Central Bedfordshire Council www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk



# Site Assessment Forms Cranfield

# Contents

ALP015	3
ALP109	10
ALP135	19
ALP185	
ALP188	34
ALP238	36
ALP289	39
ALP290	-
ALP353	
ALP363	60
NLP104	67
NLP139	74
NLP173	83
NLP176	85
NLP198	87
NLP202	95
NLP260	97
NLP261	99
NLP266	106
NLP315	114
NLP394	123
NLP417	131
NLP486	133

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>1</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP015
Site Name	Land at Bedford Road
Site Address	Land at Bedford Road, East End, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 3.80ha
	Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.80ha
	Measured GIS Area: 3.59ha
Proposed Use	Residential
Any other	Similar/adjoining submissions: NLP104, NLP315, ALP109
information	

## STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAC					
	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
-	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10	No	Number of proposed dwellings as		
	dwellings?		per proforma:		
	Work out the number of new homes from site size				
	using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 %		150 homes		
	depending on site size of land for infrastructure and				
	services, take into account topography or significant				
	areas of undevelopable land.				
	Site Size Gross to net ratio standards		Number of proposed dwellings as		
	<ul> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> </ul>		per CBC methodology:		
	• 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%				
	<ul> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul>		64 dwellings		
	Note: for this calculation use the submitted				
	Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if				
	this is smaller.				
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally	No	No designations on site.		
	significant designations? These are: Sites of Special				
	Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves,				
	Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and				
	Gardens.				
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
-	of Outstanding Natural Beauty?				
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

PageJ

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>2</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the western boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

STAG	GE 1C ASSESSMENT			
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>3</sup> .			
Critic	Critical Infrastructure			
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure	А	2014 Call for Sites did not answer	
	requirements that will enable delivery <sup>4</sup> ?		this question	
Does	Does the site continue to next stage? Yes			

	STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT			
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for			
	opment where there are no legal or ownership problems	s and the	landowner has expressed an	
intent	ion to develop the site.			
Availa	ability			
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	Site is currently in agricultural use, submission states no relocation required but isn't clear about demolition.	
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	Site has been submitted on behalf of sole land owner, intention to develop is stated.	
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	Submission states no legal or ownership issues.	
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	No.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

<sup>2</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locallyled garden villages towns and cities.pdf )

Page<sup>4</sup>

Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development. <sup>4</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements

will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

CT A C				
	STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT			
	This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary			
	ning of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable			
	nstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined			
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circo	umstance	es to considered for allocation in the	
Plan.				
Greer				
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No		
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A		
	within one of the parcels which have been identified			
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt			
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no			
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage			
	2.			
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A		
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which			
	may contribute to identification of exceptional			
	circumstances?			
	<ul> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the</li> </ul>			
	following key local services - convenience			
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper			
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,			
	library (use settlement audit)			
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>			
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA			
	<ul> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct</li> </ul>			
	that has a mainline rail station or direct			
	assess (junction) to the strategic road			
	network (A road or motorway)			
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14			
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not			
	progress any further in this assessment of			
	suitability.*			
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	N/A		
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted			
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject			
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the			
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress			
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage			
	2. <sup>5</sup>			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	
	U U			

## STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.

Prev	Previously Developed Land				
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	No part of site PDL.		
	with the NPPF definition?				
	• 76% - 100% (G)				
	• 26 - 75% (A)				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

<b>^</b> -	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)	I	
	munity	T	
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has
	designated areas)		been designated for a
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Neighbourhood Plan.
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		-
18	Community Consultation	N/A	This was not asked in 2014 Call for
	Has any community consultation taken place?		Sites.
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	The site is currently in agricultural
10	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		use.
	the settlement through the loss of services and		use.
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
<b>0</b>	house etc)		
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	Α	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completion
	be completed?		in 2016: 346
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage growth: 16.47%
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	More than 20% growth (R)		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions		
	data).		
Phys	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	R	The topography of the site is very
	features that affect the site's developability?		uneven. This would significantly
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		impact any development of the site
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
Relat	tionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	No impact
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an	-	
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		
	form?		
Aario	cultural Land Quality		
<u>Agric</u> 24	Would the development impact on high quality	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural
24		~	
	agricultural land?		Land. The most recent data from
	• 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)		Natural England does not sub-
	• 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)		classify Grades 3a and 3b.
	<ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>		Therefore site must be rated
			Amber.

Page 6

STAG	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme		
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		d at this stage as the ratings across
Stage	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		
Trans	sport and Access to Services Facilities and services		
25			
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the si	te for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately	-	
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
	applicable)?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		~
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.
	centre?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
	<ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
	None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	G	
	least hourly at peak times):		
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>		
	• 400m-800m (A)		
	<ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>		
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
	• Over 1200m (R)		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Yes, access shown onto Bliss

Page 7

			Avenue.
Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	R	Area is marked as red due to increasing pressure on middle school places and the lack of expansion capacity on the existing middle school site. A new middle school site would be required from further significant development in Cranfield
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	R	No commitment made.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of
			any upgrades required.
<u>Drain</u> 33	<ul> <li>age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te</li> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	A	Ordinary Watercourse present, JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk
Envir	onmental Health		
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	G	
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	G	
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	R	Development not acceptable in landscape terms– site integral to open slopes of the Cranfield clay ridge
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?	Her: G Arch:	Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation

Page8

	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	А	providing appropriate mitigation is
	these assets?		undertaken. No heritage comment.
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Maintain, buffer and enhance hedgerow corridors. Potential impact on farmland species. CWS 150m east
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	R	Parish GI plan identifies aspiration to create pocket park on 015 and inside of 104. Key views looking SE across to Marston Thrift identified – development of 015 and 104 would affect. ROW across southern edges of 104 and 109, would need to enhance. 315 and 109 amber, 015 and 104 red. All sites within the Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover. Awaiting leisure comments
Miner	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues
Planr	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

Site is not appropriate for development. The site is integral to the open slopes of the Cranfield clay ridge, and the topography of the site would present constraints. Development of the site could have a potential impact on farmland species and there is a County Wildlife site 150m to the east. The parish plan identifies an aspiration to create a pocket park on this site, and the key views looking South East across to Marston Thrift would be affected by development of the site. An Ordinary Watercourse has been identified on site; further modelling would be required to understand the flood risk. There have also been significant concerns raised by education in relation to the development of small sites in Cranfield. There are also likely to be significant constraints presented by topography on this site. The site will not be considered any further in this process.

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>6</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP109
Site Name	East End Farm, Cranfield
Site Address	East End Farm, Bedford Road, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 4ha
	Submitted Whole Site Area: 4ha
	Measured GIS Area: 4.60ha
Proposed Use	Residential
Any other	Very similar to NLP315, site also included in larger submission NLP104
information	

## **STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)**

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT			
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.			
	sional Site Capacity			
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 75 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 72 dwellings	
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	e Seque	ntial Test)	
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	,	
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)	
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.	
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

Page L

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>7</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the western boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.	
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

 STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>8</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>8</sup>.

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>9</sup>?
 A
 No information provided. This question was not asked in 2014 Call for Sites.

 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

STAG	STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for				
devel	opment where there are no legal or ownership problems	s and the	landowner has expressed an		
intent	ion to develop the site.				
Availa	ability				
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	A	Site is currently used for Agricultural purposes, there are some buildings which would need to be removed/ relocated but no details are given.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted by a developer on behalf of the sole landowner.		
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	No legal or ownership issues are identified on the submission form.		
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red	G	No.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

because it's not eligible for allocation.		
Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes

STAC	STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT			
	This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary			
	screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional			
	nstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined			
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circl			
Plan.		instance		
Greer	abolt			
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No		
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A		
	within one of the parcels which have been identified			
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt			
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no			
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage			
	2.			
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A		
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which			
	may contribute to identification of exceptional			
	circumstances?			
	<ul> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the</li> </ul>			
	following key local services - convenience			
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper			
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,			
	library (use settlement audit)			
	Site makes a strong contribution to housing			
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA			
	<ul> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement</li> </ul>			
	that has a mainline rail station or direct			
	assess (junction) to the strategic road			
	network (A road or motorway)			
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14			
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not			
	progress any further in this assessment of			
451	suitability.*			
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	N/A		
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted			
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject			
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the			
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress			
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage			
	2.10			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

## **STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)**

#### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.

FIEV	Freviously Developed Land			
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	No part of site is PDL.	1
	with the NPPF definition?			Ι,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Page 🛛

	700/ 4000/ (0)		
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
Com	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
17	nunity	No	Cranfield is not a pariab which has
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas)	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has been designated for a
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Neighbourhood Plan.
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		Neighbourhood Flam.
18	Community Consultation	No	The submission form states that no
10	Has any community consultation taken place?	INO	consultation has yet taken place.
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		concentration nucly of taken place.
	consultation took and any overall community		
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	The site is currently in agricultural
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		use.
	the settlement through the loss of services and		
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
Cumu	llative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	А	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		in 2016: 346
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>		Percentage growth: 16.47%
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions		
<b>D</b> I	data).		
	cal Constraints	Δ	The tenegraphy of the site is
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	А	The topography of the site is
	features that affect the site's developability?		uneven. This would impact any
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		development of the site.
Rolati	works, topography or wind turbines.	L	
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	No impact
23	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an	9	Νυπιμασι
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		
	form?		
Agric	ultural Land Quality	l	
24	Would the development impact on high quality	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural
- ·	agricultural land?	/ ``	Land. The most recent data from
	<ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul>		Natural England does not sub-
	<ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>		classify Grades 3a and 3b.
		1	

 ${}_{\rm Page}13$ 

<ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	Therefore site must be rated
	Amber.

