

# **Housing and Employment Site Assessment Report**

January 2026



**Rutland**  
County Council

# Contents

1. Purpose.....	1
2. Background.....	1
3. Introduction .....	1
4. Site Assessment Process .....	2
5. Specialist Assessment of Sites .....	3
6. Conclusions .....	6
Appendix A – Summary RAG assessment of all sites .....	7
Appendix B – Sites found suitable for allocation .....	13
Appendix C - Sites found unsuitable for allocation.....	16
Appendix D – Full Site Assessment Reports .....	31

## 1. Purpose

1.1 Action Point 8.01 in [Document RCC48](#) sets out a requirement for the County Council to:

*Reconsider assessment of sites at 2a where GIS RAG ratings were the only reason for rejection and consider whether Stage 2b assessment should be undertaken. Check landscape evidence and appraise and check for inconsistencies. Prepare an addendum to the site assessment report for 6-week consultation alongside supplementary site assessment report.*

1.2 The purpose of this document is, therefore, to provide the Inspector with the County Council's position in respect of Action Point 8.01. It is an addendum to the Housing and Employment Site Assessment Report, July 2024 ([Document EV6.1](#)).

1.3 For clarity this document also incorporates Action Points 1.02, 1.03, 1.04 and 1.05 as set out in Document RCC48

## 2. Background

2.1 The Housing and Employment Site Assessment Report July 2024 (Document EV6.1) set out the methodology that the County Council utilised for assessing the potential of sites for allocation in the Rutland Local Plan. It provides details of all sites submitted to the County Call through the 2022 Call for Sites process and those received during the Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation (November 2023 to January 2024). Document EV6.1 sets out the detailed assessment of each of these sites at Stage 1, Stage 2(a), and Stage 2(b).

2.2 The sites allocated for development in the Regulation 19 Local Plan, and subject to this Examination in Public were derived from the outcome of the evidence of site suitability set out in Document EV6.1

## 3. Introduction

3.1 During the original site assessment process the County Council screened out a number of sites at Stage 2a because they were subject to a Red RAG assessment for one or more of the following criteria:

- Heritage - Proximity to listed buildings or Scheduled Ancient Monuments
- Biodiversity - Presence of LWS, BAP priority habitat or TPOs within or adjacent to the boundary of the site
- Landscape - Sites located within a high or high/medium landscape sensitivity parcel as set out in Documents [EV8.2a](#), [EV8.2b](#) and [EV8.2c](#)

3.2 Any sites initially screened out at Stage 2a for the above reasons, but for which amended boundaries were submitted through the examination, have been excluded from this assessment process, as they are deemed to have been superseded.

3.3 Following a review of all the sites which were screened out for the reasons set out in Para 3.2 above, 63 sites were identified as ones that required further detailed re-assessment.

3.4 For completeness, the County Council also reviewed all those sites that had been screened out at Stage 1 of the original site assessment process. As a result, one site that had been screened out at Stage 1 due to the presence of a heritage asset within the site boundary was identified as requiring re-assessment.

3.5 In addition to these 64 sites a further nine were identified as being appropriate for further re-assessment, because the extent of revised boundaries or where sites had previously put forward via the Regulation 19 consultation and had not been previously assessed.

3.6 All sites subject to this assessment have also been appraised through the SA process as set out in documents [Document SD6](#) (Local Plan SA report technical annex 2 site assessments) and Document RCC53 (Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report Addendum) which can be found in the [Rutland Local Plan Examination library](#)

3.7 **A total of 73 sites have therefore been subject to re-assessment.**

## 4. Site Assessment Process

4.1 The detailed re-assessment of each of the 73 sites followed the same process as previously undertaken, but combined Stages 2a and 2b together. Apart from Landscape Sensitivity (see Section 5) additional detailed comments on the suitability of sites were sought from the following stakeholders:

- Rutland County Council Highways
- Rutland County Council Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)
- Historic & Natural Environment Department - Leicestershire County Council
- Rutland County Council Trees Officer
- Rutland County Council Conservation Officer
- Johns Associates – Ecology and Biodiversity
- Landscape Sensitivity– Detailed internal review of site landscape sensitivity set out in the Settlement Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (EV8.2a, EV8.2b and EV8.2c) produced by Bayou Bluenvironment Ltd and The Planning & Environment Studio Ltd in July 2023.
- North Northamptonshire Council - Minerals

### RAG Rating

4.2 For consistency with previous assessments, a Red / Amber / Green (RAG) system has been used. Green signals the lowest impact rating, with Amber being a moderate impact rating and Red being the highest impact value rating. The use of a RAG appraisal system provides

for a fair and consistent comparison of all the sites. It also provides the reader a clear visual interpretation of how each assessment criteria, for each site, has been rated.

## 5. Specialist Assessment of Sites

5.1 The following section provides a summary of the methodology used by each of the key stakeholders to assess the extent to which constraints exist that affect the suitability of each site to be allocated in the Local Plan.

### Highways

5.2 On behalf of the Local Highways Authority (LHA), the County Council's Highways Development Management Officer has assessed all the sites in terms of whether safe vehicular and pedestrian access could be achieved.

5.3 There is a high proportion of sites that require further technical assessment to ensure that any mitigation work is defined and is feasible. However, this would be at application stage, when full details of any proposed scheme were known.

5.4 Based on the comments provided by the Highways Officer sites have been categorised as:

- Red (significant highway and/or pedestrian constraints)
- Amber (site may be capable of providing safe vehicular and pedestrian access with mitigation)
- Green (site capable of providing safe vehicular and pedestrian access).

### Flood risk

5.5 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) undertook a desktop-based study of the sites to identify whether sites:

- fall within EA flood zone 2/3
- are subject to risk of surface water flooding
- are in close proximity to a main river
- there is the presence of an ordinary watercourse or water feature within the site.

5.6 LLFA comments are based on these findings, and each site was allocated a red / amber / green rating.

5.7 A red rating was indicated where a site includes a pond, ditch, drain, or ordinary watercourse and overlaps with EA flood mapping (Flood Zone 2/3) or surface water flood risk areas. An amber rating was indicated where a site was at risk of surface water flooding. A green rating was indicated on sites with no mapped flood risk or watercourse identified.

