**NORTHILL PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

V3a 26/1/2016

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **HOUSING SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA** | |
| **Section 1: SITE DETAILS:** | |
| Name: | Date Site visited: |
| NP Ref No: | SHLAA Ref No: |
| Settlement: | Size (Hectares): |
| Brief Site Description: | |
| How is Site Accessed? | |
| Present Use: | |
| Planning History – previous applications & results: | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 2: AVAILABILITY (***Confirmation of ownership and availability of land for development)* | | | |
| **Ownership** | | | |
| Is the land sole or jointly owned? *(please tick)* | | Sole | Joint |
| Name of Landowner(s) | Address of landowner(s) | | Contact Details |
|  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |
|  |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 2 (cont):** | | | | | | |
| **Availability of land for development** | | | | | | |
| Is/are the owners willing to submit this land for development? | | | Yes | Maybe | | No |
| Are there any legal or ownership problems in relation to the land? | | | No | Maybe | | Yes |
| Are there any existing long tenancies on the site? | | | No | Maybe | | Yes |
| Sub Totals: | | |  |  | |  |
|  | | | Col A+B | | Col B+C | |
| SECTION 1 – AVAILABILITY SCORE: | | |  | |  | |
| If there are any issues, how could these be overcome? | | | | | | |
| Site is suitable  (continue assessment) | Site may be suitable (continue assessment) | Site is not suitable  (no further action) | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | |
| **Assessors Name:** (Capitals) | **Assessors Signature:** | **Date:** | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | |
| **Landowner(s) statement**: I / We are the legal owners of the site. I / We agree with the statements made in section 1 and 2 of the Housing Site Assessment Criteria. | | | | | | |
| **Landowners Name(s):** (Capitals) | **Landowners signature:** | **Date:** | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | |

*Note – A Red /Amber/Green scoring principle is used where positive (green) responses score ‘2’ ; amber (maybe) response score ‘1’ and negative(red) responses score ‘2’. The “red and green” scores are totalled separately at the base of each column then added to the ‘amber’ score (in both cases) to give a Score Rating for that Section.*