0740			
			te de la constallata. A se due tie e feu
	tage further assesses the site's suitability using comme		
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		d at this stage as the ratings across
	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	<u>).</u>	
	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		te fen heurine. It linke te the
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	or the si	te for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes
254	• Yes, in the settlement (G)	U	103
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
200	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
	<ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
	None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	A	450.76m
	least hourly at peak times):		
	• Less than 400m (G)		
	• 400m-800m (A)		
	Over 800m (R)     OP submission form stated that improved		
	OR submission form stated that improved		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
20	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>200m (A)</li> </ul>		
	• 800m-1200m (A)	<u> </u>	

 $_{\rm Page}14$ 

	• Over 1200m (R)	1	
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Yes, access shown onto Bliss
23		0	Avenue.
Scho	ol Capacity		Avenue.
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Cumulative impact of a number of
50			smaller developments would be a
			concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	A	Significant level of development in
31	this?	A	Cranfield. A new lower school site
	u 115 :		was provided within the Land rear
			of Central Garage development
			and this could potentially
			accommodate a further form of
			entry, equivalent to around 500 –
			700 additional dwellings. The
			middle school is already at
			capacity. Pupils historically travel to
			Wootton Upper School in Beds
			Borough from year 9 onwards.
			Financial contributions would be
			required and potential new lower
			and middle school sites. No
			commitment made in submission.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a
	infrastructure for waste water and potable water?		statutory duty to supply water and
			waste water infrastructure to new
			development sites and a lack of
			available capacity does not prevent
			future development. Any
			infrastructure upgrades required
			will depend on the quantum and
			location of growth falling within
			each catchment area. Whilst the
			Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April
			2017) identifies the current capacity
			of existing water infrastructure, a
			Stage 2 study will be prepared to
			test the cumulative effect of sites
			that have been shortlisted for
			allocation in the Local Plan and
			identify the nature and timing of
			any upgrades required.
	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	est)	
33	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	А	Ordinary Watercourse present,
	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?		JFlow modelling required to confirm
	<ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>		flood risk.
	<ul> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>		
	Further Assessment Required (R)		
Envi	onmental Health		
34	Contamination	G	No significant features
	Are there any contamination constraints on site and		
	will there be any remediation required?		
35	Adjoining uses	G	
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
		·	

 ${}^{\rm Page}15$ 

	noise and smell)		
Envir	ronmental Constraints		•
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	R	Not suitable for development in landscape terms– edge of important clayland scarp slope providing setting of Cranfield.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?	Her: G Arch: A	Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken. No heritage comment.
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Need to buffer and enhance southern hedgerow corridor. Potential impact on farmland species
39	<b>Open space/leisure and Gl assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	A	No specific aspirations for site in parish GI plan. RoW on south and west sides. Adjacent to existing woodland – would need buffering and extending. Site within Marston Vale – 30% tree cover would be required. No loss of LS Open Space.
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues.
	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

## **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is considered worthy of further assessment. Whilst the topography of the site is slightly uneven in places and it is on the edge of an important clayland scarp slope, there is potential for a portion of the site to be developed. This portion would need to provide mitigation to address landscape impact, and buffering would be required to protect and enhance the southern hedgerow corridor. The site would also need to be well designed to integrate with the ROW which is clearly well used and popular with the community. In addition an Ordinary Watercourse has been identified; further modelling will be required to confirm the flood risk. The site has multi-period archaeological potential; this would not prevent allocation providing that appropriate mitigation was undertaken. A potential issue with education capacity was identified, this may also require mitigation.

#### **STAGE 3 : ACHIEVABILITY**

This section assesses whether the site is Achievable in line with NPPG Guidance: A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of the site, and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period.

Viability

$$P_{age}16$$

43 Achie	<ul> <li>Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?</li> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value</li> <li>Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value</li> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value</li> </ul>	Develop 2017) in of deve and at t both the benchm such th	uncil's Residential pment Viability Report (Feb ndicates that residual value lopment in this value area this scale would exceed e upper and lower nark land values and as e report indicates that such pment would likely be viable	
44	Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?	submiss The Co Develop 2017) is property 2016. T Central significa property period of conside develop been ca 2016 D a 17.9% with an increas Central This ind been a trends i transpo success significa within th West R upgrade Express Guided and pot is consi infrastro property Authorit increas develop	very issues stated on sion. uncil's Residential pment Viability Report (Feb s based upon residential y figures between 2013 and 'he housing market within Bedfordshire has seen ant increases in residential y values in a relatively short of time, whereby it is ered that the viability of oments within this report has autious. For example in unstable has benefited from 6 housing price increase average annual house price e in 2016 for housing within Bedfordshire of 10.74%. crease in property value has result of not only national in house prices and existing ort links to economically sful areas but also ant infrastructure projects he pipeline including: East- ail; M1-A5 link road; A421 es; Oxford to Cambridge s Way; Luton and Dunstable Busway; M1 improvements. It idered that as such ucture projects progress that y prices within the Local ty will likely continue to e which has and will e viability/deliverability of oment not only in the higher reas but also the lower reas of the Authority.	
45	<ul> <li>When can the scheme realistically commence delivery?</li> <li>0 to 5 years (deliverable)</li> <li>6 to 10 years</li> <li>11 to 15 years</li> <li>15 to 20 years</li> <li>Outside Plan Period</li> </ul>	Form s	uggests delivery could start 1 (Deliverable).	$P_{age}17$

46	What is the indicative build out time of the site?	Submission suggests it would take 5 years to build out the suggested 75 units (15 units per year). The Case Study Sites outlined within the Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that after the site has received detailed planning permission a single housebuilder would likely take one year to first completion and would build out the site at a rate of 50 dwellings per annum there after.
Does	the site pass this stage?	Yes

## SUMMARY

The sites that pass through this assessment process will not automatically be allocated for development in the Local Plan.

Sites will be selected with reference to a number of other factors including:

- The strategy, vision and objectives proposed in the draft plan
- Technical evidence studies
- The sustainability appraisal process
- The results of public consultation
- Flood Risk Sequential Approach
- Further transport modelling
- Consultation with neighbouring authorities

Page J

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>11</sup>

Site details	Site details				
Reference Number	ALP135				
Site Name	Land north of Crawley Road/Bourne End Road				
Site Address	Land north of Crawley Road/Bourne End Road, Cranfield				
Settlement	Cranfield				
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 6.4ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 9.25ha Measured GIS Area: 9.49ha				
Proposed Use	Residential				
Any other information	Very similar to submission NLP266				

## STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT					
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.					
Provis	Provisional Site Capacity					
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 190 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 115 dwellings			
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)			
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No				
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No				
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)			
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.			
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes			

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

Page 19

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>12</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the majority of its southern boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

**STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT** This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastru

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their entited initiastructure needs.					
Critical Infrastructure					
8 Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure</b> requirements that will enable delivery <sup>14</sup> ?		ormation provided. This on was not asked in 2014 r Sites.			
Does the site continue to next stage?	Yes				

**STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site.

Availa	ability		
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	Site is greenfield.
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	A	The site has been submitted by an agent on behalf of a developer. The landowner's names are provided and intention to develop is stated. No further details on landowner addresses are provided.
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	The submission form states that there are no legal issues or tenancies which would delay development.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	Planning Applications for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf</u>)
<sup>13</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	residential development recently refused. See application numbers CB/16/02039/OUT and CB/17/00976/OUT
Does the site continue to next stage?	Yes

#### STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan.

Greer	Greenbelt				
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No			
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.	N/A			
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A			
15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>15</sup>	N/A			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

## STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.

Page∡

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Previ	ously Developed Land		
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	No part of the site is PDL.
-	with the NPPF definition?		
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Com	nunity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has
17	designated areas)		been designated for a
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Neighbourhood Plan.
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		Neighbourhood Flah.
18	Community Consultation	Yes	Consultation took place for
	Has any community consultation taken place?	100	planning application, including
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		community event and meeting with
	consultation took and any overall community		parish council.
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	The site is currently in agricultural
10	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		use.
	the settlement through the loss of services and		400.
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
Cum	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	А	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		in 2016: 346
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>		Percentage growth: 16.47%
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		5 5
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions		
	data).		
Phys	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	R	Proximity of the site to airfield and
	features that affect the site's developability?		flight path.
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
Relat	ionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	R	Development of this site would
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		extend Cranfield into what is
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		currently predominantly open
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		countryside with some low-density
	form?		housing, set back from the road, to
			the south and forming the edge of
			this settlement and setting
	1	1	and bottion one and botting

 ${\rm Page}22$ 

			Cranfield within the wider countryside.
Agric	cultural Land Quality		
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.

