

Matter C, 29a

Site Allocation: VC ROC1, Land south of New Inn Hill, Rockland St Mary

**a) Has the site been allocated previously or is it a new allocation?**

VC ROC1 is a new allocation in the VCHAP.

**b) Does the site have planning permission and/or are there current applications under consideration?**

The site does not have planning permission and there are no current planning applications under consideration.

**c) What is the land currently used for, what is the ownership position and is the site currently being promoted by a developer? Are there any site occupiers/ leaseholders who would be affected, if so how?**

Current land use: VC ROC1 is a greenfield site

Ownership position: The site is in multiple ownership (three landowners)

Promotion by developer: The site is not currently being promoted by a developer although interest has been expressed in the site by a number of developers

Impact on site occupiers/ leaseholders: The site is currently vacant

**d) Is the site sustainably located in relation to village services and facilities? Where is the nearest (a) primary school (b) convenience shop (c) village hall (d) recreation ground (e) other key facilities? How accessible are these for walkers and cyclists, in the case of walkers for example by continuous footways?**

Yes, the site is sustainably located in relation to village services and facilities. The table below summarises the connectivity of the site to the identified services and facilities.

FACILITY	LOCATION	SETTLEMENT
Primary school	School Lane	Rockland St Mary
Local shop	The Street	Rockland St Mary
Village hall	The Street/ School Lane	Rockland St Mary
Recreation ground	Green Lane	Rockland St Mary
Other (bus stop)	The Street	Rockland St Mary

A pedestrian footpath extends along the The Street, through Rockland St Mary, however this does not continue along School Lane and therefore does not provide a continuous pedestrian footpath to the local primary school. Similarly, the pedestrian footpath along New Inn Hill extends to the junction with Green Lane but there is no footpath along Green Lane to the recreation ground.

**e) Would the landscape and other physical impacts of the housing allocation be acceptable? Would it be acceptable in relation to the character and appearance of the area? How does it relate to the existing built-up area of the settlement? Are there any other significant constraints?**

VC ROC1 is recognised in the supporting text and policy requirements as being within a sensitive landscape location. The site is at the crest of the landscape, in proximity to the Broads Authority area and this is reflected in the requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to be undertaken to inform the design, layout and landscaping of the site. Views of the site will also be visible from the identified Public Rights of Way that run to the east of the site (Rockland St Mary FP3) and to the north of the site on the opposite side of New Inn Hill (Rockland St Mary FP2). To the east of the site a line of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order will need to be protected.

To the west of the site is a cluster of Grade II heritage assets comprising a farmhouse and former agricultural outbuildings. As agreed with Historic England, to preserve a link between these buildings and the wider agricultural setting, the detailed policy requires an area of open space to the west of the site to enable long views to- and from the listed buildings to be retained.

Assessments of the landscape and townscape impact, as well as the potential heritage impact of development, are included within the following evidence base documents:

Site assessment ([B.1A](#))

Landscape Visual Appraisal ([B.5.1](#))

Historic Impact Assessment ([B.4.1](#))

**f) Is the access and site acceptable in highway terms?**

Yes. The supporting text notes that the vehicular access into the site could result in the loss of a mature oak tree on the site frontage however this tree has subsequently been felled following approval of a Tree Works application. On- and off-site highways works have been identified in discussions with the highways authority, and these are included in the site-specific policy requirements for the site.

**g) Is the estimate of site capacity justified?**

Yes. The numbers proposed for the site respond to the identified heritage and landscape constraints.

Appendix 1 of the Topic Paper sets out the site density ([B.11.1](#)).

**h) Are the site-specific requirements for development of the site justified, consistent with national policy and would they be effective?**

Yes. The site-specific policy requirements are supported by the evidence base for the Plan and have been informed by discussions with key technical consultees (such as Historic England and the highways authority). The policy requirements are justified by the evidence, are consistent with national policy and the Council considers that they will be effective.