5.8 It should be noted that this screening does not replace a formal flood risk assessment (FRA).

## Archaeology

5.9 The Historic & Natural Environment Department at Leicestershire County Council undertook assessments to evaluate the likelihood and significance of buried archaeological remains, referred to as heritage potential and the degree to which development would harm those remains, defined as heritage risk.

5.10 Heritage potential reflects the probability that a site contains archaeological assets of local, regional, or national importance, based on evidence such as designated heritage assets, known archaeological remains.

5.11 Heritage risk considers the vulnerability of these assets to proposed development and the level of mitigation required. Sites were classified as High Risk (Red) where substantial archaeological potential of regional or national importance is anticipated, required early desk-based assessment and field evaluation. Medium Risk (Amber) where significant local or regional potential exists, likely needing pre-determination evaluation and mitigation. A Low Risk (Green) score was given only where limited local potential is identified, with mitigation was considered possible.

## Trees

5.12 The County Council's Tree Officer provided comments for each site in respect of the following criteria:

- the Tree Preservation Order status;
- the presence and quality of trees;
- woodland and green infrastructure, and;
- how these influence the suitability of each site for development.

5.13 Sites with extensive or high-value tree cover were seen as having major constraints, while those with little or no tree presence were considered suitable.

5.14 As well as providing site specific comments, the Tree Officer provided an indicative red / amber / green rating for each site to indicate unsuitable for allocation / suitable subject to mitigation / suitable for allocation.

## Heritage

5.15 The historic environment has a range of heritage assets including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Archaeology sites and Historic Parks and Gardens. The assessment of the impact of development on heritage assets was sought from the Council's Conservation Officer. As well as providing site specific comments, the Conservation Officer has provided an indicative red / amber / green rating for each site indicating a high / medium / low risk of harm to heritage assets.

## Ecology/Biodiversity

5.16 External Consultants, Johns Associates, were engaged to provide an assessment of each of the sites. Using data from Leicestershire Ecology Records Centre (LERC) and other sources, the consultants provided comprehensive comments covering the presence of

international, national and locally designated biodiversity and geological sites, including potential impact on SSSI's, Local Wildlife Sites, Local Geological Sites, Priority Habitats and protected species.

5.17 The ecological assessment also included a red / amber / green rating for each of the sites. A red rating indicates that ecological mitigation is unlikely to be possible/effective or would be too costly, an amber rating indicates that ecological surveys / mitigation would be required, and a green rating indicates that the site presents no ecological issues.

#### Landscape

5.18 Each of the sites were assessed against the Rutland Settlement Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, 2023 (EV8.2a, EV8.2b and EV8.2c to determine the 'Landscape Sensitivity' of each site. This involved a detailed appraisal, on a site-by-site basis, of the potential impact that development on each site might have on the local landscape sensitivity.

5.19 The Landscape Sensitivity Assessment defined parcels around settlement edges using Planned Limits of Development plus a 150m buffer, using desk-based and field surveys to determine sensitivity to housing and employment development against landscape, visual, and value criteria, rated on a five-point scale, as well as using professional judgement.

5.20 These more recent post-examination assessments of landscape sensitivity adopt a more site-specific and detailed approach, with Planning Officers applying professional judgement to further consider each site's position within the defined parcel.

#### Agricultural Land

5.21 The NPPF emphasises the importance of local authorities in taking into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The Government also affirms the importance of protecting soils and the services they provide.

5.22 The County has some excellent or very good (Grade 1 & 2) agricultural land around Oakham, Uppingham and the larger villages along with some Grade 3 (moderate/good) agricultural land. As such the Local Plan seeks to protect good quality agricultural land where possible.

5.23 The following RAG rating for agricultural land quality was used during to re-assess the 73 identified sites: Red – Grade 1 or 2, Amber - Grade 3 and Green – Grade 4/5 or urban.

#### Assessment Outcomes and Decision-Making Process

5.24 Following receipt and review of the detailed stakeholder comments for each of the 73 sites a thorough of review of the comments was undertaken to determine the extent to which it was considered that each site had the potential for allocation within the Rutland Local Plan.

5.25 This process involved:

- Understanding and interpreting the combined evidence from the specialist responses to determine whether the constraints identified for each site could be realistically mitigated.
- Making use of the RAG rating system, to ensure a clear and fair comparison of each of the sites.

- Taking account of an indicative dwelling capacity for the site. This was derived from the developable site area multiplied by a notional density of 30 dwellings per hectare<sup>1</sup>.

5.26 The full assessment, including those comments provided by the key stakeholders, along with the conclusions for each site, is set out in Appendix D.

5.27 Importantly, a red rating did not automatically exclude a site from being considered suitable for allocation, but instead it highlighted those areas which required more detailed consideration and possible mitigation.

## 6. Conclusions

6.1 Overall, a total of 73 sites were reassessed through the detailed site assessment process outlined above. Following the application of the RAG ratings, specialist input and comprehensive review 6 sites have been identified as suitable for allocation.

6.2 This re-assessment process is sought to provide evidence for the Inspector holding the Examination in Public of the Rutland Local Plan. It does not follow that the identification of sites as being suitable for allocation as a result of this process are ones which the County Council would wish to see allocated within the Rutland Local Plan.

6.3 The full list of sites considered suitable for allocation as part of this reassessment exercise is presented in Appendix B.

6.4 In addition to identifying sites suitable for allocation, further detail on the reasoning behind these decisions is provided in Action Point 8.02 - Note to Summarise the Reasons for Sites Selected in Oakham and Larger Villages - Sites Selected and Not Selected (Document RCC55 in the [Rutland Local Plan Examination library](#)). This document sets out the justification for the allocation sites in the Local Plan, as well as the rationale for excluding those sites not allocated in the Local Plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> In some circumstances key stakeholder comments have been based upon the indicative number of dwellings identified for that site. Where stakeholder comments suggested a site was not suitable for allocation on the basis of the indicative number the assessment process concluded at this time that it was not suitable for allocation. However, that does not necessarily rule out that development on such sites at any point in the future.