OT A			
	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme		
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		d at this stage as the ratings across
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		
	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
250	applicable)?	0	163
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
~=	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.
	centre?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)	•	
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
27	None (R)     Distance to hus stone with a frequent convice (at	R	
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	ĸ	
	least hourly at peak times):		
	• Less than 400m (G)		
	• 400m-800m (A)		

I			]
	• Over 800m (R)		
	OR submission form stated that improved		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> </ul>		
	• Over 1200m (R)		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Site fronts onto Crawley Road and
	5		Bourne End Road.
Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Cumulative impact of a number of smaller developments would be a concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	A	Significant level of development in
51	this?		Cranfield. A new lower school site
			was provided within the Land rear
			of Central Garage development
			and this could potentially
			accommodate a further form of
			entry, equivalent to around 500 –
			700 additional dwellings. The middle school is already at
			capacity. Pupils historically travel to
			Wootton Upper School in Beds
			Borough from year 9 onwards.
			<b>U</b>
			Financial contributions would be
			required and potential new lower
			and middle school sites. No
	Hilitian (Con Flootniaity and Press they don't		commitment made in submission.
	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc		
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a
	infrastructure for waste water and potable water?		statutory duty to supply water and
			waste water infrastructure to new
			development sites and a lack of
			available capacity does not prevent
			future development. Any
			infrastructure upgrades required
			will depend on the quantum and
			location of growth falling within
			each catchment area. Whilst the
			Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April
			2017) identifies the current capacity
			of existing water infrastructure, a
			Stage 2 study will be prepared to
			test the cumulative effect of sites
			that have been shortlisted for
			allocation in the Local Plan and
			identify the nature and timing of
			any upgrades required.
Drain	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	st)	
			Ordinary Watercourse present,
33	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	A	
33	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?	A	
33	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?	A	JFlow modelling required to confirm
33	<ul><li>site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li><li>No assessment required (G)</li></ul>	A	
33	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?	A	JFlow modelling required to confirm

 ${}_{\rm Page}24$ 

<ul> <li>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>Environmental Constraints</li> <li>Landscape character</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?</li> <li>Heritage/ Archaeology</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?</li> <li>Ecological Assets</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?</li> <li>Arable land with grazed paddou for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.</li> <li>Open space/leisure and Gl assets</li> </ul>	Envi	ronmental Health		
Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?       Some scope if well integrated respected scale of Gossards C and character of clay plateau t west.         36       Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?       A       Some scope if well integrated respected scale of Gossards C and character of clay plateau t west.         37       Heritage/Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?       Her: G       Site has been evaluated and ft to have low archaeological Arch: G         38       Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?       A/G       Arable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with corean space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?       G       Limited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI networ Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp ace and green infrastructure?         40       What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste mineral safeguarding sites?       G       No issues         40       What would			G	No significant features
will there be any remediation required?       G         35       Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)       G       Noise from Airfield / Football C         Environmental Constraints       A       Some scope if well integrated respected scale of Gossards O and character of clay plateau t west.         36       Landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?       A       Some scope if well integrated and respected scale of Gossards O and character of clay plateau t west.         37       Heritage Archaeology       Her: G       Site has been evaluated and ft to have low archaeological Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?       Her: G       Site has been evaluated and ft to have low archaeological Are there any opportunities for their enhancement?         38       Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?       A/G       Arable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bound trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.         39       Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?       G       Limited aspirations identified in Forest of		Are there any contamination constraints on site and		5
35       Adjoining uses       G       Noise from Airfield / Football C         36       Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)       Noise from Airfield / Football C         36       Landscape character       A       Some scope if well integrated indicates of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?       A       Site has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.         37       Heritage/Archaeology       Her:       G       Site has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.         38       Ecological Assets       A/G       Arable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.         39       Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any opportunities for their enhancement?       G       Limited aspirations identified ir Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sy and green infrastructure?         39       Open space/leisure and GI assets and meet and green infrastructure?       G       No issues         40       What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?       G <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)Image: Some scope if well integrated respected scale of Gossards C and character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?ASome scope if well integrated respected scale of Gossards C and character of clay plateau t west.37Heritage/Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G Arch: GSite has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/G Arable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and boundar trees would need to be retained and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any optential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GImited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of G Inetwork Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover a the site. No loss of LS Open space and green infrastructure?G40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	35		G	Noise from Airfield / Football Club
cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)Environmental Constraints36Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?ASome scope if well integrated respected scale of Gossards G and character of clay plateau t west.37Heritage/Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G GSite has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/G Arable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI netword Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open space and green infrastructure?40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues91Winerals and WasteGNo issues92Planning HistorySNo issues <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
noise and smell)Environmental Constraints36Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?ASome scope if well integrated respected scale of Gossards G and character of clay plateau t west.37Heritage/Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Site has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/G Arable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GNo issues40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues				
36Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?ASome scope if well integrated respected scale of Gossards C and character of clay plateau t west.37Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G Areable and with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GA40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites as and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues				
What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?respected scale of Gossards C and character of clay plateau t west.37Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G GSite has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/G GArable land with grazed paddod east. Nice hedges and boundar trees would need to be retained and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and Gl assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI networ Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues9Planning HistoryForest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open spNo	Envi	ronmental Constraints		•
Iandscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?and character of clay plateau t west.37Heritage/Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G Arch: GSite has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/GArable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified ir PGIP, and not part of GI networ Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issuesPlanning HistoryPlanning HistoryGNo issues	36	Landscape character	А	Some scope if well integrated and
Iandscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?and character of clay plateau t west.37Heritage/Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G Arch: GSite has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/GArable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified ir PGIP, and not part of GI networ Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issuesPlanning HistoryPlanning HistoryGNo issues				respected scale of Gossards Green
or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?Heritage/Archaeology to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage assets?37Heritage/Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets?Her: G GSite has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/G AArable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI networ Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues				and character of clay plateau to
Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?37Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G Arch: GSite has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/GArable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retained and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and Gl assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open s afeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues		designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		west.
Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?37Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?Her: G Arch: GSite has been evaluated and for to have low archaeological potential. No objection to alloc No heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/GArable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retained and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and Gl assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open s afeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues		or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		
<ul> <li>37 Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?</li> <li>38 Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?</li> <li>39 Open space/leisure and Gl assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?</li> <li>39 Minerals and Waste</li> <li>40 What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?</li> <li>40 What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?</li> <li><b>38</b> Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?</li> <li><b>39</b> Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?</li> <li><b>Minerals and Waste</b></li> </ul>	37		Her:	Site has been evaluated and found
Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?GNo heritage comments.38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/GArable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI network Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues		What would the impacts of development be on any	G	to have low archaeological
these assets?38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/GArable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and bounda trees would need to be retained and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and Gl assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI network Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issues		heritage assets and their setting?	Arch:	potential. No objection to allocation.
<ul> <li>38 Ecological Assets         What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?         <ul> <li>39 Open space/leisure and Gl assets             Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?</li> <li>G Minerals and Waste</li> <li>4/G Arable land with grazed paddo east. Nice hedges and boundate trees would need to be retaine and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.</li> <li>G Limited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI network Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open space and grean infrastructure?</li> <li>Minerals and Waste</li> <li>G No issues</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	G	No heritage comments.
<ul> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?</li> <li><b>39</b> Open space/leisure and Gl assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?</li> <li><b>Minerals and Waste</b></li> <li><b>40</b> What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?</li> <li><b>Flanning History</b></li> </ul>		these assets?		
<ul> <li>biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?</li> <li>39 Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?</li> <li>Minerals and Waste</li> <li>40 What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?</li> <li>Minerals and Waste</li> </ul>	38		A/G	Arable land with grazed paddock in
there any opportunities for their enhancement?and well buffered. Likely of val for farmland birds with records Brown Hare, BAP species.39Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI network Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issuesPlanning HistoryPlanning HistorySecond StateSecond State		What would the impacts of development be on any		east. Nice hedges and boundary
39Open space/leisure and Gl assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI network Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issuesPlanning HistoryPlanning HistoryForest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open sp		biological, geological or ecological assets and are		trees would need to be retained
39Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?GLimited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI network Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open spMinerals and WasteGNo issues40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GNo issuesPlanning HistoryPlanning HistoryCCC		there any opportunities for their enhancement?		and well buffered. Likely of value
<ul> <li>39 Open space/leisure and Gl assets         <ul> <li>Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?</li> <li>Minerals and Waste</li> <li>40 What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?</li> <li>G Limited aspirations identified in PGIP, and not part of GI network Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open spece</li> <li>Minerals and Waste</li> </ul> </li> <li>40 What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?</li> <li>Planning History</li> </ul>				for farmland birds with records of
Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?PGIP, and not part of GI network Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open spMinerals and WasteG40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GPlanning HistoryNo issues				
leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?       Mid Beds GI plan. Site within t Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open spece         Minerals and Waste       40       What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?       G       No issues         Planning History       Ketter       Ketter       Ketter       Ketter	39		G	
capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?       Forest of Marston Vale, so we would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open spect the site. No loss of LS Open spect the site spect				PGIP, and not part of GI network in
and green infrastructure?       would seek 30% tree cover ac the site. No loss of LS Open spectrum         Minerals and Waste       40         What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?       G         Planning History       Vertical sectors of the site sectors of the sectors of				
Minerals and Waste       the site. No loss of LS Open spectrum         40       What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?       G       No issues         Planning History       Volume       Volume       Volume       Volume				
Minerals and Waste         40       What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?       G       No issues         Planning History       Volume       Volume       Volume       Volume		and green infrastructure?		
40       What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?       G       No issues         Planning History       G       No issues       Solution				the site. No loss of LS Open space.
safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites? Planning History	-		T	
mineral safeguarding sites? Planning History	40		G	No issues
Planning History				
41 What is the sites planning history? (For example Planning application refused				
	41			
planning applications and submissions to previous (CB/16/02039/OUT and				
Allocations Plans) CB/17/00976/OUT).				/
Does the site continue to next stage? No	Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

## **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is not considered worthy of further assessment. Assessment has identified the presence of an Ordinary Watercourse; further assessment would be required to confirm flood risk. Potential issues with educational capacity have also been identified in Cranfield. The site itself is constrained by its proximity to the airfield and indeed the flightpath.