*Section 6 provides the ‘Site Score Rating’ enabling a number of sites to be compared numerically in a league table for further analysis.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 3 - ACHIEVABILITY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| *This section forms an objective assessment of ‘achievability’ given physical site constraints.* | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Physical Features:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Flooding** | | Is site within flood risk zones 3a &3b based on Environment Agency maps? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Is the site in a critical drainage area for surface water flooding? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| **Nationally significant designations** | | Distance from nationally important sites (please circle). | | | | >800m | 400-800m | | <400m | |
| **Conservation Area** | | Proximity of site to conservation area (please circle). | | | | >800m | 400-800m | | <400m | |
| **Development Potential:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Status** | Greenfield (GF)/ Brownfield (BF) / Mixed (Mxd) / Not known (NK) | | | | | BF | Mxd  NK | | GF | |
| If mixed – please describe: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Is the site in the settlement envelope? | | | | | | Yes |  | | No | |
| Is the site currently in use? | | | | | | No | Yes | |  | |
| Would site usage limit the future development potential of the land? | | | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Are there permanent features that affect the ability of the site to be developed? | | | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Could the site be developed within the next 13 yrs? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| Have the services of a developer, interested in developing the land, been secured? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| **Utilities** - Is site affected by significant infrastructure crossing the site (eg: power lines, pipes) | | | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| **Contamination:** | | | Do issues exist? | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Do nearby sources of air pollution exist? | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Do nearby sources of noise pollution exist? | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Are there likely historic mineral or waste considerations on the site? | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Do public rights of way exist across the site? | | | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Do public rights of way exist in the vicinity of the site? | | | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Do building(s) exist which could be retained? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| Do building(s) exist which could be converted? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| **Does a development plan exist for this site? If so:** | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| Is the basic idea of how the site is to be developed appropriate? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| Is there a better way of developing the site? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| Is the development of the site likely to be viable? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| Does the site provide any infrastructure? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| Is there the potential for any community infrastructure levy? | | | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| **If issues are identified, how could they be overcome?** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Totals: | | | | | |  |  | | |  |
|  | | | | | | Col A+B | | Col B+C | | |
| SECTION 2 – ACHIEVABILITY – SCORE: | | | | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | |  | |  | | |
| Site is suitable  (continue assessment) | | | | Site may be suitable (continue assessment) | Site is not suitable  (no further action) | | | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | | | |
| **Assessors Name:** (Capitals) | | | | **Assessors Signature:** | **Date:** | | | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | | | |
| **SECTION 4: SUITABILITY (SUSTAINABILITY)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| *This section forms an objective assessment of environmental, social and economic criteria.* | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Environmental aspects:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Drainage & Flooding** | | Do drainage or flooding issues exist in the settlement? | | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Is the site likely to give rise to lack of sewer capacity and resultant flooding? | | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Is the development likely to impact on the downstream capacity of foul and / or surface water sewers? | | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| **Landscape** | | Is the site is naturally well screened? | | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| Does the site have some natural screening? | | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| Is the site exposed and not naturally well screened? | | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Will the site interrupt views **into** the village? | | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Will the site interrupt views **out of** the village? | | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Would site development have a positive/negative effect on visual amenity of locality? (give reasons). | | | | Pos | Maybe | | | Neg |
| Reasons: | | | | | | | | |
| Would the site development have a detrimental impact on a valued landscape? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Can development make use of existing features? | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| **Open space/leisure and green infrastructure** | | Distance of site from locally important sites (please circle) | | | | >800m | 400 – 800m | | <400m | |
| Distance of site from important green space (please circle) | | | | >800m | 400 – 800m | | <400m | |
| Are there any designation opportunities? | | | | Yes | Maybe | | No | |
| **Impact on biological**  **geological**  **ecological assets** | | Will development of the site have a detrimental impact on views into a conservation area? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Will development of the site have a detrimental impact on the setting of a conservation area? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Will development of the site have a detrimental impact on approaches to a conservation area? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Will development of the site have a detrimental impact on hedgerows and natural habitats? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Will the development impact on existing and future management and conservation of wildlife? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Are there any tree preservation orders in or near the site for development? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Are there any protected species in or near the site for development? (evidence required) | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Is development of the site likely to impact on ancient woodland? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| **Historic environment** | | Are there archaeological features/ finds which could impact on the development of the site? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Will development of the site have a detrimental impact on listed buildings? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Will development of the site have a detrimental impact on existing old buildings? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |
| Will development of the site have a detrimental effect on locally listed buildings? | | | | No | Maybe | | Yes | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 4: SUITABILITY(SUSTAINABILITY) CONT’D** | | | | | | | | |
| **Utilities** | Is there sufficient local capacity to accommodate development of Gas, Water, Electric, Telephone, Broadband on the site? | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| If not, is there evidence that additional/new provision will be made? | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| **Social Aspects:** | | | | | | | | |
| **Housing**  **Transport & Access** | Willthe site development provide affordable housing provision? | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| Will the site development have a detrimental impact on adjoining property? | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Will the site development conflict with adjoining uses? | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Will the likely scale of the site development have a detrimental impact on traffic volume? | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Will the likely scale of the development have a detrimental impact on public safety? | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Will site development have a detrimental impact on surrounding properties | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Can the site be accessed safely by pedestrians with push chairs and cyclists. | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| Has site exit / entrance got clear views of oncoming traffic? | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| Has oncoming traffic got clear views of site entrance? | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| Does the site impact on known traffic bottlenecks? | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Does the site impact on known traffic blackspots? | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Are there road capacity or highway issues? | | | No | Maybe | | | Yes |
| Does the site have connections to existing footways? | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| Distance from recreation facilities: | | | <400m | 400-800m | | | >800m |
| Distance from footway: **<400m 400-800m >800m** | | |  |  | | |  |
| Distance from open space: **<400m 400-800m >800m** | | |  |  | | |  |
| Distance from food shops: **<400m 400-800m >800m** | | |  |  | | |  |
| Distance to bus stop: **<400m 400-800m >800m** | | |  |  | | |  |
| Can food shops be accessed by bus? | | | Yes | Maybe | | | No |
| **Economic Aspects**: | | | | | | | | |
| Would development of the site support local businesses? | | | | Yes | | Maybe | | No |
| Is the site within walking distance of local businesses? | | | | Yes | | Maybe | | No |
| Would development involve the loss of business premises? | | | | No | | Maybe | | Yes |
| Would development facilitate the provision of additional/new/upgraded business premises? | | | | Yes | | Maybe | | No |
| Sub Totals: | | | |  | |  | |  |
|  | | | | Col A+B | | | Col B+C | |
| SECTION 3 – SUSTAINABILITY - SCORE | | | |  | | |  | |
| Site is suitable  (continue assessment) | | Site may be suitable (continue assessment) | Site is not suitable  (no further action) | | | | | |
|  | |  |  | | | | | |
| **Assessors Name:** (Capitals) | | **Assessors Signature:** | **Date:** | | | | | |
|  | |  |  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 5: ACCEPTABILITY** | | | | | | |
| *This section forms an objective assessment of the site based on ‘acceptability’ criteria expressed in the parish questionnaire and consultations.* | | | | | | |
| How many dwellings would the development site support? | | |  | <5 | | >10 |
| Would the landowner consider **part-site** development? | | | Yes | Maybe | | No |
| How many dwellings would the **part-site** development support? | | | 5-10 | <5 | | >10 |
| Is the development site adjacent to the settlement envelope | | | Yes | Maybe | | No |
| Does the development site offer road frontage? | | | Yes |  | | No |
| Is the development site to the rear of existing properties? | | | No | Maybe | | Yes |
| Is the development site in the open countryside | | | No | Maybe | | Yes |
|  | | |  |  | |  |
|  | | |  |  | |  |
|  | | |  |  | |  |
| Sub Totals: | | |  |  | |  |
|  | | | Col A+B | | Col B+C | |
| SECTION 4 – ACCEPTABILITY - SCORE | | |  | |  | |
|  | | |  | |  | |
| Site is suitable  (continue assessment) | Site may be suitable (continue assessment) | Site is not suitable  (no further action) | | | | |
|  |  |  | | | | |