**i) Would development of the site be viable, including the delivery of policy compliant affordable housing?**

The Council has produced a Viability Appraisal as part of the evidence base for the Plan, ([B.6.1](#)), and considers that the site is viable, and will deliver a policy compliant quantum of affordable housing.

The site promoter confirmed in their October 2024 Delivery Statement that the site is available, suitable and deliverable taking into account the policy requirements for the site.

The 2024 and 2025 Delivery Statement documents are appended to this statement.

**j) Overall, is the site deliverable within the plan period? When is development likely to commence? Has the landowner/developer confirmed this?**

Yes, the site is deliverable within the Plan period. The site promoter updated the anticipated timescales for delivery of the site in their October 2025 Delivery Statement.

Anticipated planning application submission date: 2027

Commencement of works on site expected: 2028/29

Completion expected: Within 18-24 months of commencement on site

## Delivery Statement: Supplementary/Amended Information (October 2025)

SITE REFERENCE:  
VCROC1

SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):  
Land south of New Inn Hill

SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):  
John Long Dip TP MRTPI, Director John Long Planning Ltd on behalf of John Heathcote,  
Diana Davies and Robert Loades (the Landowners of site VCROC1).

DATE OF COMPLETION OF SUPPLEMENTARY/ AMENDED INFORMATION:  
9 October 2025

Please provide an update in the text box below to any of the original responses provided in response to Questions 1-4 of the 'Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan' for your site. You will need to refer to the original submission when completing this form and clearly state which response is to be updated. This information will be brought to the attention of the Inspector as part of the Examination process.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary).

The majority of the information included in the VCROC1 Landowner's original response (4 October 2025 remains valid. The Landowner's situation and position has not changed and the land remains available for development.

The only change required is to Section 4 of the original response which set out a likely timetable for key events up to commencement/completion of the scheme which was based on an assumption that the VCHAPs would be adopted in 2025.

Given that adoption of the VCHAPS is now likely in 2026, the expectation now is that the Landowners will conclude negotiations with prospective developers/purchasers towards the end of 2026 (following adoption of the Plan). The likelihood is that a planning application will be submitted (by developers) in 2027, with a commencement on site in 2028/29 following approval of the planning application and discharge of conditions etc. Completion of the 25 units is likely to be within 18 to 24 months of the development commencing, depending on the developer and housing market at the time.

or

The information submitted in 2024 remains valid and unchanged

John Long (signature) 8 October 2025 (date)

## **Delivery Statement for South Norfolk Council Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan**

**SITE REFERENCE:**

VCROC1

**SITE ADDRESS (as per the site allocation policy):**

Land south of New Inn Hill

**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

Approximately 25 dwellings on 1.47ha

**DELIVERY STATEMENT COMPLETED BY (and on behalf of):**

John Long Dip TP MRTPI, Director John Long Planning Ltd and Daniel Green of Durrants on behalf of John Heathcote, Diana Davies and Robert Loades (the Landowners of site VCROC1).

**DATE OF COMPLETION OF DELIVERY STATEMENT:**

4 October 2024

1. Please confirm whether the site meets the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and can therefore be considered to be available, suitable and deliverable taking into account the policy requirements of the GNLP and the VCHAP, as well as CIL payments, Biodiversity Net Gain, and where appropriate Nutrient Neutrality.