Development of this site would extend Cranfield into what is currently open countryside. This area is currently rural in nature and development of this site would represent urbanisation of this rural fringe. This would change significantly the historical and unique settlement pattern of Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. It is also considered that a residential development of this scale would not be appropriate considering the proximity of the site to the airfield. Due to the large number of sites which the Council has had submitted, at this stage it is not considered necessary to take forward sites such as this which would present noise issues for residents and may also present constraints for the Cranfield Airport in the future if it wished to expand businesses operations.

Page 26

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>16</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP185
Site Name	Land at Broad Green Farm
Site Address	Land at Broad Green Farm Broad Green Farm, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 4.52ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 20.78ha Measured GIS Area: 4.51ha
Proposed Use	Residential
Any other information	Very similar to NLP261

## STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	E 1A ASSESSMENT						
This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.							
Provisional Site Capacity							
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 150 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 81 dwellings				
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)				
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No					
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No					
	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)				
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.				
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.				
Does	the site continue to next stage?	•	Yes				

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

Page **Z** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>17</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement						
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the southern boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.				
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.				
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes				

#### STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT

This s	stage of the assessment rules out sites that are n	ot able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>18</sup> .	
Critic	al Infrastructure		
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure	A No information provided This	

8	requirements that will enable delivery <sup>19</sup> ?	A	question was not asked in 2014 Call for Sites.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

#### **STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site.

Availa	Availability						
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	Site is currently used for Agricultural purposes; submission form states that no relocation or demolition would be required.				
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted on behalf of the sole landowner. Intention to develop is stated.				
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	The submission form states that there are no legal issues or tenancies which would delay development.				
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	No.				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>18</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.
<sup>19</sup> This is an assessment based on the information based on th

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

Does the site continue to next stage?

Yes

	STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT							
	This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary							
	screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional							
	Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA							
	assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the							
Plan.								
Green								
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No						
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A						
	within one of the parcels which have been identified							
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt							
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no							
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage							
	2.							
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A						
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which							
	may contribute to identification of exceptional							
	circumstances?							
	<ul> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the</li> </ul>							
	following key local services - convenience							
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper							
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,							
	library (use settlement audit)							
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>							
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA							
	Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement							
	that has a mainline rail station or direct							
	assess (junction) to the strategic road							
	network (A road or motorway)							
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14							
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not							
	progress any further in this assessment of							
	suitability.*							
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	N/A						
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted							
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject							
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the							
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress							
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage							
	2. <sup>20</sup>							
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes					
	0							

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.

## Previously Developed Land

16	5	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	No part of the site is PDL.
		with the NPPF definition?		
		• 76% - 100% (G)		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Comm			
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has
	designated areas)	110	been designated for a
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Neighbourhood Plan.
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		C
18	Community Consultation	N/A	Not asked in 2014 Call for Sites.
	Has any community consultation taken place?		
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	The site is currently in agricultural
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of the settlement through the loss of services and		use.
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
	lative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to	А	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	be completed?		Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 346
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage growth: 16.47%
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions		
	data).		
	cal Constraints	-	
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	There are no obvious physical
	features that affect the site's developability?		constraints.
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
Relati	works, topography or wind turbines. onship to Settlement	l	
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	No issues identified.
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		
	form?		
	ultural Land Quality		
24	Would the development impact on high quality	А	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural
			Land. The most recent data from
	agricultural land?		
	50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)		Natural England does not sub-
	•		Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated

 ${}_{\rm Page}30$ 

		Amber.
	•	

STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT				
This stage further assesses the site's suitability using comments from technical specialists. A red rating for				
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		d at this stage as the ratings across	
	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance			
	port and Access to Services Facilities and services			
25	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the cit	to for housing. It links to the	
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		le for housing. It links to the	
	Council's Demement Therarchy Addit.			
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately			
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes	
200	• Yes, in the settlement (G)	Ŭ		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>			
	settlement (R)			
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes	
	applicable)?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>			
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available	
	school?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Other catchment school available (A)			
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.	
	centre?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>			
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.	
20	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)	Ŭ	Supermanier.	
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent			
	(A)			
	• None (R)			
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	А	612.44m	
	least hourly at peak times):			
	Less than 400m (G)			
	• 400m-800m (A)			
	• Over 800m (R)			
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>			
	public transport facilities could be provided as			
	part of the development (G)			
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R		
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>			

 ${}^{\rm Page}31$ 

29       Is the site accessible from the existing road network?       R       Although submission s site can be accessed f highway, it's not clear laccess would be achie access the access would be achie access the access the access the access the access would be achie access the accestates the access the accesthe access the access the a	rom how suitable eved. a number of would be a relopment in r school site e Land rear elopment ally er form of ound 500 – gs. The dy at ically travel to I in Beds onwards. is would be new lower s. No submission. <b>stage)</b> ies have a y water and
30       Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?       A       Cumulative impact of a smaller developments concern.         31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A       Significant level of dev Cranfield. A new lower was provided within tho of Central Garage dev and this could potentia accommodate a furthe entry, equivalent to arc 700 additional dwelling middle school is alread capacity. Pupils histori Wootton Upper School Borough from year 9 o Financial contributions required and potential and middle school site aread capacity. Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?       R/A/G       Water utilities company statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity doer statutory	would be a relopment in r school site e Land rear elopment ally r form of ound 500 – gs. The dy at cally travel to l in Beds onwards. would be new lower s. No submission. <b>stage)</b> ies have a y water and
31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A       Significant level of dev Cranfield. A new lower was provided within the of Central Garage dev and this could potentia accommodate a furthe entry, equivalent to arc 700 additional dwelling middle school is alread capacity. Pupils histori Wootton Upper School Borough from year 9 o Financial contributions required and potential and middle school site commitment made in statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure for waste water and potable water?         32       Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?       R/A/G       Water utilities compani statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity does future development.	would be a relopment in r school site e Land rear elopment ally r form of ound 500 – gs. The dy at cally travel to l in Beds onwards. would be new lower s. No submission. <b>stage)</b> ies have a y water and
this?       Cranfield. A new lower was provided within the of Central Garage deviand this could potential accommodate a furthe entry, equivalent to arc 700 additional dwelling middle school is alread capacity. Pupils histori Wootton Upper School Borough from year 9 o Financial contributions required and potential and middle school site commitment made in s         Water Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastructure will be assessed at a later 32         Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?       R/A/G         Water utilities capacity does during the statutory duty to supply waste water infrastructure development. An available capacity does future development.	r school site e Land rear elopment ally r form of bund 500 – gs. The dy at ically travel to I in Beds inwards. would be new lower is. No submission. <b>stage)</b> ies have a y water and
32 Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water? Water utilities company statutory duty to supply waste water infrastruct development sites and available capacity does future development. An	ies have a y water and
32 Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water? Water utilities company statutory duty to supply waste water infrastruct development sites and available capacity does future development. An	ies have a y water and
infrastructure for waste water and potable water? statutory duty to supply waste water infrastruct development sites and available capacity does future development. An	y water and
will depend on the qua location of growth fallin each catchment area. Stage 1 Water Cycle S 2017) identifies the cur of existing water infras Stage 2 study will be p test the cumulative effet that have been shortlis allocation in the Local identify the nature and any upgrades required	a lack of s not prevent ny s required antum and ng within Whilst the Study (April rrent capacity structure, a prepared to ect of sites sted for Plan and timing of
Drainage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Test)	
<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?         <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Environmental Health	
34Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?GNo significant features	
35       Adjoining uses       G       Nothing obvious from p         Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;       G       Nothing obvious from p	pollution

 ${}^{\rm Page}32$ 

	noise and smell)				
Envi	ronmental Constraints				
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	A	Some scope for limited development only if set within landscape mitigation.		
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?	Her: A Arch: R	Unsuitable for allocation in archaeological terms, site lies immediately adjacent to a Scheduled Monument. Heritage comment next to SAM.		
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Need to buffer and enhance hedgerows and central pond, potential impact on farmland species.		
39	<b>Open space/leisure and Gl assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	R	Parish GI plan identifies aspiration for allotments on this site. Adjacent to Moat Farm monument. Site within Marston Vale – 30% tree cover would be required. No loss of LS open space.		
Mine	erals and Waste				
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues		
Plan	Planning History				
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None.		
Does	s the site continue to next stage?		No		

## STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is not considered worthy of further assessment. Assessment has identified the presence of an Ordinary Watercourse; further assessment would be required to confirm flood risk. Potential issues with educational capacity have also been identified in Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure.

The site is not suitable for allocation because it is adjacent to a Scheduled Monument. In addition to this the parish plan identifies an aspiration for allotments on this site and it is not clear how access could be achieved for this site. There is also a potential impact on farmland species from development of this site. This site will not be assessed any further as part of this process.

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>21</sup>

Site details			
Reference Number ALP188			
Site Name Land at Wharley Farm, Cranfield			
Site Address	Land at Wharley Farm, College Road, Wharley End, Cranfield		
Settlement	Cranfield		
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 14.14ha		
	Submitted Whole Site Area: 88ha		
	Measured GIS Area: 14.65ha		
Proposed Use	Residential and education/community facilities		
Any other The site adjoins Cranfield University. Very similar to NLP260			
information			

## STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT			
This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provisional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 425 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 255 dwellings	
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	e Seque	ntial Test)	
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)	
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.	
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.	
Does the site continue to next stage? Yes			Yes	

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

Page34

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>22</sup> . Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	R	The site is not of a sufficient scale to be self contained and does not relate well to the existing settlement of Cranfield as defined by the settlement envelope. The site does have some relationship to the University, but the Airfield separates the site from the main Cranfield settlement.	
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does the site continue to next stage?			No	

 ${}^{\rm Page}35$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>23</sup>

Site details				
Reference Number	ALP238			
Site Name	Land west of Mill Road, Cranfield			
Site Address	Land west of Mill Road, Cranfield			
Settlement	Cranfield			
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 7.76ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 10.86ha Measured GIS Area: 10.89ha			
Proposed Use	Residential			
Any other information				

## STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provisional Site Capacity				
<ul> <li>Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?</li> <li>Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land.</li> <li>Site Size Gross to net ratio standards <ul> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul> </li> <li>Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.</li> </ul>	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 230 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 140 dwellings		
Flood Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the Sequential Test)				
2 Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3 Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Nationally significant designations (All sites which reach S	Stage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4 Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5 Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does the site continue to next stage?	Yes			

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

 $<sup>{}^{\</sup>rm Page}36$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.
towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>24</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the eastern boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

 STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>25</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>26</sup>?
 A
 No information provided. This question was not asked in 2014 Call for Sites.