## Appendix A – Summary RAG assessment of all sites

Site ID	Name of site	Landscape	Ecology	Archaeology	Heritage	LLFA	Highways	Trees	Agricultural Land	Suitable for Allocation Yes/No
8819	The Lookout at Barleythorpe – Option 3	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Amber	Amber	Yes
8822	Leicester Road, Uppingham	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Amber	Amber	Red	Yes
8823	St George's Barracks, Edith Weston – reduced site area	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Yes
25	Land off Pickworth Road, Great Casterton	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Yes
23	Land to the North of College Close, Great Casterton, PE9 4AW	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Green	Green	Green	Amber	Yes
72	Luffenham Road, Ketton	Amber	Green	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	Yes
61	Oakham Enterprise Park, Ashwell	n/a	Red	Medium risk	Low Risk	Red	Amber	Amber	Green	No
63	The King Centre and Oakham Football Club, Barleythorpe	Red	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Red	Amber	No
69	Land East of Uppingham Road, Oakham	Red	Red	Medium risk	High risk	Amber	Green	Red	Red	No
57	Land South West of Oakham	Red	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Amber	Red	No
60	Catmose, Catmose Street, Oakham	Green	Red	High risk	High risk	Amber	Amber	Amber	n/a	No
75	Land west of Ashwell Road, Oakham	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Red	Red	No

Site ID	Name of site	Landscape	Ecology	Archaeology	Heritage	LLFA	Highways	Trees	Agricultural Land	Suitable for Allocation Yes/No
155	Land East of Uppingham Road, Oakham	Red	Red	High risk	High risk	Red	Green	Amber	Red	No
8817	The Lookout at Barleythorpe – Option 1	Red	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
8818	The Lookout at Barleythorpe – Option 2	Red	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
8824	Cold Overton Road, Oakham	Red	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Green	Green	Amber	No
168	Land rear of 7 Stockerston Road, Uppingham	Red	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Green	Red	Amber	No
73	Launde Farm Uppingham	Red	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Green	Amber	Red	No
8821	Stockerston Road, Uppingham	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
17	Uppingham old sewage works	Amber	Red	Low risk	Low risk	Green	Amber	Red	Green	No
6390	Welland Vale Garden Centre, Glaston Road, Uppingham	n/a	Amber	Low risk	Low risk	Amber	Green	Amber	Red	No
8825	Land at 1 Luffenham Road, Barrowden	Amber	Green	Medium risk	Medium risk	Green	Red	Green	Amber	No
2	7 Wakerley road, Barrowden	Red	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Red	Amber	No
2418	Land south of Back Lane, Barrowden	Red	Amber	Medium risk	High risk	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
8036	Land of Knossington Road, Braunston	Amber	Amber	Low risk	Low risk	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
2438	Land north of Brooke Road, Braunston	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Low Risk	Green	Amber	Green	Amber	No

Site ID	Name of site	Landscape	Ecology	Archaeology	Heritage	LLFA	Highways	Trees	Agricultural Land	Suitable for Allocation Yes/No
4495	Land to rear of 10 Church Street/land off Oakham Road, Braunston	Red	Amber	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
2643	Land off Rogues Lane, Cottesmore (Site 2)	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Amber	Red	Amber	No
2588	Land off Rogues Lane, Cottesmore (Site 2)	Amber	Green	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
2433	Land at Main Street, Cottesmore	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
146	Manor Farmyard, Main Street, Cottesmore	Red	Amber	Medium risk	High risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
1354	Paddock off Weston Rd and Gibbet Lane, Edith Weston	Red	Red	Medium risk	High risk	Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
77	Adjacent No. 17 Whitwell Road North Empingham	Red	Amber	Medium risk	High risk	Green	Green	Green	Amber	No
40	Exton Road, Empingham	Amber	Amber	High risk	High risk	Green	Red	Amber	Amber	No
44	Main Street, Empingham	Green	Amber	High risk	High risk	Amber	Amber	Amber	n/a	No
10	Land at Highfields Farm, Empingham	Red	Red	Medium Risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Green	Red	No
4506	Land at Manor Farm Lane, Essendine 1	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
4507	Land at Manor Farm, Essendine	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
47	Land to rear of Essendine Road, Essendine	Amber	Green	Medium risk	Low Risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
148	Land East of Stamford Road, Exton	Amber	Amber	Low risk	Medium risk	Red	Red	Amber	Amber	No

Site ID	Name of site	Landscape	Ecology	Archaeology	Heritage	LLFA	Highways	Trees	Agricultural Land	Suitable for Allocation Yes/No
149	Land at The Workshops, Exton	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Green	Red	Amber	Amber	No
150	Land at Home Farm, Exton	Amber	Amber	High risk	Low Risk	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	No
141	Land off Old Great North Road, Great Casterton	Red	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
35	Workshop site, Stretton Road, Greetham	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
157	Land North of Bridge Lane, Greetham	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
4480	Paddock to the rear of 8 Bridge Lane Greetham	Green	Green	Medium risk	Low risk	Green	Red	Red	Amber	No
8820	Greetham Quarry, Greetham	Green	Red	Medium risk	Low risk	Amber	Amber	Green	Amber	No
1692	Land at Manor Green, Ketton	Green	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Green	Red	Amber	Amber	No
4492	Land South of Luffenham Road, ketton	Red	Green	Low risk	Medium risk	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	No
15	Ketton Disused Quarry Barrowden Road, Ketton	Green	Red	Low risk	Amber	Amber	Red	Amber	n/a	No
4481	Field east of Long Barn Mews, Ketton	Red	Amber	High risk	High risk	Red	Red	Amber	Amber	No
4493	Land to the rear of Park Farm House, 5 Luffenham Road, Ketton	Red	Red	Medium risk	Low risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
4502	Geeston Road, Ketton	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Red	Amber	No
2543	Former Quarry, Barrowden Road, Ketton	Green	Red	Low risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Amber	n/a	No

