been identified.

### Site Visit Observations

The site is located within a clear gap between two distinct parts of Carleton Rode and would encroach on this, reducing the separation and impacting upon the local landscape. Consideration would need to be given to the impact of development on the identified heritage assets.

### Local Plan Designations

None

### Availability

The site is considered to be available

### Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable but would be subject to highway mitigation measures

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site is considered to be an **UNREASONABLE** option for development due to the adverse landscape impact that would arise from the erosion of the gap which separates the distinct parts of the settlement. A reduction in the scale of the site as well as a reduction in the proposed numbers on the site has failed to overcome the earlier concerns about the landscape and visual impact further development in this location would result in.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 28 April 2022

## SN4080

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN4080
Site address	Land north of The Turnpike, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary – unallocated
Planning History	Previous withdrawn and refused applications for new dwelling(s) (most recent 2014/2418)
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.66ha
Promoted Site Use, including (m) Allocated site (n) SL extension	Allocation
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Up to 25dph (up to 17 dwellings)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Access off B1113 unlikely to be acceptable, constrained access from Rode Lane  <b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Red	Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School 2km, no footways with particular safety issues along B1113  Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 920 metres. Access would involve walking along B1113 which has no footways and fast moving traffic.	

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>		Distance to Carleton Rode village hall and playing field 2.4km away	Amber
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Wastewater capacity to be confirmed	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk		Information for site unavailable	Amber
Identified ORSTED Cable Route		Not within identified cable route or substation location	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Green	No known contamination or ground stability issues	Green
Flood Risk	Amber	Some identified surface water flood risk on site and on highway  <b>LLFA</b> - Green	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	Not applicable	Plateau Farmland	Not applicable
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )		B1 Tas Tributary Farmland	

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is relatively contained in the landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land	Green
Townscape	Amber	Remote from main area of settlement. Development would also be backland from existing development along Rodel Lane	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity <b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green. SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Grade II listed buildings at Poplar Farm to north of site <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No loss of public open space	Green
Transport and Roads	Amber	Constrained local road network other than B1113 with no footways <b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	Agricultural and residential	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development would have a poor relationship with existing development. It is remote from the main areas of existing settlement within Carleton Rode and would be to the rear of the existing pattern of settlement along Rode Lane. Also potential impact on listed buildings to north	Not applicable
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Access is possible from Rode Lane, but further guidance from the Highway Authority would be needed	Not applicable
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Greenfield land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues	Not applicable
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential along Rode Lane, agricultural use to west, no compatibility issues	Not applicable
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Site is largely level	Not applicable
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedging and tress on boundaries	Not applicable
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows	Not applicable
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No existing infrastructure or contamination	Not applicable
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Limited views into site due to boundary treatment	Not applicable



Site Visit Observations	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	Site is remote from main settlement with poor relationship to existing development	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

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

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Site is in private ownership	Not applicable
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Unknown	Not applicable
When might the site be available for development?	Within 5 years	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Supporting documents from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery	Green
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Possible highways improvements required	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has not stated that affordable housing will be provided although contribution would be required due to size of site. Would need to be clarified	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	None identified	

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

Site is not suitable for settlement limit extension given distance from existing development boundaries.

### **Site Visit Observations**

Remote site with poor relationship to existing development.

### **Local Plan Designations**

Outside and well removed from existing development boundaries.

### **Availability**

Promoter states the site is available.

### **Achievability**

Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is **UNREASONABLE**. The site is separated from the main settlement and is considered to have detrimental impact on the form and character of the settlement and character of the overall landscape. Loss of the boundary hedgerow to obtain access to the site has also been identified as a potential landscape issue.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 26 Aug 2020

SN5004

Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5004
Site address	Land south of Mile Road, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside closest development boundary of Bunwell
Planning History	None
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	Site area is 1ha, promoter considers 0.6ha is developable allowing for footpath
Promoted Site Use, including (o) Allocated site (p) SL extension	Allocated site
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 12-15 dwellings, allowing for reduced site area due to public footpath  (25 dwellings at 25dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

### Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

#### **HELAA Score:**

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

#### **Site Score:**

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

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

#### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Access to the site	Amber	<p>Site is currently accessed from field to rear but has road frontage. However, a new access would need to cross a green verge and a ditch and would necessitate the removal of some of the hedge.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to carriageway widening, footway and connection with footway at north side of the road, improvement to footway at north side of road may be required.</p>	Amber
<p>Accessibility to local services and facilities</p> <p><b>Part 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School; 2,400m</p> <p>Distance to Bunwell Primary School; 2,700m</p> <p>Bus stop: 200m with peak time service to Norwich</p> <p>Distance to Bunwell shop/post office; 830m with footpath</p> <p>Limited local employment to east of site</p>	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Distance to Carleton Rode village hall; 1,600m to south of site	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Utilities capacity to be confirmed  Environment Agency: Green (foul water capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Amber	Promoter indicates that services are available.	Amber
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	Unknown but unlikely as it is undeveloped farmland.	Green

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1</p> <p>Whole site is at risk of surface water flooding, from low to high risk with the majority of the site being at medium risk.</p> <p>There is a deep ditch along the front and western boundaries.</p> <p><b>LLFA:</b> Red. Flooding would be severe enough to prevent development. The on-site flood risk is minor to moderate/major ponding in the 3.33% and 1.0% AEP events. The site is affected by a major flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site southeast-north with flow lines indicating the same direction.</p> <p>Only a small area of the site is unaffected by flood risk (southwest corner).</p> <p>Access to the site appears to be heavily affected by the on-site flood risk.</p> <p>The site is within very close proximity to a large number of internal flood records associated with Bunwell Street. This must be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>We would advise that inclusion of this site in the plan is reassessed and potentially removed.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Fluvial Flood Risk)</p>	Red

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>  Rural River Valley Tributary Farmland Tributary Farmland with Parkland Settled Plateau Farmland Valley Urban Fringe Fringe Farmland	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A
SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>	N/A	E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	Site is immediately adjacent to the development boundary and on a field, which is delineated to the west by a public footpath. However, it is separated from the existing development by a strong field line with mature trees to the east which it would breach. In doing this it visibly encroaches into the open countryside as the fields to the east and south are flat and open. There are long views.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	The site is adjacent to existing development where modern bungalows have been built along the frontage with a C17 cottage to the rear. The footpath to the west limits frontage development which would be the most appropriate form of development in this location as it marks the transition from village to countryside. Developing to the rear would not reflect the most recent form of development and would create a hard built-up approach to the village.	Amber



Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Amber	<p>No designations. Water present in the ditch and nearby pond – would need investigation for species; water voles. Also hedge and tree habitat; bats &amp; birds.</p> <p><b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Amber. Ponds within 250m radius of site - Amber risk zone for great crested newts. SSSI IRZ but Natural England only require consultation for over 100 houses at this site. Not in GI corridor.</p> <p>Adjacent to Carleton Rode FP1</p>	Amber
Historic Environment	Amber	<p>Listed building to east; Meadowley – Grade II C17 cottage.</p> <p><b>HES</b> - Amber</p>	Amber
Open Space	Green	<p>No. Public footpath within site.</p>	Amber
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Mile Road has a footpath to the east of the site but not to the west.</p> <p>Carleton Rode FP1 near west boundary within the site.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Subject to carriageway widening, footway and connection with f/w at north side of the road, improvement to f/w at north side of road may be required.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Green	<p>Dwellings to east. Open countryside to south and west. Some dwellings/field opposite. Compatible uses.</p> <p>Public footpath within site to west, which would need to be accommodated.</p>	Green

