

# Carlton Rode Village Cluster Site Assessment Forms

## Contents

|                |    |
|----------------|----|
| SN0547REV..... | 3  |
| SN2086.....    | 10 |
| SN4009.....    | 18 |
| SN4067.....    | 26 |
| SN4068.....    | 33 |
| SN4080.....    | 41 |

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

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   | Previous withdrawn and refused applications for new dwelling(s)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

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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:   |    |
| 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<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>  | Amber                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><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<br><br>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. |                      |
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</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<br><br><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                       |
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>        |                              | Rural River Valley  |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland  |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland  |                             |
|  |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland  |                             |
|  |                              | Plateau Farmland  | x                           |
|  |                              | Valley Urban Fringe   |                             |
|  |                              | Fringe Farmland   |                             |
| 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<br><br><b>HES - Amber</b>  | 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<br><br><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 |                      |
| 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  |                      |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Greenfield land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues  |                      |
| 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  |                      |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Site is largely level   |                      |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Hedging and tress on boundaries   |                      |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows  |                      |
| 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   |                      |
| 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   |                      |
| <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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | 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

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

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   |  |                    |
|---|--|--------------------|
|   | Comments   | Site Score (R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability?<br><i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | 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?<br>(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

| CONCLUSION  |
|---|
| <p><b>Suitability</b></p> <p>The site is a significant distance from the main settlement and its services. Potential heritage, flooding and highway safety issues have been identified.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b></p> <p>Remote site with poor relationship to existing development.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b></p> <p>Outside and well removed from existing development boundaries.</p> <p><b>Availability</b></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b></p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Preferred Site:</b><br/> <b>Reasonable Alternative:</b><br/> <b>Rejected:</b> Yes</p> |

Date Completed: 26 Aug. 20

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

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

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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:   |    |
| 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                 | <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>  |                      |

|   |                              |  |                             |
|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Part 2:<br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br>oVillage/ community hall<br>oPublic house/ cafe<br>o Preschool facilities<br>o Formal sports/ recreation facilities |                              | Distance to Carleton Rode village hall and recreation area 1.5km                                       | Green                       |
| Utilities Capacity  | Amber                        | Capacity constraints at Carleton Rode Water Recycling Centre<br><br>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<br><br><b>LLFA</b> - Green            | Amber                       |
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br>(Land Use Consultants 2001)  |                              | Rural River Valley   |                             |
|   |                              | Tributary Farmland   |                             |
|   |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland   |                             |
|   |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland   |                             |
|   |                              | Plateau Farmland   | x                           |
|   |                              | Valley Urban Fringe  |                             |
|   |                              | Fringe Farmland  |                             |
| SN Landscape Character Area (Land Use Consultants 2001)   |                              | E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland  |                             |
| 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<br><br><b>Senior Heritage and Design Officer</b> - Red<br><br><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<br><br><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<br>(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. |                         |
| 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  |                         |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Agricultural, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues   |                         |
| 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   |                         |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Site is largely level   |                         |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Hedgerow on highway boundary. Some hedging and trees on western boundary.   |                         |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | Some habitat in hedgerow and trees  |                         |
| 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  |                         |
| 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  |                         |

|  |   |       |
|--|---|-------|
| <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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | 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

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)   |                                     |                      |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
|  | Comments                            | Site Score (R/ A/ G) |
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?  | Site is in single private ownership |                      |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br><i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Unknown                             |                      |
| When might the site be available for development?<br><i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>                      | Immediately                         |                      |
|  | Within 5 years                      | Yes<br>Green         |
|  | 5 – 10 years                        |                      |
|  | 10 – 15 years                       |                      |
|  | 15-20 years                         |                      |
|  | Comments:                           | Green                |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   |   |                    |
|---|---|--------------------|
|   | Comments  | Site Score (R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability?<br><i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | 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?<br><i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>  | 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

### 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

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

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

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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:   |    |
| 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 potentially constrained by nature of road and hedgerow on boundary<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green.   | Amber                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><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<br><br>Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 2km, largely without footways<br><br>Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell just under 2km, with no footway |                      |
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</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<br><br><b>LLFA</b> – Amber. Significant information would be required due to the constraints on the site   | Amber                       |
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br>( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> )        |                              | Rural River Valley   |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland   |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland   |                             |
|  |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland   |                             |
|  |                              | Plateau Farmland   | X                           |
|  |                              | Valley Urban Fringe  |                             |
|  |                              | Fringe Farmland  |                             |
| SN Landscape Character Area ( <i>Land Use Consultants 2001</i> ) |                              | E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland CHECK  |                             |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                     | Green                        | Site relatively constrained in landscape. No loss of high grade agricultural land  | Green                       |
| Townscape  | Amber                        | 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<br><br><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. | Amber                       |