Site ID	Name of site	Landscape	Ecology	Archaeology	Heritage	LLFA	Highways	Trees	Agricultural Land	Suitable for Allocation Yes/No
2525	Former Quarry, Barrowden Road, Ketton	Green	Red	Low risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Amber	n/a	No
5330	Site at Manor Farm, Manor Lane, Langham	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	High risk	Green	Red	Amber	Amber	No
7	Manton, St Mary's Road, Paddock	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Green	Red	Amber	Amber	No
54	The Stables - Land east of Cemetery Lane, Manton	Amber	Amber	Low risk	Medium risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
315	Land Off Thistleton Road Market Overton	Red	Green	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	No
2448	Land at 1 Stamford Road Morcott including the White Horse Inn	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
144	Land off Glaston Road, Morcott	n/a	Green	Medium risk	Medium risk	Green	Green	Green	Red	No
4787	Land at Morcott LE15 9DU	Red	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Green	Amber	Amber	No
8031	Land South of Glebe Road, North Luffenham	Red	Amber	Medium risk	High risk	Green	Red	Amber	Amber	No
42	Land south of Glebe Road, North Luffenham	Red	Green	Medium risk	High risk	Red	Red	Green	Amber	No
2639	Land to rear of St Johns Close, Ryhall	Amber	Red	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Red	Amber	Amber	No
4501	Land to the west of A6121 Ryhall Road, Ryhall	Red	Green	Medium risk	Medium risk	Amber	Green	Amber	Red	No
4503	Land off Mill Street Ryhall	Red	Red	Medium risk	High risk	Red	Red	Red	Amber	No
8035	Land off Pinfold Lane, South Luffenham	Red	Red	Medium risk	High risk	Red	Red	Amber	Amber	No

Site ID	Name of site	Landscape	Ecology	Archaeology	Heritage	LLFA	Highways	Trees	Agricultural Land	Suitable for Allocation Yes/No
50	Land off A6121, South Luffenham	Red	Green	Medium risk	High risk	Green	Amber	Amber	Amber	No
43	Back Lane, South Luffenham	n/a	Green	High risk	High risk	Amber	Red	Amber	Amber	No
135	Land to the East of Ashwell Road, Whissendine	Amber	Amber	Medium risk	Low risk	Green	Red	Amber	Amber	No
8	Stapleford road, Whissendine	Red	Amber	Medium risk	Low risk	Green	Red	Amber	Amber	No
3631	Land on Stapleford Road, Whissendine	Red	Amber	Medium risk	Medium risk	Red	Amber	Amber	Amber	No

## Appendix B – Sites found suitable for allocation

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings	Conclusions
<b>OAKHAM</b>				
8819	The Lookout at Barleythorpe – Option 3	Residential	125	Less significant landscape impact than sites 8817 and 8818, which could be mitigated. No significant constraints. The impact on the highway network is not yet known without further assessment due to the scale of development; however it is noted that the local highways authority did not object to a planning application 2022/0796/MAO for circa 600 dwellings. As the indicative number of dwellings for this site is 125, it is considered that adequate highways access would not be a significant constraint. LLFA advises that FRA and detailed drainage strategy with maintenance is required, potentially alongside Land Drainage Consent.
<b>UPPINGHAM</b>				
8822	Leicester Road, Uppingham	Residential	34	<p>It is well-contained by existing boundary vegetation and could accommodate housing without significant harm to landscape character, provided a strong, landscape-led edge is secured to respect its transitional role between Uppingham and surrounding LCAs.</p> <p>While there are no designated heritage assets on-site, nearby assets and known archaeological remains require proportionate investigation and mitigation. Localised surface water flood risk necessitates a Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy, and access from Leicester Road appears achievable with pedestrian connectivity improvements.</p>

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings	Conclusions
				Retention and protection of hedgerow ash and boundary vegetation, alongside biodiversity enhancements, will be essential.
<b>LARGER VILLAGES</b>				
8823	St George's Barracks, Edith Weston – reduced site area	Residential	300-500	Ecological appraisal of this site indicates a red rating; however, this is primarily due to the proximity to candidate LWS notified for calcareous grassland, breeding bird assemblages and reptile populations on the former airfield. The revised site boundaries submitted for this site cover the previously developed land of the technical buildings. Specialist assessment across all other areas including highways, LLFA, heritage and landscape find that development of this site would be acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation measures, although additional detailed assessments would be required.
25	Land off Pickworth Road, Great Casterton	Residential	77	The site contains a Local Wildlife Site, but this is only a smaller part of the hedgerow on Pickworth Road. Access off Old Great North Road can be achieved but with needs to address issues of a TRO, speed limit traffic calming.
23	Land to the North of College Close, Great Casterton, PE9 4AW	Residential	62	Ecological assessment of this site identified constraints associated with hedgerow and calcareous grassland associated with the LWS on Pickworth Road. However, provision of access off College Close would avoid the LWS. The site has been identified as medium risk from a heritage and archaeological perspective, and the LHA have indicated that access is likely to be acceptable subject to localised highway works. This site has now been granted planning permission for 41 dwellings under application 2024/1311/MAF.
72	Luffenham Road, Ketton	Residential	126	No significant constraints have been identified for this site. Adequate protection must be afforded to the woodland of Cat's Hill Spinney to the north of this site, but from a landscape perspective, it's presence would help to contain new development and reduce its prominence in the landscape, noting that any development would need to be sensitive to the setting of Ketton. It is likely that suitable access could be achieved,



Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings	Conclusions
				although a Traffic Regulation Order may be required to relocate the village boundary and 30/60mph transition and a transport assessment would be required.