*‘Open countryside’ is defined as a site which* has ‘road *frontage’ but is not located adjacent to an existing property or the settlement envelope. Comments please re definition!*

*Outside the settlement envelope and occupying agricultural/greenfield land??*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 6: SITE SCORE RATING** | | |
| Score c/f | Col A + B | Col B + C |
| SECTION 1 |  |  |
| SECTION 2 |  |  |
| SECTION 3 |  |  |
| SECTION 4 |  |  |
| Grand totals |  |  |
| **CONCLUSION:** | | |
| Site is suitable  (continue assessment) | Site may be suitable (continue assessment) | Site is not suitable  (no further action) |
|  |  |  |
| **Assessors Name**  (Block Capitals) | **Assessors**  **Signature:** | **Date:** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Note. The individual score rating of the ‘site’ will enable a parish-wide league table to be created identifying sites in ‘ease of development’/preference order. The spread of these throughout the parish along with the type/mix of development (private/affordable/social), quality of build, blend-ability etc will need to be the subject of another study once viable sites are identified. JP thoughts.

**The following to be used in writing the report (summary of assessment criteria)**

**Annex 1 Site Summary.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SITE NUMBER:** | **SITE NAME:** |
| Site picture | **Description to include:**  Topography  Agricultural grade of land  Footpaths and usage  Flooding  Use  Buildings  Area in hectares  Brownfield/Greenfield |
| **Access** |
| **Comments to objectively summarise:**  Availability  Achievability  Suitability  Acceptability  Overall impact |