 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

STAG	STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT				
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for				
develo	opment where there are no legal or ownership problems	and the	landowner has expressed an		
intenti	ion to develop the site.				
Availa	ability				
9	What is the existing use of the site?	G	Site is currently used for		
	Would the existing use limit the development		Agricultural purposes; submission		
	potential?		form states that no relocation or		
			demolition would be required.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner	А	The site has been submitted by a		
	who has expressed an intention to develop the site?		land agent on behalf of the		
			landowners. Intention to develop is		
			stated and land owner names and		
			addresses are provided.		
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could	G	The submission form states that		
	delay or prevent development?		there are no legal issues or		
	If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically		tenancies which would delay		
	overcome?		development.		
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	R	Yes.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>25</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	CB/14/05007/OUT. Granted for 230 dwellings.
Does the site continue to next stage?	No

 ${}^{\rm Page}38$ 

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>27</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP289
Site Name	Land North of Rectory Lane
Site Address	Land North of Rectory Lane, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 3.70ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.70ha Measured GIS Area: 3.57ha
Proposed Use	Residential
Any other information	

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provis	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 60 units Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 64 units		
Flood	Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.		ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

# **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

 $<sup>{}^{\</sup>rm Page}39$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>28</sup>.

Relat	ionship to Settlement		
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Cranfield, bordering the existing settlement envelope to the west.
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

-	GE 1C ASSESSMENT				
This	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>29</sup> .				
Critic	cal Infrastructure				
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure	Α	This question was not asked in Call		
	requirements that will enable delivery <sup>30</sup> ?		for Sites 2014		
Does	Does the site continue to next stage? Yes				

This : devel	<b>GE 1D ASSESSMENT</b> stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not avai lopment where there are no legal or ownership problems tion to develop the site.		
Avail	lability		
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	Site is currently pasture land and no demolition or relocation would be required.
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted on behalf of the sole landowner, intention to develop is stated.
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	A	Potential issues.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	No
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>29</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

Page4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

STAG	STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT				
This s	This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary				
	screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional				
	nstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined				
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circu	umstance	es to considered for allocation in the		
Plan.					
	Greenbelt				
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No			
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A			
	within one of the parcels which have been identified				
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt				
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no				
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage				
	2.				
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A			
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which				
	may contribute to identification of exceptional				
	circumstances?				
	Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the				
	following key local services - convenience				
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper				
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,				
	library (use settlement audit)				
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>				
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA				
	<ul> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement</li> </ul>				
	that has a mainline rail station or direct				
	assess (junction) to the strategic road				
	network (A road or motorway)				
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14				
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not		*		
	progress any further in this assessment of				
	suitability.*				
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	N/A			
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted				
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject				
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the				
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress				
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage				
	2.31				
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		
	, and the second s				

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

# STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.

Previ	Previously Developed Land				
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	No.		
	with the NPPF definition?				
	• 76% - 100% (G)				
	• 26 - 75% (A)				
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Com	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has
	designated areas)		been designated for a
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Neighbourhood Plan.
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		
18	Community Consultation	N/A	This question was not asked in Call
	Has any community consultation taken place?		for Sites 2014.
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	
19	•	INU	
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		
	the settlement through the loss of services and		
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
•	house etc)		
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	More than 20% growth (R)		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	А	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		in 2016: 346
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage growth: 16.47%
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions data).		
Phys	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	A	Site has uneven topography.
	features that affect the site's developability?	<i>/</i>	
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
Rolat	works, topography or wind turbines. ionship to Settlement		l
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	No impact
23		9	
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		
And	form?		
	ultural Land Quality	•	The site is in Orada 0. Assistant to a
24	Would the development impact on high quality	А	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural
	agricultural land?		Land. The most recent data from
	<ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul>		Natural England does not sub-
	<ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>		classify Grades 3a and 3b.
		1	Therefore site must be rated
	<ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>		Amber.

Page42

STAG	GE 2 ASSESSMENT			
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	nts from	technical specialists. A red rating for	
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically			
Stage	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		<b>·</b> · ·	
	sport and Access to Services			
25	Facilities and services			
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the	
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.			
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately			
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes	
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>			
	settlement (R)			
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes	
	applicable)?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		· · · · ·	
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Other settlement ask and qualitable (A)</li> </ul>			
05.0	Other catchment school available (A)			
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?	А	Other catchment school available	
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>			
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.	
200	centre?	U	103.	
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>			
	settlement (R)			
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket	
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)			
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent			
	(A)			
	None (R)			
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R		
	least hourly at peak times):			
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>			
	• 400m-800m (A)			
	• Over 800m (R)			
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>			
	public transport facilities could be provided as			
	part of the development (G)			
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R		
	• Less than 800m (G)			
	• 800m-1200m (A)			
	• Over 1200m (R)			
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	А	Site fronts on to Rectory Road,	
			however this road may need to be	

Page43

		1	we are deal to an able and a few this
			upgraded to enable access for this number of houses.
Scho	ol Capacity		number of nouses.
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	R	Area is marked as red due to increasing pressure on middle school places and the lack of expansion capacity on the existing middle school site. A new middle school site would be required from further significant development in Cranfield.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	R	No commitment made.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	est)	
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required
Envir	ronmental Health		
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	R	Development not appropriate in landscape terms – important gateway site to open plateau landscape on crest of clay ridge.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any	Her:G Arch:	Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this

 $P_{age}44$ 

	beritage exects and their estimat	٨	would not provent allocation
	heritage assets and their setting?	А	would not prevent allocation
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of		providing appropriate mitigation is
	these assets?	-	undertaken. No heritage comment.
38	Ecological Assets	А	Grazing land, potential HPI, retains
	What would the impacts of development be on any		and enhance. Possible impact to
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		Farmland Species.
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	R	Parish GI plan identifies area as existing open space, with aspiration to renovate and improve access to Holywell Spring. Would need to buffer existing woodland, and deliver 30% woodland cover. Adjacent to bridleway to south and footpath to north, would need to enhance. Part of woodland mosaic extending from Marston Thrift SSSI.
Mino	rals and Waste	/	Awaiting leisure comments.
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	No issues
40	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including	0	110 155065
	mineral safeguarding sites?		
Plann	hing History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		None
	planning applications and submissions to previous		
	Allocations Plans)		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is not suitable for development. The site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation, providing appropriate mitigation was undertaken. There have also been significant concerns raised by education in relation to the development of small sites in Cranfield.

Importantly, the site has uneven topography, and is an important gateway site to open plateau landscape on the crest of a clay ridge. The site is used as grazing land and is a potential Habitat of Principle Importance which should be retained and enhanced, development of the site could have an impact on farmland species. The Parish GI plan identifies this area as existing open space with an aspiration to renovate and improve access to Holywell Spring.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>32</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP290
Site Name	Land at Flitt Leys Close
Site Address	Flitt Leys Close, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 3.78ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.78ha
	Measured GIS Area: 3.68ha
Proposed Use	Residential
Any other information	Adjoining submissions: ALP353, ALP386, NLP198, NLP486

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	E 1A ASSESSMENT				
This s	tage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small	ll or conf	ict with national policy designations.		
Provis	Provisional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 75 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 44 dwellings		
	this is smaller.				
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

 $P_{age}46$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

	towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>33</sup> .				
	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	Although the site does not adjoin the settlement envelope, it adjoins a housing allocation which is currently in the process of being built out. As part of the Local Plan, settlement envelopes will be updated to take account of new allocations, and in this instance it is highly likely that the boundary would be extended to include this allocation. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

### **STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT**

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>34</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>35</sup>?
 A
 This question was not asked in Call for Sites 2014.