## Appendix C - Sites found unsuitable for allocation

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
<b>OAKHAM</b>				
61	Oakham Enterprise Park, Ashwell	Employment	10.7	Significant flood risk and impact on biodiversity and ecology, immediately adjacent to BAP habitat.
63	The King Centre and Oakham Football Club, Barleythorpe	Residential	74	Currently in in employment use. Loss of football pitches/green Infrastructure. Impact on priority woodland habitat. LLFA flood risk due to watercourse nearby.
69	Land East of Uppingham Road, Oakham	Residential	131	Significant landscape impact due to high visibility from Uppingham Road and would harm the distinctive historic pattern and soft southern edge of Oakham. Site is entirely covered by Area TPO, very few dwellings would make it onto this site without damaging trees of high value. significant ecological constraints, including the presence of Priority deciduous woodland and the high cost and complexity of achieving the required Biodiversity Net Gain. Development would cause substantial harm to the historic and distinctive southern approach to Oakham and the setting of the Conservation Area.
57	Land South West of Oakham	Residential	810	The site spans two parcels with high visual openness, valued views, and strong rural character. Development would breach a well-defined southern edge, harm the setting of the Conservation Area, and alter the town's form and identity. Ecological constraints due to presence of Priority habitats (deciduous woodland and watercourses).
60	Catmose, Catmose Street, Oakham	Residential	45	Constraints relating to heritage, archaeology, loss of GI/open space. This site is in employment use and therefore not deliverable.
75	Land west of Ashwell Road, Oakham	Residential	265	Significant ecological constraints. The site contains deciduous woodland, a Local Wildlife Site, water features, mature hedgerows.

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				Ecological designations present. Large Tree Preservation Orders limit developable area. Site is highly constrained and not suitable for development.
155	Land East of Uppingham Road, Oakham	Residential	220	Multiple significant constraints. Located in Flood Zone 2/3 and is adjacent to/includes a watercourse and therefore high risk of fluvial and surface water flooding. Would result in the loss of priority deciduous woodland, resulting in significant harm to biodiversity. The site is in an area of high landscape sensitivity, where development would breach Oakham's defined edge and damage valued views and town character. Development would cause high risk of harm to the Oakham Conservation Area, its rich historic environment including numerous listed buildings and Oakham Castle.
8817	The Lookout at Barleythorpe – Option 1	Residential	381	This option at the Lookout, Barleythorpe would result in development extending significantly westward. This area of land is conspicuous, and the scale of development proposed would therefore have a significant impact upon landscape character. The impact on the highway network is not yet known without further assessment due to the scale of development; however, it is noted that the local highways authority did not object to a planning application 2022/0796/MAO for circa 600 dwellings, a greater number than the indicative figure of 381 dwellings. LLFA advises that FRA and detailed drainage strategy with maintenance is required, potentially alongside Land Drainage Consent.
8818	The Lookout at Barleythorpe – Option 2	Residential	246	This 'medium' option at the Lookout, Barleythorpe would result in development extending significantly westward. This area of land is conspicuous, and the scale of development proposed would have an impact upon landscape character. The impact on the highway network is not yet known without further assessment due to the scale of development; however, it is noted that the local highways authority did not object to a planning application 2022/0796/MAO for circa 600 dwellings, a greater number than the indicative figure of 246 dwellings.

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				LLFA advises that FRA and detailed drainage strategy with maintenance would be required, potentially alongside Land Drainage Consent.
8824	Cold Overton Road, Oakham	Residential	87	Development would create an abrupt and visually prominent extension of the town onto rising ground, resulting in significant adverse landscape and visual impacts when viewed from surrounding roads and properties.
<b>UPPINGHAM</b>				
168	Land rear of 7 Stockerston Road, Uppingham	Residential	25	The site is not suitable for housing development. It has severe arboricultural constraints due to TPOs and large RPAs, significant landscape sensitivity requiring extensive tree removal, and flood-related constraints. Development also would likely cause unacceptable harm to green infrastructure and local character. It would also cause the loss of a historic Local Wildlife Site (LWS 12498) and faces significant ecological constraints, woodland habitat, and the need for extensive species surveys and mitigation, making biodiversity net gain compliance costly and challenging.
73	Launde Farm, Uppingham	Residential	367	This site does not adjoin the PLD. Notwithstanding, given the combined issues of high flood risk, landscape sensitivity, and loss of BMV agricultural land, the site is unsuitable for allocation.
8821	Stockerston Road, Uppingham	Residential	445	A safe and convenient vehicular access cannot be achieved due to insufficient visibility at the current speed limit on Stockerston Road. The development would generate a significant traffic impact on the surrounding road network, particularly in Uppingham town centre, where opportunities for mitigation are very limited. In addition, substantial pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure would be required to ensure connectivity, but delivering these improvements within the existing highway boundaries is unlikely to be feasible. Overall, the site fails to meet essential requirements for access, safety, and sustainable

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				connectivity. There are also significant ecological constraints due to two on-site Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and confirmed populations of Great Crested Newts (GCN) in all waterbodies.
17	Uppingham old sewage works	Any use	10	Development would require the removal of numerous trees protected by a blanket Tree Preservation Order.
6390	Welland Vale Garden Centre, Glaston Road, Uppingham	Retail	5000sqm	This site falls outside the scope of the Landscape Sensitivity Study, so further work would be needed to consider whether this site is suitable for a retail allocation. Retail sites require sequential assessment. The Neighbourhood Plan already allocates a site for retail use. Any expansion of development at this location should be dealt with by way of application and consideration against policies in the adopted plan.
<b>LARGER VILLAGES</b>				
8825	Land at 1 Luffenham Road, Barrowden	Residential	21	The Local Highway Authority has advised that visibility and design constraints mean a compliant access for 21 dwellings is unlikely to be achieved. This site has a resolution to approve planning application 2025/0930/FUL for 5 dwellings on this site, subject to S106 agreement.
2	7 Wakerley Road, Barrowden	Residential	15	Concerns in relation to landscape, biodiversity, highways and trees.
2418	Land south of Back Lane, Barrowden	Residential	75	Given the heritage and landscape sensitivity in this location, the scale of growth proposed and the intrusion into the countryside, limiting the site's ability to integrate into the settlement pattern. A Transport Assessment and detailed would be necessary to determine whether the site is suitable for allocation. This site is not considered as a potential site for allocation.
8036	Land off Knossington Road, Braunston	Residential	7	LHA would only support a smaller development of two dwellings on this site, so would not be suitable for allocation. No other significant constraints. Whilst the landscape parcel for this site is high/medium,