|                             |       |  |       |
|-----------------------------|-------|--|-------|
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity | Green | No protected sites in close proximity<br><br><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green.<br>SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain  | Green |
| Historic Environment        | Amber | Grade II listed building on opposite side of road<br><br><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.)<br><br><b>HES</b> - Amber | Amber |
| Open Space                  | Amber | No loss of public open space   | Amber |
| Transport and Roads         | Amber | Local highway network is constrained with no footways<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>  | 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<br>(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. |                         |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>Any additional highways observations?  | Safe access should be achievable, but with loss of part or all of the hedgerow on the highway boundary  |                         |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Greenfield site, no potential redevelopment or demolition issues  |                         |
| 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  |                         |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Site is largely level   |                         |
| 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   |                         |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows  |                         |
| 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   |                         |
| 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  |                         |

|   |   |              |
|---|---|--------------|
| <p><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)</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>Amber</p> |
|---|---|--------------|

### 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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | 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

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)   |                                     |     |                         |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
|  | Comments                            |     | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?  | Site is in single private ownership |     |                         |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br><i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Unknown                             |     |                         |
| When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>                         | Immediately                         | Yes |                         |
|  | Within 5 years                      | Yes | Green                   |
|  | 5 – 10 years                        |     |                         |
|  | 10 – 15 years                       |     |                         |
|  | 15-20 years                         |     |                         |
|  | Comments:                           |     | Green                   |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)  |   |                       |
|--|---|-----------------------|
|  | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>   | 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?<br><i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i> | 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

### 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

## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

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

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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:   |    |
| 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 to site could be constrained by nature of road and hedgerow on boundary<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>  | Amber                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><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<br><br>Distance to bus stop with peak time service to Norwich 1.5km, largely without footways<br><br>Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell 1.3km, no footway |                      |
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</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<br><br><b>LLFA</b> - Green  | Green                       |
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>           |                              | Rural River Valley   |                             |
|   |                              | Tributary Farmland   |                             |
|   |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland   |                             |
|   |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland   |                             |
|   |                              | Plateau Farmland   | x                           |
|   |                              | Valley Urban Fringe  |                             |
|   |                              | Fringe Farmland  |                             |
| SN Landscape Character Area<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> |                              | E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland  |                             |
| 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<br><br><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green.<br>SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain.                                   | Green                       |
| Historic Environment  | Amber                        | Grade II listed cottage to south of site<br><br><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<br><br><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. |                      |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>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.                            |                      |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)  | Agricultural land with no redevelopment or demolition issues   |                      |
| 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  |                      |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)                                      | Site is largely level  |                      |

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
| 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.  |     |
| 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  |     |
| 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   |     |
| 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   |     |
| <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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | 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

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)   |                                     |     |                         |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
|  | Comments                            |     | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?  | Site is in single private ownership |     |                         |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br><i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Unknown                             |     |                         |
| When might the site be available for development? <i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>                         | Immediately                         | Yes |                         |
|  | Within 5 years                      | Yes | Green                   |
|  | 5 – 10 years                        |     |                         |
|  | 10 – 15 years                       |     |                         |
|  | 15-20 years                         |     |                         |
|  | Comments:                           |     | Green                   |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)  |   |                       |
|--|---|-----------------------|
|  | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i>   | 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?<br><i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i> | 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

### 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. 20



## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Site Reference   | SN4068                                      |
| Site address   | Land south of Flaxlands Road, Carleton Rode |
| Current planning status<br>(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<br>(i) Allocated site<br>(j) SL extension | Allocation                                  |
| Promoted Site Density<br>(if known – otherwise assume 25 dwellings/ha) | 15dph – promoted for 12 dwellings           |
| Greenfield/ Brownfield   | Greenfield                                  |

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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:   |    |
| 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<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS</b> – Green | Green                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><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<br><br>Distance to Carleton Rode Primary School 390 metres, no footway<br><br>Distance to bus stop with peak time bus service to Norwich service 1.6km, no footway<br><br>Distance to shop / post office in Bunwell 1.8km, no footway |   |                      |
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</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<br><br><b>LLFA</b> - Green   | Green                       |
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>        |                              | Rural River Valley  |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland  |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland  |                             |
|  |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland  |                             |
|  |                              | Plateau Farmland  | x                           |
|  |                              | Valley Urban Fringe   |                             |
|  |                              | Fringe Farmland   |                             |
| SN Landscape Character Area <i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i> |                              | E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland   |                             |
| Overall Landscape Assessment                                   | Green                        | Site would effectively merge two separate settlements within Carleton Rode. No loss of high grade agricultural land   | Amber                       |
| Townscape  | Green                        | Would continue existing linear development pattern<br><br><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. | Amber                       |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                    | Amber                        | No protected sites in close proximity<br><br><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green.<br>SSSI IRZ. Potential for protected species and Biodiversity Net Gain   | Green                       |

|                        |       |  |       |
|------------------------|-------|--|-------|
| Historic Environment   | Amber | Grade II listed building to south<br><br><b>Senior Heritage and Design Officer</b><br>– Amber. Part of the parcel further to the south would affect the setting of the church.<br><br><b>HES - Amber</b> | Amber |
| Open Space             | Green | No loss of public open space   | Green |
| Transport and Roads    | Amber | Constrained local highway network with no footways<br><br><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?                                     | 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. |                      |
| Is safe access achievable into the site?<br>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   |                      |

|  |  |     |
|--|--|-----|
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Agricultural land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues   |     |
| 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.  |     |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Site is relatively level   |     |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Boundaries are open.   |     |
| 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   |     |
| 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   |     |
| 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   |     |
| <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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | Comments  | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
|--|---|-------------------------|
|  |   |                         |
|  |   |                         |
|  |   |                         |
| <b>Conclusion</b>                          | Does not conflict with existing or proposed land use designations | Green                   |