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit: 09/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	There would be some impact as this is part of the open countryside on the south side of Mile Road. There are six bungalows to the north but on this side of the road the site is located beyond the row of bungalows and a tree boundary to the east. There is also a substantial hedge on frontage which would need to be partially removed to create an access point.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	There is no existing access from the road and there is a wet ditch and a significant hedge line. There would be a loss of hedgerow which would impact on this approach to the village.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Small, grassed field and public footpath running north-south on west side.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Bungalow to east, road to north and fields on all other sides.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Level and flat, apart from the ditches on two sides.	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Substantial hedge and water filled ditch to north along road, hedge and trees to east.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Hedges on boundaries with trees to east. Ditch along frontage and pond to west indicating possible water-based species habitat.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	No evidence of contamination. Phone lines along frontage.  Public footpath sign and footpath through site.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments Site Visit: 09/02/22	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	The landscape is very open and flat. Views into and out of the site are wide, particularly from the west and only limited by a small degree by the hedge when directly in front. It would be visible for some distance.	N/A
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	The site is at the far end of the village, away from the school and services. It would create a hard edge to the existing soft transition from the village into the countryside. It could impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building. If developed it would need to be single storey to reflect adjacent development which would lower the possible density. Development would be further limited by the footpath which must be retained and there is a concern with surface water flooding and the retention of the ditches as well as the loss of hedgerow.	Red

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)  Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No	Red
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	New access required.	Amber
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Indicated it would be provided.	Amber
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	Footpath	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### **Suitability**

The site is of a suitable size for allocation is located adjacent to the existing settlement limit of Bunwell however a number of constraints have been identified, including a significant flood risk identified by the Lead Local Flood Authority. The site has a road frontage but is not currently accessed via Mile Road and the creation of a suitable vehicular access would require crossing a water filled ditch and breaching an established hedgerow along the boundary. Landscape and visual impact concerns have also been identified. A PROW forms the western boundary of the site.

### **Site Visit Observations**

The site forms a prominent entrance to the village of Bunwell and could be a continuation of the existing built form. However, in-depth development of the site would be not be in character with the prevalent form of development closest to the site and would have an adverse impact on the current approach into the settlement, creating an increasingly urbanised transition between the rural surround and the village. A water filled ditch runs along the northern boundary and may constrain access into the site. Creation of an access would result in the loss of an established hedgerow along the site frontage.

### **Local Plan Designations**

None

### **Availability**

The site is considered to be available

### **Achievability**

Significant flood risk identified by the Lead Local Flood Authority suggest that development of this site is not achievable. No supporting evidence has been submitted by the promoter of the site to mitigate the on site flood risk. A suitable access into the site would be required and it would be necessary to cross a deep water filled ditch.

### **OVERALL CONCLUSION:**

The site is considered to be an UNREASONABLE option for development. The Lead Local Flood Authority have confirmed a significant flood risk exists across the site and inclusion of the site within the VCHAP is therefore not supported by the LLFA. Development of the site would also have a significant landscape impact, altering the gateway entrance to the village of Bunwell to an adverse degree. A suite of highway mitigation measures have been identified and in addition to these an access to the site would be required, resulting in the loss of the established boundary hedgerow further impacting on the transition from rural to village.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 28 April 2022

## SN5023SL

### Part 1 - Site Details

Detail	Comments
Site Reference	SN5023SL
Site address	Land west of Rode Lane and south of Mill Road, Carleton Rode
Current planning status (including previous planning policy status)	Outside development boundary
Planning History	1999/1257 and 2008/1879 for erection and use of stables. 1980/1105/O for residential development, refused 26/06/1980.
Site size, hectares (as promoted)	0.3 ha
Promoted Site Use, including (q) Allocated site (r) SL extension	Settlement Limit extension
Promoted Site Density (if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha)	Promoted for 9dwellings  (8 dwellings at 25 dph)
Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield

### Part 2 - Absolute Constraints

**ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS** (if 'yes' to any of the below, the site will be excluded from further assessment)

Is the site located in, or does the site include:	Response
SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ramsar	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Flood Risk Zone 3b	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No
Locally Designated Green Space	No