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				ribbon development alongside Knossington Road could be in-keeping with the settlement form and character if small in scale.
2438	Land north of Brooke Road, Braunston	Residential	33	Planning permission granted on appeal. The settlement boundary will be amended to include this site
4495	Land to rear of 10 Church Street/land off Oakham Road, Braunston	Residential	77	An allocation likely to have a landscape impact on the setting and conservation area. Highways concerns whether adequate access can be achieved. Site not suitable for allocation due to harm on CA and immediate harm to setting of listed buildings by a large village expansion.
2643	Land off Rogues Lane, Cottesmore (Site 2)	Residential	42	Significant arboricultural constraints. Significant loss of green infrastructure. The site comprises a more intimate scale meadow with substantial enclosure by trees and hedges with a parkland character, although it is not a designed landscape it is adjacent to designated as Important Open Space in the Local Plan.
2588	Land off Rogues Lane, Cottesmore (Site 2)	Residential	77	The site has a poor relationship to the existing built form of the village. Development of this site would be likely to be a prominent extension to the settlement and would be prominent in local views from the existing housing and from Mill Lane and Rogues Lane. It is not clear if an adequate access can be accommodated for such development and a Transport Statement would be required to support any application. Due to the number of detailed assessments required to determine if access can be provided and a TA this site is not suitable for allocation at this stage.
2433	Land at Main Street Cottesmore	Residential	30	Based on consultation with Highways, limitations of the access any development of the site would need to be restricted to 8 dwellings or less, even though the site is 1ha. Some small scale development if well designed could present a low visual impact on the landscape. Heritage comments state the site is not capable of 30 dwellings, for a more informed heritage-led style of development here given the immediate context of listed buildings then a low density would be preferable, and

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				the site may be deemed suitable, but not at the calculated indicative level.
146	Manor Farmyard, Main Street, Cottesmore	Residential	73	Landscape sensitivity is high in this location due to the proximity to both the Conservation Area and heritage assets. The number of dwellings proposed would be large scale growth and not an appropriate scale for an allocation due to the Conservation Area and heritage assets. The access to site does not appear to be sufficient space to accommodate a suitable sized access for the proposed number of dwellings. An alternative access would be required.
1354	Paddock off Weston Rd and Gibbet Lane, Edith Weston	Residential	83	Development of this site has the potential to adversely affect Rutland Water SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR site due to the location of protected species adjacent to the north-eastern site boundary. A Transport Assessment will be required to assess the impact of development and identify any off-site highway improvements. Development of this site would have a landscape impact on the setting of Rutland Water and would result in unacceptable harm to the Conservation Area and heritage setting.
77	Adjacent No. 17 Whitwell Road North Empingham	Residential	4	The site falls within the Rutland Water Area and contributes to the historic environment around Empingham. Housing in this location would erode the rural character of the area and harm its landscape quality due to being located in a location which is sensitive to change. An appeal for a single dwelling was dismissed due to harm to local character and appearance, making a proposal for four dwellings even more inappropriate.
40	Exton Road, Empingham	Residential	18	Development on the site would cause significant harm to designated heritage assets, including the Scheduled dovecote (DLE5233), the Empingham Conservation Area, and nearby listed buildings. The site lies within the historic core, and its character and appearance would be eroded by the development of 18 units on this site, which would adversely affect the setting of the dovecote and listed buildings. The site

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				is also adjacent to BAP habitat and there is no pedestrian connectivity due to Exton Road lacking a footway and has no capacity to accommodate them
44	Main Street, Empingham	Residential	6	The site is located within Empingham Conservation Area and includes listed c.18th outbuildings, with further listed buildings surrounding it and archaeological sensitivity within the historic core. Development of 6 dwellings on a site of this size would result in substantial harm to the significance and setting of these heritage assets and erode the character of the Conservation Area. These constraints cannot be mitigated against for housing development on this site.
10	Land at Highfields Farm, Empingham	Residential	44	Both sites are constrained, but for Part 2, Exton Road ecological, heritage, landscape, and access constraints exist which make allocation difficult to justify. For Part 1, Whitwell Road, while less constrained, still possesses significant heritage, landscape, and ecological challenges, meaning neither site is suitable for allocation without major mitigation, and even then, impacts may remain unacceptable.
4506	Land at Manor Farm Lane, Essendine 1	Residential	86	Development will need to consider impacts and ensure an ecological buffer zone to the LWS and BAP to prevent habitat loss/degradation. Small scale ribbon development may be acceptable from a landscape perspective. However, there is a significant highways constraint due to a lack of pedestrian connectivity and lack of safe and convenient access.
4507	Land at Manor Farm Lane, Essendine	Residential	37	Highways objection cannot be mitigated due to lack of pedestrian connectivity and lack of safe and convenient access. Landscape impact of development would be high along Manor Farm Lane due to the impact on the important setting of the Manoria Earthworks Scheduled Monument and St Mary's church.
47	Land to rear of Essendine Road, Essendine	Residential	97	Highways objection cannot be mitigated due to insufficient land within the public highway. It is unlikely a safe and suitable access can be achieved to Stamford Road for all users.



Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
148	Land East of Stamford Road, Exton	Residential	9	The site lies Flood Zone 2/3 and/or includes a water feature, which indicates a high likelihood of fluvial flooding. There are also constraints relating to the provision of a safe and compliant access, due to limited carriageway width, poor visibility and the potential necessity to remove an existing stone wall.
149	Land at The Workshops, Exton	Residential	9	There is uncertainty about site access due to the presence of private land between the site and the public highway and is therefore not suitable for allocation.
150	Land at Home Farm, Exton	Employment	0.51ha 15,000 sqft	From LHA perspective the site would have the potential to accommodate employment use, but not a business which is heavily reliant on HGV access. Archaeological assessment highlights the presence of historic buildings on this site which would require historic building recording and there would likely be an emphasis to retain the buildings as they contribute to the historic character of the village. This may limit the scope of development possible on this site.
141	Land off Old Great North Road, Great Casterton	Residential Care Home	40	The site is located in a sensitive river valley floodplain, close to main river which is Flood Zone 2/3. It also acts as a landscape buffer which contributes to the historic setting of the village.
35	Workshop site, Stretton Road, Greetham	Residential	25	Due to the presence of a watercourse adjacent to the boundary and the southern part of the site in Flood Zone this presents a significant constraint to development. The site also includes boundary hedgerows that require a 10m buffer, with potential mitigation needed for water vole, great crested newts, and bats which further constrains the site.
157	Land North of Bridge Lane, Greetham	Residential	31	Adjacent with minor overlap to BAP habitat, mitigation required to ensure protection measures to ensure the trees/hedges on adjacent land as well as boundary hedges are protected and enhanced respectively. Housing development on the parcel would not present significant landscape impact. Flooding risk is localised but still requires information to show this has been appropriately assessed and managed. Site submission proposes that the site would be accessed via