 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

**STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site. **Availability** What is the existing use of the site? 9 G Site is currently used for Would the existing use limit the development agriculture, no demolition or potential? relocation required. 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G Site has been submitted on behalf who has expressed an intention to develop the site? of sole land owner, intention to develop is stated. 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G Submission states no legal or

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

		T	
	delay or prevent development?		ownership issues.
	If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically		
	overcome?	-	·
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	No
	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red		
_	because it's not eligible for allocation.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes
	SE 1E ASSESSMENT	<b>_</b> .	
	section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt I		
	ning of sites to determine whether they may be capable		
	mstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined		
	ssment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circ	umstanc	es to considered for allocation in the
Plan.	a halt		
Gree		No	
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No N/A	
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A	
	within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt		
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no		
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.		
15a		N/A	
158	Does the site have all of the following merits that	IN/A	
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which		
	may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?		
	<ul> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience</li> </ul>		
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper		
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,		
	library (use settlement audit)		
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>		
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA		
	<ul> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement</li> </ul>		
	that has a mainline rail station or direct		
	assess (junction) to the strategic road		
	network (A road or motorway)		
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14		
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not		
	progress any further in this assessment of		
	suitability.*		
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	N/A	
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted		
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject		
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the		
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress		
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage		
	2. <sup>36</sup>		

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT) STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any

Page48

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

	Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance. Previously Developed Land				
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? • 76% - 100% (G) • 26 - 75% (A)	R	No part of the site is PDL.		
Com	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R) munity				
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has		
17	designated areas) Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?	INO	been designated for a Neighbourhood Plan.		
18	<b>Community Consultation</b> Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.	N/A	This question was not asked in 2014 Call for Sites.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc)	No	The site is currently in agricultural use.		
Cum	ulative Impact				
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) <i>This is calculated by working out the total number of</i> <i>completions over the last ten years as a percentage</i> <i>of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using</i> <i>census and completions data).</i> What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) <i>This is calculated by working out the total number of</i> <i>outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as</i> <i>percentage of the total number of dwellings in April</i> 2016 (as calculated using census and completions	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818 Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Percentage growth: 15.57% Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 346 Percentage growth: 16.47%		
Phys	data). ical Constraints				
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	R	Proximity to the airfield.		
	tionship to Settlement				
23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	G	No impact.		

 $_{\rm Page}49$ 

Agric	Agricultural Land Quality			
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.	

	E 2 ASSESSMENT		
	tage further assesses the site's suitability using comme		
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		d at this stage as the ratings across
-	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		
	port and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately	-	
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)	-	
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
05.1	Other catchment school available (A)	0	
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement of an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
20	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)		oupermanter.
	<ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>		
	(A)		
	• None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	A	766.96m
<b>-</b> -	least hourly at peak times):		
	Less than 400m (G)		
	<ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>		
		l	

 ${}^{\rm Page}50$ 

		1	[]
	public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G) • 800m-1200m (A) • Over 1200m (R)	R	
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	A	It is proposed in the submission that access be taken from the adjoining allocated site.
	ol Capacity	-	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	R	Area is marked as red due to increasing pressure on middle school places and the lack of expansion capacity on the existing middle school site. A new middle school site would be required from further significant development in Cranfield
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	R	Submission does not commit to
	this?		new facilities.
	· Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc		
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	st)	
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required
	onmental Health		A 111
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Not suitable for development in

 ${}_{\rm Page}51$ 

	What would the impacts of development be on the		landscape terms. Site forms
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		important southern extent of
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		clayland plateau.
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		Clayland plateau.
07	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	Her:	Site has multi-period
	What would the impacts of development be on any	G	archaeological potential
	heritage assets and their setting?	Arch:	but this would not prevent
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	A	allocation providing appropriate
	these assets?		mitigation is undertaken. No
			heritage comment.
38	Ecological Assets	G	Opportunities for enhancement,
	What would the impacts of development be on any		potential impact on Farmland
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		species.
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	A/G	RoW along eastern side, would
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space,	A/G	Row along eastern side, would need to enhance. Within Forest of
39	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,	A/G	
39	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there	A/G	need to enhance. Within Forest of
39	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space	A/G	need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover.
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there	A/G	need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? rals and Waste	A/G	need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover.
Mine	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? rals and Waste What would the impacts of development be on		need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover. Awaiting leisure comments.
Mine	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? <b>rals and Waste</b> What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including		need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover. Awaiting leisure comments.
Mine 40	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? rals and Waste What would the impacts of development be on		need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover. Awaiting leisure comments.
Mine 40	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? <b>Trals and Waste</b> What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites? <b>Trans History</b>		need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover. Awaiting leisure comments.
Mine 40 Plan	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? rals and Waste What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites? ning History What is the sites planning history? (For example		need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover. Awaiting leisure comments. No issues
Mine 40 Plan	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? <b>Trals and Waste</b> What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites? <b>Trans History</b>		need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover. Awaiting leisure comments. No issues
Mine 40 Plant 41	Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? <b>Trals and Waste</b> What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites? <b>ning History</b> What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous		need to enhance. Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% woodland cover. Awaiting leisure comments. No issues

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is not considered worthy of further assessment. The sites proximity to the airfield makes it inappropriate for residential development; when considering the large amount of sites which the Council has had submitted it is not considered necessary to take forward sites such as this which would present noise issues for residents and may also present constraints for the Cranfield Airport in the future if it wished to expand businesses operations.

The site also forms the southern extent of an important clayland plateau. There have also been significant concerns raised by education in relation to the development of small sites in Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. The site also has multi-period archaeological potential, though this does not preclude allocation. In summary the site's proximity to the airfield and landscape value make it inappropriate to consider the site any further within this process.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>37</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP353
Site Name	Land at Flitt Leys Close
Site Address	Flitt Leys Close, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 2.43ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.14ha Measured GIS Area: 3.68ha
Proposed Use	Residential
Any other information	Similar/adjoining submissions: ALP386, NLP198

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAGE 1	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
This stag	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
	Provisional Site Capacity				
1 Is dv W us de se ar Si	<ul> <li>the site likely to accommodate less than 10</li> <li>wellings?</li> <li>Vork out the number of new homes from site size</li> <li>sing density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 %</li> <li>epending on site size of land for infrastructure and</li> <li>ervices, take into account topography or significant</li> <li>reas of undevelopable land.</li> <li>ite Size Gross to net ratio standards</li> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> <li>ote: for this calculation use the submitted</li> <li>evelopable Area, or the area measured in GIS if</li> </ul>	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 60 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 44 dwellings		
th	is is smaller.				
	isk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th		ntial Test)		
	more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 3?	No			
	more than 50% of the site at risk from surface ater flooding?	No			
National	Ily significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)		
siq So So	more than 50% of the site covered by nationally gnificant designations? These are: Sites of Special cientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, cheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and ardens.	No	No designations on site.		
	more than 50% of the site located within the Area	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
	e site continue to next stage?		Yes		

# STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

 $<sup>{}^{\</sup>rm Page}53$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

	towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>38</sup> .			
	ionship to Settlement			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	Although the site does not adjoin the settlement envelope, it adjoins a housing allocation which is currently in the process of being built out. As part of the Local Plan, settlement envelopes will be updated to take account of new allocations, and in this instance it is highly likely that the boundary would be extended to include this allocation. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.	
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

### **STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT**

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>39</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>40</sup>?
 A
 This question was not asked in Call for Sites 2014.

 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

**STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site. **Availability** What is the existing use of the site? 9 G Site is currently used for Would the existing use limit the development agriculture, no demolition or potential? relocation required. 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G Site has been submitted by sole who has expressed an intention to develop the site? land owner, intention to develop is stated.

**11** Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G Submission states no legal or

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf</a> )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

		T	
	delay or prevent development?		ownership issues.
	If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically		
	overcome?		·
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	No
	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red		
_	because it's not eligible for allocation.		X
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes
0746			
	GE 1E ASSESSMENT	<b>-</b>	and the summer data as a more line to sum
	section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt I		
	ning of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable		
	mstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined		~
Plan.	ssment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circ	umstand	es to considered for allocation in the
Gree	nholt		
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	
13 14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A	
14	within one of the parcels which have been identified		
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt		
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no		
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage		
	2.		· ·
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A	
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which		
	may contribute to identification of exceptional		
	circumstances?		
	Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the		
	following key local services - convenience		
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper		
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,		
	library (use settlement audit)		
	Site makes a strong contribution to housing		
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA		
	• Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement		
	that has a mainline rail station or direct		
	assess (junction) to the strategic road		
	network (A road or motorway)		
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14		
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not		
	progress any further in this assessment of		
	suitability.*		
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	N/A	
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted		
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject		
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the		
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress		
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage		
<b>D</b>	2. <sup>41</sup>		No.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT) STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any

 ${}^{\rm Page}55$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

revi	iously Developed Land		
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? • 76% - 100% (G) • 26 - 75% (A) • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)	R	No part of the site is PDL.
Com	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas) Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has been designated for a Neighbourhood Plan.
18	<b>Community Consultation</b> Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.	N/A	This question was not asked in 2014 Call for Sites.
19	Sustainability of Settlement Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc)	No	The site is currently in agricultural use.
Cum	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) This is calculated by working out the total number of completions over the last ten years as a percentage of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using census and completions data).	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818 Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Percentage growth: 15.57%
21	<ul> <li>What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> </li> <li>This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data).</li> </ul>	A	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 346 Percentage growth: 16.47%
Phys	ical Constraints		
22 Relat	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	R	The site is in close proximity to the airfield.
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	No impact.
20	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?		

Agric	Agricultural Land Quality			
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.	