## Part 3 - Suitability Assessment

### **HELAA Score:**

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

### **Site Score:**

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

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

### **SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Access to the site	Amber	Two existing accesses from Rode Lane and Mill Road, would both need to be widened and some boundary vegetation (hedgerow and trees) would need to be removed.  <b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access requires hedge & tree removal, carriageway widening & footway. Investigate pedestrian link to local bus stop. Network poor, narrow roads, no footway to school.	Amber
Accessibility to local services and facilities  <i>Part 1:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primary School</li> <li>○ Secondary school</li> <li>○ Local healthcare services</li> <li>○ Retail services</li> <li>○ Local employment opportunities</li> <li>○ Peak-time public transport</li> </ul>	Amber	Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School 1,400m, no footway  Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 1,900m, largely without footways  Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell around 1,900m, with no footway	N/A

Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<i>Part 2:</i> Part 1 facilities, plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ café</li> <li>○ Preschool facilities</li> <li>○ Formal sports/ recreation facilities</li> </ul>	N/A	Carleton Rode village hall and recreation area adjacent to west	Green
Utilities Capacity	Amber	Promoter states that there are no known constraints but this would need to be confirmed  <b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Foul water capacity)	Amber
Utilities Infrastructure	Green	Promoter states that mains water, sewerage and electricity are all available.	Green
Better Broadband for Norfolk	N/A	Available to some or all properties and no further upgrade planned via BBfN.	Green
Identified ORSTED Cable Route	N/A	Not within identified cable route or substation location.	Green
Contamination & ground stability	Amber	No known contamination or ground stability issues, but may need investigation as buildings/stables on site.	Amber



Constraint	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Flood Risk	Amber	<p>Flood Zone 1 Identified surface water flood risk through the centre of the site, along the road and to west at village hall.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b> – Green. At risk of surface water flooding. Would not prevent development. Mitigation required, standard information at planning stage.</p> <p>The site is affected by a flow path in the 0.1% AEP event. The flow path cuts the site north-south in the east of the site. This needs to be considered in the site assessment.</p> <p>A large area of the site is unaffected by flood risk and has the potential to be developed.</p> <p>The site is at the head of a flow path and has potential to reduce flooding downstream.</p> <p>Any water leading from off-site to on-site should be considered as part of any drainage strategy for the site.</p> <p><b>Environment Agency:</b> Green (Fluvial flood risk)</p>	Amber

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Type ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	Plateau Farmland	N/A

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )	N/A	E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland  Agricultural Land Classification; Grade 3 Good to moderate	N/A
Overall Landscape Assessment	Green	The site is relatively contained within the landscape by mature hedges and is on the corner of two roads. However, it is at the edge of the settlement and, despite the village hall further along, the settlement character changes here as it transitions to countryside. Development of the site would extend the built-up area into the countryside. Loss of hedgerow would be detrimental.	Amber
Townscape	Amber	Linear development would be in character with the existing form of the village. However, it would extend the village beyond this corner and consolidated development in this location would not reflect the historic character of the village.	Amber
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Green	No protected sites in close proximity.  <b>NCC Ecologist:</b> Green. SSSI IRZ but housing not identified for NE consultation. If discharge of water more than 20m <sup>3</sup> /day to surface or seep away, NE need to be consulted. Not in GI corridor.	Green
Historic Environment	Amber	Listed dwelling opposite, Corner Farmhouse, it is set back from the frontage.  <b>HES</b> - Amber	Amber
Open Space	Green	No	Green

Impact	HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Transport and Roads	Amber	<p>Local highway network is constrained with no footways.</p> <p><b>NCC Highways</b> – Amber. Access requires hedge &amp; tree removal, carriageway widening &amp; footway. Investigate pedestrian link to local bus stop. Network poor, narrow roads, no footway to school.</p>	Amber
Neighbouring Land Uses	Amber	<p>Agricultural and residential, with recreation area and village hall to west.</p> <p>Compatible uses but potential noise from village hall.</p>	Amber