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				Bridge Lane or Little Lane, but LHA confirms that neither of these would be capable of providing suitable access to the site.
4480	Paddock to the rear of 8 Bridge Lane Greetham	Residential	5	Significant constraints relating to access and environmental impact. The site contains a high volume of established green infrastructure, making development without tree loss challenging. There is no connection to the public highway and Bridge Lane cannot accommodate two-way traffic or be widened without third-party land.
8820	Greetham Quarry, Greetham	Residential	83	It is not clear if a suitable access route could be provided into the main part of the site based on the red line plan submitted. However, LHA have indicated that access would be possible from either permitted site 2023/1095/RES or from the public highway if the site limits were to be extended eastwards and westwards at the entrance. Ecological assessment indicates that development would likely result in the loss of a Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) and potentially priority calcareous grassland, both high-value features. It should be noted that this site is subject to a restoration condition 36 under planning application 2020/0971/MIN. Recent S73 application 2025/1166/MIN seeks to vary this condition by amending the completion date of restoration to September 2027. To allocate this site would impact the ability to meet the conditions for restoration of the site. It would also be contrary to adopted plan policy MSC Policy 12 and Policy MIN 9 in the submitted Plan in respect of restoration and aftercare of minerals extraction sites. Furthermore, the site is not classed as previously developed land under the NPPF, and its allocation at this point would undermine biodiversity and geodiversity objectives in the Local Plan.
1692	Land at Manor Green, Ketton	Residential	106	Archaeological and Heritage assessment indicates that the site could be developed without harming the historic environment. Ecological and Tree Officer assessment highlight the requirement for protection measures and buffers to existing hedgerows and mature trees on site should this site be developed. New development would be in keeping

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				with the setting of Ketton in the landscape. However, LHA has expressed concerns over whether the site would be suitable for the indicative number of dwellings proposed, so has not been found suitable for allocation. This site now has a resolution to approve planning application 2025/0267/MAF for 41 dwellings, subject to S106 agreement.
4492	Land South of Luffenham Road, ketton	Residential	38	The site is highly sensitive in landscape terms due to its location within the River Chater valley, an intimate, largely unsettled rural landscape of positive character that forms an important gateway and approach into Ketton along the A6121. It contributes significantly to the settlement's identity, open views, and historic setting, and development here would introduce built form contrary to the established pattern, harm key views and open spaces, and adversely affect heritage assets, impacts that cannot be effectively mitigated.
15	Ketton Disused Quarry Barrowden Road, Ketton	Residential	72	The site is designated as Local Green Space in the Ketton & Tinwell Neighbourhood Plan. The site is also a candidate non-statutory Local Wildlife Site notified for calcareous grassland, which is considered to represent a significant constraint to the allocation of this site as it will be costly to achieve the required BNG and will involve the loss of the LWS. The highway network along Barrowden Road and through the village to the A6121 is wholly unsuitable for the traffic associated with this proposed development, with no means of improvements.
4481	Field east of Long Barn Mews, Ketton	Residential	34	Significant constraints relating to flood risk. The site does not lend itself to development without compromising the character and appearance of the area with setting harm. New development would be contrary to established settlement form and pattern and would affect important views and areas of important open space.
4493	Land to the rear of Park Farmhouse, 5	Residential	5	Development would be contrary to established settlement form and pattern, would affect important views and areas of important open space, and important heritage assets. The location of the access would

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
	Luffenham Road, Ketton			be directly opposite Northwick Road, which is not ideal and therefore suitable access cannot be achieved.
4502	Geeston Road, Ketton	Residential	35	Significant ecological, arboricultural and access constraints. The site contains a historic Local Wildlife Site and non-priority woodland, both of which require buffers. High-value mature trees with RPAs restrict developable land. Safe vehicular and pedestrian access is unlikely without substantial loss of foliage and highway works.
2543	Former Quarry, Barrowden Road, Ketton	Employment	Up to 20,000 sqm	The site is designated as Local Green Space in the Ketton & Tinwell Neighbourhood Plan. The site is also a candidate non-statutory Local Wildlife Site notified for calcareous grassland, which is considered to represent a significant constraint to the allocation and will involve the loss of the LWS. The highway network along Barrowden Road and through the village to the A6121 is wholly unsuitable for the traffic associated with this proposed development, with no means of improvements.
2525	Former Quarry, Barrowden Road, Ketton	Residential	80	The site is designated as Local Green Space in the Ketton & Tinwell Neighbourhood Plan. The site is also a candidate non-statutory Local Wildlife Site notified for calcareous grassland, which is considered to represent a significant constraint to the allocation and will involve the loss of the LWS. The highway network along Barrowden Road and through the village to the A6121 is wholly unsuitable for the traffic associated with this proposed development, with no means of improvements.
5330	Site at Manor Farm, Manor Lane, Langham	Residential	29	Road network is not suitable to accommodate additional level of traffic. Development would harm the Conservation Area and the setting of Manor Barn, causing a significant change in character.
7	St Mary's Road, Paddock, Manton	Residential	10	LHA would only support development of a small number of dwellings than the indicative capacity for this site and as such, would not be suitable for allocation for 10 dwellings. Other constraints could be mitigated, noting that due to proximity to Rutland Water, additional ecological work may be