STAG	STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT			
	This stage further assesses the site's suitability using comments from technical specialists. A red rating for			
any q	any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across			
	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance			
Trans	sport and Access to Services			
25	Facilities and services			
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the	
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.			
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately			
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.	
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>			
	settlement (R)			
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes	
	applicable)?			
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Other catchment school available (A)			
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available	
	school?			
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Other catchment school available (A)			
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.	
	centre?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining			
26	settlement (R)		Supermarket	
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.	
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)     Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent			
	<ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>			
	(A) Nono (P)			
27	None (R) Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	A	612.32m	
21	least hourly at peak times):		012.3211	
	Less than 400m (G)			
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> </ul>			
	Over 800m (R)     OP submission form stated that improved			
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>			

Page 57

	public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G) • 800m-1200m (A) • Over 1200m (R)	R	
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	A	It is proposed that the site would be accessed through the adjoining allocated site.
	ol Capacity	-	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	R	Area is marked as red due to increasing pressure on middle school places and the lack of expansion capacity on the existing middle school site. A new middle school site would be required from further significant development in Cranfield
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	R	No commitment made to address
	this?		this.
Water	Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te		
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required.
	onmental Health	D (1) (0	A 141
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
	onmental Constraints		Net eviteble for development in
36	Landscape character	R	Not suitable for development in

 ${}^{\rm Page}58$ 

	What would the impacts of development be on the		landscape terms – built form would
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		intrude into the open plateau
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		landscape
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		lanuscape
07	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	Llan	Cita haa muulti maniad
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	Her:	Site has multi-period
	What would the impacts of development be on any	G	archaeological potential
	heritage assets and their setting?	Arch:	but this would not prevent
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	A	allocation providing appropriate
	these assets?		mitigation is undertaken. No
			heritage comments.
38	Ecological Assets	G	Opportunities for enhancement,
	What would the impacts of development be on any		potential impact on Farmland
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		species.
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	A/G	RoW along western side, would
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		need to enhance. Within Forest of
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		Marston Vale, would need to
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space		deliver 30% woodland cover.
	and green infrastructure?		Awaiting leisure comments.
Mine	erals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	No issues
	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including		
	mineral safeguarding sites?		
Plan	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		None
	planning applications and submissions to previous		
	Allocations Plans)		
Does	s the site continue to next stage?		No

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The sites proximity to the airfield makes it inappropriate for residential development; when considering the large amount of sites which the Council has had submitted it is not considered necessary to take forward sites such as this which would present noise issues for residents and may also present constraints for the Cranfield Airport in the future if it wished to expand businesses operations.

Importantly, built development on this site would intrude into the open plateau landscape. There have also been significant concerns raised by education in relation to the development of small sites in Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. The site also has multi-period archaeological potential, though this does not preclude allocation. In summary the site's proximity to the airfield and landscape value make it inappropriate to consider the site any further within this process.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>42</sup>

Site details			
Reference Number	ALP363		
Site Name	Land adjacent to 32 Merchant Lane, Cranfield		
Site Address	Land adjacent to 32 Merchant Lane, Cranfield		
Settlement	Cranfield		
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.34ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.34ha Measured GIS Area: 0.35ha		
Proposed Use	Residential		
Any other information			

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provi	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 8-12 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 11 dwellings		
	this is smaller.				
	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?	•	Yes		

# **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

Page 60

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>43</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to the existing settlement, bordering the settlement envelope on one side.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

 STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>44</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>45</sup>?

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>45</sup>?

 9
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>45</sup>?

 9
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>45</sup>?

 9
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>45</sup>?

 9
 This question was not asked in Call for Sites 2014.

 9
 Yes

STAG	STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT				
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for				
develo	opment where there are no legal or ownership problems	and the	landowner has expressed an		
intenti	ion to develop the site.				
Availa	ability				
9	What is the existing use of the site?	G	The site is currently an orchard;		
	Would the existing use limit the development		however demolition of a small		
	potential?		outbuilding would be required.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner	G	The site has been submitted on		
	who has expressed an intention to develop the site?		behalf of the sole land owner, and		
			intention to develop is stated.		
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could	G	Form states that there are no legal		
	delay or prevent development?		or ownership issues.		
	If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically				
	overcome?				
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	No		
	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red				
	because it's not eligible for allocation.				
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages towns and cities.pdf</u>)
 <sup>44</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT         This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional         Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan.         Greenbelt         13         Is the site located within the Green Belt?			
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.	N/A	
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A	
15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>46</sup>	N/A	Details
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

# STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.

Previ	Previously Developed Land		
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	
	with the NPPF definition?		
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Com	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has
	designated areas)		been designated for a
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Neighbourhood Plan.
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		Ũ
18	Community Consultation	N/A	Not known, this was not asked in
	Has any community consultation taken place?		2014 call for sites.
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		
	the settlement through the loss of services and		
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
Cum	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	Α	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%
	• Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	A	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
21	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		in 2016: 346
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage growth: 16.47%
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	0 ( )		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions data).		
Phys	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	R	The site is in close proximity to
	features that affect the site's developability?		Cranfield Airfield.
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
Relat	ionship to Settlement	I	l
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	No impact
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an	-	
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		
	form?		
Aaric	cultural Land Quality	I	l
24	Would the development impact on high quality	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural
	agricultural land?		Land. The most recent data from
	50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)		Natural England does not sub-
	<ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>		classify Grades 3a and 3b.
			Therefore site must be rated
	• 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)		Amber.
		1	רווואפו.

Page 63

STAC	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents from	technical specialists. A red rating for
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		
	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	te for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		Ğ
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
	applicable)?		
	Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining		
26	settlement (R)	<u> </u>	Cure a mere a relient
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)     Convenience Store / Root Office / Newsgent		
	<ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>		
	(A) None (B)		
27	None (R) Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	A	470.19m
	least hourly at peak times):		
	Less than 400m (G)		
	• 400m-800m (A)		
	<ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
-	Less than 800m (G)		
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
	<ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Submission suggests that site
		-	

Page 64

			existing road network.
Scho	ol Capacity	ı	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	R	Area is marked as red due to increasing pressure on middle school places and the lack of expansion capacity on the existing middle school site. A new middle school site would be required from further significant development in Cranfield.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	R	No commitment made.
Water	Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc		
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of
<b>D</b> .			any upgrades required.
33	<ul> <li>age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required
Envir	onmental Health		
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	R	Not suitable for development in landscape terms. Site contains scrub woodland and is an integral part of the clay plateau.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?	Her: G Arch:	Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation

Page 65

	biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?		
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	G/A	Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% tree cover. Awaiting leisure comments
Mine	erals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues
Plan	ning History		•
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None
Doog	s the site continue to next stage?		No

### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The sites proximity to the airfield makes it inappropriate for residential development; when considering the large amount of sites which the Council has had submitted it is not considered necessary to take forward sites such as this which would present noise issues for residents and may also present constraints for the Cranfield Airport in the future if it wished to expand businesses operations.

The site also contains scrub woodland and is an integral part of the clay plateau. There have also been significant concerns raised by education in relation to the development of small sites in Cranfield. The site also has multi-period archaeological potential, though this does not preclude allocation. In summary the site's proximity to the airfield and landscape value make it inappropriate to consider the site any further within this process.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>47</sup>

Site details	Site details				
Reference Number	NLP104				
Site Name	Land South of Bedford Road				
Site Address	Land South of Bedford Road, Cranfield				
Settlement	Cranfield				
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 25.51ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 25.51ha Measured GIS Area: 27.9ha				
Proposed Use	Residential				
Any other information					

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	E 1A ASSESSMENT		
	age of the assessment rules out sites that are too small	ll or confl	ict with national policy designations
	sional Site Capacity		
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:765 dwellingsNumber of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:459 dwellings as per calculations but likely much less due to topography.
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	e Seque	ntial Test)
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	
Nation	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.
	he site continue to next stage?		Yes

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

Page **6** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>48</sup>

Relat	ionship to Settlement		
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the western boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

STA	STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT			
This	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>49</sup> .			
Criti	Critical Infrastructure			
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure	G	Form states that there are no	
	requirements that will enable delivery <sup>50</sup> ? critical infrastructure requirements			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

	E 1D ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for				
	opment where there are no legal or ownership problems	s and the	landowner has expressed an		
intent	ion to develop the site.				
Availa	ability				
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	A	Site is currently used for Agricultural purposes, there are some buildings which would need to be removed/ relocated but no details are given.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted by a developer on behalf of the landowner. Full landowner details are provided and the intention to develop is stated.		
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	A	No answer is given as to whether the landowner is the sole owner of the site however it is stated that all landowners are intent on developing the site and there are		

<sup>48</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locallyled garden villages towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>49</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development. <sup>50</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure

requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	no ownership issues or tenancies which would delay development. No.
Does	the site continue to next stage?	•	Yes

STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan.

Greenbelt			
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.	N/A	
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> <li>Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage</li> </ul>	N/A N/A	
	2. <sup>51</sup>		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across

Page 65

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.			
Previe	ously Developed Land		
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? • 76% - 100% (G) • 26 - 75% (A) • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)	R	The submission form states that the site is partially PDL. However the NPPF definition of PDL is clear in excluding land occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings.
Comn	nunity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas) Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has been designated for a Neighbourhood Plan.
18	<b>Community Consultation</b> Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.	No	The submission form states that no consultation has yet taken place.
19	Sustainability of Settlement Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc)	No	The site is currently in agricultural use.
Cumu	Ilative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) <i>This is calculated by working out the total number of</i> <i>completions over the last ten years as a percentage</i> <i>of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using</i> <i>census and completions data).</i> What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) <i>This is calculated by working out the total number of</i> <i>outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as</i> <i>percentage of the total number of dwellings in April</i> 2016 (as calculated using census and completions <i>data).</i>	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818 Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Percentage growth: 15.57% Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 346 Percentage growth: 16.47%
Physi	cal Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	R	The topography of the site is very uneven. This would significantly impact any development of the site.
Relati	ionship to Settlement		1 
23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	G	No impact.
-	ultural Land Quality		

Page 70

24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.
----	---	---	---

STAC	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents from	technical specialists. A red rating for
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		0
-	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	te for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Other established evidential (A)</li> </ul>		
25 4	Other catchment school available (A)	<u> </u>	Vaa
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?	G	Yes.
	Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
20	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)	0	Supermarket.
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
	• None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	А	492.55m
	least hourly at peak times):		
	Less than 400m (G)		
	• 400m-800m (A)		
	• Over 800m (R)		
	OR submission form stated that improved		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
		1	1