#### Part 4 - Site Visit

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2011 and August 2016)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
Impact on Historic Environment and townscape?	Development of a linear nature could be accommodated without having a significant adverse impact on the townscape or on heritage asset on the opposite side of Rode Lane, although there would be harm from the loss of hedgerow and an impact on the character of this part of the village due to the extension of residential dwellings to the west.	N/A
Is safe access achievable into the site? Any additional highways observations?	Safe access should be achievable, but with loss of part or all of the hedgerow on the highway boundary.	N/A
Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)	Stable, greenfield. No issues.	N/A
What are the neighbouring land uses and are these compatible? (impact of development of the site and on the site)	Residential and village hall with playing field. There may be some noise and disturbance at times.	N/A
What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)	Flat	N/A
What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)	Hedges on all sides, conifer hedge to south but this is less visible. Some trees on boundary with recreation area on western boundary.	N/A
Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?	Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows.	N/A
Utilities and Contaminated Land – is there any evidence of existing infrastructure or contamination on / adjacent to the site? (e.g., pipelines, telegraph poles)	Overhead power line on western boundary with village hall. No evidence of contamination but are some buildings on site.	N/A
Description of the views (a) into the site and (b) out of the site and including impact on the landscape	Views limited into and out of site by hedgerows. Some longer views possible from Mill Road to the west.	N/A

Site Visit Observations	Comments (Based on Google Street View images dated June 2011 and August 2016)	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Initial site visit conclusion</b> (NB: this is an initial observation only for informing the overall assessment of a site and does not determine that a site is suitable for development)	If development of site is linear only then it could be a settlement limit extension which would partially reflect the existing linear pattern of development, although it would break out to the west of Rode Lane. Will need further views from the Highway Authority, Senior Heritage and Design Officer (re setting of listed building) and Landscape Architect (re loss of hedge if the site progresses further. Also will need to get view of Water Management Officer or LLFA about surface water flood risk and whether this can be mitigated.	Amber

#### Part 5 - Local Plan Designations

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

Local Plan Designations (UNIFORM)	Comments	Site Score (R/ A/ G)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Development of the site does not conflict with any existing or proposed land use designations.	Green

## Part 6 - Availability and Achievability

<b>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b> (in liaison with landowners)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b>
Is the site in private/ public ownership?	Private	N/A
Is the site currently being marketed? (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	No – have had enquiries.	N/A
When might the site be available for development? (Tick as appropriate)  Immediately Within 5 years 5 – 10 years 10 – 15 years 15-20 years	Immediately	Green

<b>ACHIEVABILITY</b> (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Site Score (R/A/G)</b>
Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? (Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)	Promoter has stated it is deliverable, but no evidence submitted.	Amber
Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated? (e.g., physical, community, GI)	Site is under threshold for these.	Green
Has the site promoter confirmed that the delivery of the required affordable housing contribution is viable?	Promoter has indicated affordable housing could be provided, although would not be required as under size threshold.	Green
Are there any associated public benefits proposed as part of delivery of the site?	No	N/A

## Part 7 - Conclusion

### Suitability

The site is of a suitable size for a settlement limit extension and is located adjacent to the existing defined settlement limit. A surface water flowpath has been identified as running through the centre of the site. An established roadside boundary comprising a mix of hedgerow and trees forms the site frontage – the creation of a suitable access into the site would impact on this boundary. The site is adjacent to the village hall and opposite existing residential development to the east.

### Site Visit Observations

A linear form of development in this location would continue the existing pattern of development however an extension of the settlement limit to the west of Rode Lane would alter the character of this part of the village. The existing boundary vegetation, as well as the gap between the village hall the existing settlement limit, provides for a transition from rural to village setting. This would be adversely impacted by development of the site.

### Local Plan Designations

None.

### Availability

The site is considered to be available.

### Achievability

The site is considered to be achievable although both flood and highway mitigation works would be required may impact on the viability of the site.

### OVERALL CONCLUSION:

The site has been assessed as being an **UNREASONABLE** addition to the settlement limit as development of the site would extend the built forms westwards beyond the clear boundary of Rode Lane and Flaxlands. Partial (or complete) loss of the vegetation along the road frontage to create a suitable access into the site would also have a harmful effect on the character of the area, impacting on the transition from the rural to village setting. An identified surface water flowpath on the site may be addressed by appropriate mitigation measures which could improve the current off-site situation.

**Preferred Site:**

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 28 April 2022