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				required. This site sits within a landscape parcel of high sensitivity, but modest, well- designed development may have limited harmful impacts on the wider landscape qualities of the parcel or historic settlement form.
54	The Stables - Land east of Cemetery Lane, Manton	Residential	9	Significant access constraints. No connection with the public highway.
315	Land Off Thistleton Road Market Overton	Residential	15	Site read as being part of open countryside and important for the setting of the village. Landscape significant here as per views shown in landscape study - not suitable for allocation.
2448	Land at 1 Stamford Road Morcott including the White Horse Inn	Residential	23	This site is in a prominent position when approached from the A47 and does not relate well to the existing settlement form, although it does adjoin the PLD. From a heritage perspective, the site is not likely to achieve 23 units given the permission already secured. A limited number of dwellings over and above those already permitted under 2022/0254/FUL may be supported, but subject to further HIA in terms of the impact on the historic environment. This is a sensitive site in view of the belt of trees, the extent of the planned limits of development and views into the Conservation Area from the junction, so it would not necessarily be a suitable site to extend into the whole of the submitted red line area. The site is bounded to the north by a high value woodland belt which should be retained with a 10m buffer to mitigate against damage, further limiting site capacity. Taken together, these factors make this site unsuitable for allocation.
144	Land off Glaston Road, Morcott	Employment	9050sqm	This site falls outside the scope of the Landscape Sensitivity Study, so further work would be needed to consider whether this site is suitable for an employment allocation, especially in the light of the Conservation Officer's comment. The site and surrounding landscape is open and that contributes to the wider landscape characteristics and on the approach to Morcott, a distinctive village comprising a significant historic environment. The agricultural land is grade 2. Whilst Highways consider

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				the site suitable, the development of the site would require upgrading of the A47 junction. Also, significant off-site pedestrian/cyclist improvements and new bus stop infrastructure is likely to be requested. Therefore, it is considered the site is unsuitable for an employment allocation due to the loss of grade 2 agricultural land and the need for further landscape work to be undertaken to determine whether the development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape. There are likely to be other sites more suitable, and the level of highways improvements may impact on the viability.
4787	Land at Morcott LE15 9DU	Residential	129	Significant landscape constraint. Weak visual and spatial relationship to the historic village with greater impact to the east.
8031	Land South of Glebe Road, North Luffenham	Residential	11	Development would result in a negative impact on the surrounding road network, and the site has no pedestrian connectivity, nor is it able to achieve it. Significant landscape impact as it would disrupt important vistas and the perceptual break between village and open countryside. Development would harm the highly significant historic environment of North Luffenham, including the setting of Grade I and Grade II* heritage assets and the Conservation Area.
42	Land south of Glebe Road, North Luffenham	Residential	9	The site is located in a highly sensitive and open location, regarding landscape and historic environment, including nearby heritage assets. Development would cause harm to the setting of the listed buildings and the Conservation Area. A safe access cannot be achieved.
2639	Land to rear of St Johns Close, Ryhall	Residential	38	Site has no connection with the public highway and requires significant work to mitigate flood risk. In addition, the River Gwash LWS is located partly within the site boundary, and the site carries various ecological constraints.
4501	Land to the west of A6121 Ryhall Road, Ryhall	Residential	114	Development would breach the natural river valley skyline and disrupt the distinctive, undeveloped setting that defines the village's character and landscape. Development would also result in the loss of high-quality agricultural land.

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
4503	Land off Mill Street Ryhall	Residential	27	Development of this is unlikely to be able to deliver the required BNG owing to the presence of watercourse habitat, and prior removal of Priority woodland. Development would harm the distinctive river valley landscape, intrude into the Conservation Area, and erode important open space that defines the village's character, with only very limited infill offering potential without significant adverse impact. Access to the site is unsuitable because it would require a major bridge upgrade and a new junction on Mill Street where adequate visibility cannot be achieved and where the access would conflict with an existing pedestrian and cycle crossing. Trees of high value all around the site makes development highly problematic and unlikely to be possible to overcome. Development would compromise the open character of the Conservation Area and harm the distinctive visual setting of Ryhall.
8035	Land off Pinfold Lane, South Luffenham	Residential	67	Pinfold Lane is unsuitable to accommodate additional traffic and has no pedestrian connectivity and there is significant landscape impact due to reducing the historic separation between the two parts of the village, this area of the village has a strong riparian and pastoral character, characterised by watercourses and grazing land. The site is located adjacent to a stream/Local Wildlife Site which constrains the site. Development would cause irreversible harm to the historic core, listed buildings, and rural character of South Luffenham.
50	Land off A6121, South Luffenham	Residential	58	The landscape impact of development in this location cannot be mitigated because it would drastically change the village's character, harm the landscape, and damage important natural features. Development would erode the distinctive open character and rural setting of South Luffenham on approach from Stamford Road, causing significant visual harm to the edge of the Conservation Area.
43	Back Lane, South Luffenham	Residential	10	The site lies within the historic core, the Conservation Area and includes listed buildings. New development would severely harm the setting of heritage assets and the character of the village. From a highway's

Site ID	Name of Site	Proposed Use	Indicative No. of dwellings (residential)/site area (employment)	Conclusions
				perspective, the road has no pedestrian provision and no scope to improve this.
135	Land to the East of Ashwell Road, Whissendine	Residential Care Home	22	Significant access and connectivity constraints as well as an adjacent BAP habitat. The topography and narrow nature of Ashwell Road, combined with existing dwellings, make achieving a safe and adequate vehicular access with appropriate visibility highly unlikely. Furthermore, the site is severed by a public right of way, and off-site pedestrian infrastructure is limited with little scope for improvement. These factors collectively mean the Local Highway Authority would not support development at this location.
8	Stapleford road, Whissendine	Residential	32	The area represents open countryside of some importance to the setting of Whissendine when approaching the village along Stapleford Road. Its inner boundary is generally fragmented and has a soft and well-vegetated transition between the village and countryside that could be harmed by development unless sensitively landscaped. New small-scale development would be likely to extend the village northwards away from its historic core and linear form of the village. From a highway's perspective, it is unclear whether access can be achieved as the site does not abut the highway.
3631	Land on Stapleford Road, Whissendine	Residential	110	The site has weak relationship with settlement form and would impact on the setting of the village when approaching the village along Stapleford Road. Site also identified as requiring enhanced surveys due to a mapped water feature on or adjoining the boundary.



## Appendix D – Full Site Assessment Reports

See document RCC51a in [Local Plan Examination library](#)