*(Approx. 100 words)*

The Landowners consider the site meets the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Landowners confirm that the site remains 'available' for development. Having reviewed the latest iteration of policy (Policy VC-ROC1, Reg. 19 Addendum version) and its requirements, the Landowners confirm that on the basis of current available information, the site remains 'suitable' for development. Also, taking into account the site's requirements including the measures to protect heritage assets, CIL and BNG the site remains 'deliverable'. The site is outside of the 'Nutrient Neutrality Surface Water Catchment (River Yare)'; and currently outside of the 'Waste Water Treatment Works within the Catchments' zone. Once allocated, the Landowners (or promoters/developers) will work together to jointly commission the necessary technical work to support a planning application and inform a development scheme including landscaping; foul water (including any necessary nutrient neutrality mitigation), arboriculture, ecology work etc. The highway works, to include a pedestrian footway across the site frontage to connect to the existing pedestrian footway to the west of the site (Eel Catcher Close) can be delivered, provided that the land to create the connection is either in the Landowners ownership or the adopted highway. A secondary pedestrian access to the site from The Street, east of Old Hall Barn can be achieved, which can enable a connection to the public footpath to the east of the proposed allocation can be delivered. However, this access will need to be shared with farm vehicles as it provides an important field access to farmland to the south. The Landowners control additional land in the area, should any offsite BNG mitigation be necessary.

2. Please confirm the land ownership details of the site, including any discussions and/or agreements with developers if appropriate.

*(Approx. 100 words)*

The site is owned by three landowners. The Landowners are confident that the site is not encumbered by restrictive covenants and have had this confirmed by their lawyers. No formal contract has yet been entered into regarding the site's sale to a developer, although a number of developers have expressed an interest in purchasing the site. The Landowners intention is to continue to promote the site through the Development Plan process, and once formal allocation is confirmed will enter into discussions with prospective developers/purchasers.

3. Please provide any details relating to progress made towards the submission of a planning application on the site if applicable (i.e., obtaining pre-application advice, technical surveys, engagement and/or agreements with statutory bodies, or the submission of a planning application).

*(Approx. 100 words)*

The Landowners have commissioned their own heritage advice to better understand the potential heritage impacts of a future scheme and likely mitigation measures. The advice confirms that a development of 25 dwellings can be accommodated on the site, without an adverse impact on nearby heritage assets. The Landowners note, the provisions in the latest iteration of policy (Policy VC-ROC1, Reg. 19 Addendum version) to retain an area at the western end of the site free from development, and can support this expectation. The landowners have also commissioned their own highway advice to confirm that the site can be adequately accessed and the necessary visibility splays can be achieved.

4. Please provide a brief commentary on the site's delivery, for example an anticipated date for the submission of a planning application, a predicted start-on-site date and the likely completion date of the development.

*(Approx 100 words)*

The Landowners intend to continue to promote the site through the Development Plan process. Once the site is formally allocated in the Adopted VCHAPs document assumed to be in 2025, the Landowners will conclude negotiations with prospective developers/purchasers. The expectation is that a planning application will be submitted late 2025/early 2026, with a commencement on site, later in 2026/early 2027 following approval of the planning application and discharge of conditions. Completion of the 25 units is likely to be within 18 to 24 months of the development commencing, most likely late 2028/early 2029.

Matter C, 29b

Settlement Limit: Rockland St Mary, Hellington and Holverston

**a) Are the settlement limits proposed suitable and justified given their policy function?**

Yes, the existing settlement limit for Rockland St Mary is suitable and justified. The settlement limit encompasses development along The Street, as well as extending out to Surlingham Lane, Bee-Orchid Way and School Lane. The settlement limit focuses future infill development to occur within the main built-up area and prevents further encroachment into the countryside.

The settlement limits do not meet any of the criteria outlined in the Topic Paper and therefore there are no proposed changes to the existing boundaries.

There are no significant areas of existing development that not included in the settlement limits.

**b) Where changes to settlement limits are proposed, are these:**

**(i) Justified by development on the ground? or**

**(ii) Where potentially allowing further development, that development would be in a suitable location relative to services and facilities, would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not have any other adverse planning effect?**

No changes to the settlement limits are proposed as part of the VCHAP.

**c) Should any other settlement limits be included in the plan to reflect other hamlets or existing areas of development in the cluster?**

No. There are no other hamlets or existing areas of development that are of a significant enough scale to justify a settlement limit. Hellington and Holverston do not have settlement limits as they are very rural and sparsely developed.