## Part 6 Availability and Achievability

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

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)  |  |                       |
|--|--|-----------------------|
|  | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability? <i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Supporting form from promoter. No known significant constraints to delivery. However, promoter has noted delay in delivery to go through | Amber                 |

|  |  |       |
|--|--|-------|
|  | 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 |       |
| Are on-site/ off-site improvements likely to be required if the site is allocated?<br><i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i> | 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

| CONCLUSION   |
|--|
| <p><b>Suitability</b></p> <p>Site of a suitable size for allocation.</p> <p><b>Site Visit Observations</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Designations</b></p> <p>Site is outside development boundary but adjacent to existing allocation.</p> <p><b>Availability</b></p> <p>Promoter states the site is available, but not immediately which would need to be clarified.</p> <p><b>Achievability</b></p> <p>Development of the site is achievable, subject to a suitable access being achievable.</p> <p><b>OVERALL CONCLUSION:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Preferred Site:</b></p> |

**Reasonable Alternative:**

**Rejected:** Yes

Date Completed: 26 Aug. 20



## SN Village Clusters Housing Allocations Document – Site Assessment Form

### Part 1 Site Details

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

### Part 2 Absolute Constraints

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>ABSOLUTE ON-SITE CONSTRAINTS</b> (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:   |    |
| 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, constrained access from Rode Lane<br><br><b>NCC HIGHWAYS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>   | Amber                |
| Accessibility to local services and facilities<br><br><i>Part 1:</i><br><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<br><br>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. |                      |
| <i>Part 2:</i><br>Part 1 facilities, plus<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Village/ community hall</li> <li>○ Public house/ cafe</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<br><br><b>LLFA</b> - Green   | Amber                       |
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>HELAA Score (R/ A/ G)</b> | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Site Score (R/ A/ G)</b> |
| SN Landscape Type<br><i>(Land Use Consultants 2001)</i>        |                              | Rural River Valley   |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland   |                             |
|  |                              | Tributary Farmland with Parkland   |                             |
|  |                              | Settled Plateau Farmland   |                             |
|  |                              | Plateau Farmland   | x                           |
|  |                              | Valley Urban Fringe  |                             |
|  |                              | Fringe Farmland  |                             |
| 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 Rodel Lane                               | Amber                       |
| Biodiversity & Geodiversity                                    | Green                        | No protected sites in close proximity<br><br><b>NCC Ecology</b> – Green.<br>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<br><br><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<br><br><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 |                      |
| 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  |                      |
| Existing land use? (including potential redevelopment/demolition issues)   | Greenfield land with no potential redevelopment or demolition issues  |                      |
| 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  |                      |
| What is the topography of the site? (e.g. any significant changes in levels)   | Site is largely level   |                      |
| What are the site boundaries? (e.g. trees, hedgerows, existing development)  | Hedging and tress on boundaries   |                      |
| Landscaping and Ecology – are there any significant trees/ hedgerows/ ditches/ ponds etc on or adjacent to the site?   | Potential habitat in trees and hedgerows  |                      |
| 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   |                      |

|  |  |     |
|--|--|-----|
| 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                                  |     |
| <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 ( <i>UNIFORM</i> ) | 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

| AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (in liaison with landowners)   |                              |     |                         |
|--|------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
|  | Comments                     |     | Site Score<br>(R/ A/ G) |
| Is the site in private/ public ownership?  | Site is in private ownership |     |                         |
| Is the site currently being marketed?<br><i>(Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | Unknown                      |     |                         |
| When might the site be available for development?<br><i>(Tick as appropriate)</i>                      | Immediately                  |     |                         |
|  | Within 5 years               | Yes | Green                   |
|  | 5 – 10 years                 |     |                         |
|  | 10 – 15 years                |     |                         |
|  | 15-20 years                  |     |                         |
|  | Comments:                    |     | Green                   |

| ACHIEVABILITY (in liaison with landowners, and including viability)   |  |                       |
|---|--|-----------------------|
|   | Comments   | Site Score<br>(R/A/G) |
| Evidence submitted to support site deliverability?<br><i>(Yes/ No) (Additional information to be included as appropriate)</i> | 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?<br><i>(e.g., physical, community, GI)</i>  | 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

### 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. 20