 $_{\rm Page}71$ 

	part of the development (G)		
	part of the development (G)		
22	Distance to propose their stations	<b>D</b>	
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
	• Less than 800m (G)		
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
	• Over 1200m (R)	0	
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Site fronts onto Bedford Road.
	ol Capacity		Ourselative impost of a number of
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A/R	Cumulative impact of a number of
			smaller developments would be a
31	If not has a commitment been made to address	Δ.	concern.
51	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	А	Significant level of development in Cranfield. A new lower school site
			was provided within the Land rear of Central Garage development
			and this could potentially
			accommodate a further form of
			entry, equivalent to around 500 –
			700 additional dwellings. The
			middle school is already at
			capacity. Pupils historically travel to
			Wootton Upper School in Beds
			Borough from year 9 onwards. No
			commitment made on submission.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a
_	infrastructure for waste water and potable water?		statutory duty to supply water and
			waste water infrastructure to new
			development sites and a lack of
			available capacity does not prevent
			future development. Any
			infrastructure upgrades required
			will depend on the quantum and
			location of growth falling within
			each catchment area. Whilst the
			Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April
			2017) identifies the current capacity
			of existing water infrastructure, a
			Stage 2 study will be prepared to
			test the cumulative effect of sites
			that have been shortlisted for
			allocation in the Local Plan and
			identify the nature and timing of
Drain	age and Elegating (All sites subject to Sequential Te	et)	any upgrades required.
33	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	A	Ordinary Watercourse present,
55	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?		JFlow modelling required to confirm
	<ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>		flood risk
	<ul> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>		
Envir	onmental Health	I	
34	Contamination	G	No significant features
	Are there any contamination constraints on site and		rio signinoant leatures
	will there be any remediation required?		
35	Adjoining uses	G	
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		
i i			

 ${\rm Page}72$
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
	noise and smell)		
Envi	ronmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	R	Not suitable for development in landscape terms– site at crest of distinctive ridge forming setting of Cranfield, important landform seen in views across Marston Vale.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?	Her: G Arch: A	Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken. No heritage comments.
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Extensive arable area, need to maintain, buffer and enhance hedgerow corridors. Potential impact on farmland species. CWS 150m east
39	<b>Open space/leisure and Gl assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	A	Parish GI plan identifies important views from current eastern edge of village towards Marston Thrift that would be lost. Site within Marston Vale – 30% tree cover would be required. No loss of LS open space.
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues
Plan	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The constraints identified mean that this site will not be considered any further as part of this process. This site has extremely uneven topography, which would present a significant constraint to residential development. There is an Ordinary Watercourse present, further work would be required to confirm flood risk. There have also been significant concerns raised about the education capacity in Cranfield and the site has multi-period archaeological potential, though this would not preclude allocation if appropriate mitigation was undertaken.

There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. Further to this, the site is not suitable in landscape terms as it is at the crest of a distinctive ridge. The views from this site are identified as important within the Parish Plan. The site is also in relatively close proximity to a CWS and may have an impact on farmland species.

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>52</sup>

Site details		
Reference Number	NLP139	
Site Name	Land West off Lodge Road, Cranfield	
Site Address	Land West off Lodge Road, Cranfield	
Settlement	Cranfield	
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.61ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.61ha Measured GIS Area: 0.59ha	
Proposed Use	Residential	
Any other information		

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
	sional Site Capacity		iet with haterial policy designations.		
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 15 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 14 dwellings		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

# **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

 $P_{age}74$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>5</sup>

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to the existing settlement, bordering the settlement envelope and an allocated site.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

STAC	STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT				
This	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>54</sup> .				
Critic	Critical Infrastructure				
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure	G	Submission states no critical		
	requirements that will enable delivery <sup>55</sup> ?		infrastructure required.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?	Yes			

	STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for				
	opment where there are no legal or ownership problems	s and the	e landowner has expressed an		
intenti	ion to develop the site.				
Availa	ability				
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	The site is currently vacant.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	A	The site has been submitted on behalf of the sole land owner. No landowner details are provided, but intention to develop is stated.		
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	Form states that there are no legal or ownership issues.		
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	No		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

<sup>53</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locallyled garden villages towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>54</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development. <sup>55</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure

requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

STAG	E 1E ASSESSMENT			
	ection records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt F	Review a	nd also provides a preliminary	
	screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional			
	nstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined			
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circl			
Plan.				
Green	ibelt			
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No		
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.	N/A		
15a 15b	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> <li>Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject</li> </ul>	N/A N/A		
Doest	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage $2.56$ the site continue to next stage?		Yes	
2000				

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.

Previ	Previously Developed Land		
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	
	with the NPPF definition?		
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Page7t

	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
Com	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas) Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has been designated for a Neighbourhood Plan.
18	<b>Community Consultation</b> Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.	No	
19	Sustainability of Settlement Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc)	No	
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) This is calculated by working out the total number of completions over the last ten years as a percentage of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using census and completions data).	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818 Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Percentage growth: 15.57%
21	<ul> <li>What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> </li> <li>This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data).</li> </ul>	A	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 346 Percentage growth: 16.47%
Phys	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	G	None identified.
	tionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	G	No impact
	cultural Land Quality		
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.

Page77

STAC	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
This s	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents from	technical specialists. A red rating for
any q	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically	/ exclude	ed at this stage as the ratings across
Stage	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).	
Trans	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the si	te for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
200	applicable)?	Ŭ	
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Other catchment school available
ZJU	school?		Other Catchment School available
	Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Other established overlights (A)</li> </ul>		
25d	Other catchment school available (A)	G	Yes.
250	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?	G	Tes.
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>No, but on adjusting asttlement doop (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
00	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
	None (R)		700.40
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	A	782.12m
	least hourly at peak times):		
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>		
	• 400m-800m (A)		
	• Over 800m (R)		
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>		
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
	• Over 1200m (R)		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Site fronts on to Lodge Road.

Page 78

Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	R	Area is marked as red due to increasing pressure on middle school places and the lack of expansion capacity on the existing middle school site. A new middle school site would be required from further significant development in Cranfield.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	R	Proposes contributions but not a new school.
	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	1	
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	1	Cite is at limited visit of surface
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required
Envir	onmental Health		
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35 Envir	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell) onmental Constraints	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
36	Landscape character	A	Some scope, but important to
	What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		retain roadside enclosure.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	Her: G Arch: A	Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is

 $P_{age}79$ 

	these assets?		undertaken. No heritage comments
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	R	Adjacent to HPI – parkland, contains trees and rough grass. Identified to be in GCN recolonization area but proposal is over development.
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	G/A	Within Forest of Marston Vale, would need to deliver 30% tree cover. Awaiting Leisure comments.
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues
Plan	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is considered worthy of further assessment. Some concerns have been raised in relation to education provision in Cranfield and the site has multi-period archaeological potential, though this would not preclude allocation providing that appropriate mitigation is undertaken. The site is adjacent to a Habitat of Principle Importance, and although the site is identified to be in a GCN recolonization area the proposal is considered overdevelopment and therefore mitigation is likely to be required. It is considered that this site is worthy of further assessment as part of this process, however if development was to go ahead then some roadside enclosure should be retained and further work would be required in terms of ecology.

# **STAGE 3 : ACHIEVABILITY**

This section assesses whether the site is Achievable in line with NPPG Guidance: A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of the site, and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period.

Viabil	Viability			
43	<ul> <li>Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?</li> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value</li> <li>Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value</li> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value</li> </ul>	G	The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable	
Achie	vability			
44	Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?		Nothing stated on submission form The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential property figures between 2013 and	

		2016. The housing market within Central Bedfordshire has seen significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%. This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East- West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements. It is considered that as such infrastructure projects progress that property prices within the Local Authority will likely continue to increase which has and will increase viability/deliverability of development not only in the higher value areas but also the lower value areas of the Authority.
45	<ul> <li>When can the scheme realistically commence delivery?</li> <li>0 to 5 years (deliverable)</li> <li>6 to 10 years</li> <li>11 to 15 years</li> <li>15 to 20 years</li> <li>Outside Plan Period</li> </ul>	Submission states site will commence development in 0-5 years.
46 Does 1	What is the indicative build out time of the site?	Submission states development would be completed in 0-5 years. The Case Study Sites outlined within the Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that after the site has received detailed planning permission a single housebuilder would likely take one year to build out this site. Yes





The sites that pass through this assessment process will not automatically be allocated for development in the Local Plan.

 ${}^{\rm Page}82$ 

Sites will be selected with reference to a number of other factors including:

- The strategy, vision and objectives proposed in the draft plan
- Technical evidence studies
- The sustainability appraisal process
- The results of public consultation
- Flood Risk Sequential Approach
- Further transport modelling
- Consultation with neighbouring authorities

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>57</sup>

Site details	Site details				
Reference Number	NLP173				
Site Name	Bayley Gate Farm				
Site Address	Wharley Gate Farm, Cranfield				
Settlement	Cranfield				
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 28.5ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 28.5ha Measured GIS Area: 28.5ha				
Proposed Use	Residential				
Any other information	The site adjoins Cranfield University.				

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provis	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 600 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 513 dwellings		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

 $<sup>{\</sup>rm Page}83$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>58</sup> . <b>Relationship to Settlement</b>			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	R	The site is not of a sufficient scale to be self contained and does not relate well to the existing settlement of Cranfield as defined by the settlement envelope. The site does have some relationship to the University, but the Airfield separates the site from the main Cranfield settlement.
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

 ${}^{\rm Page}84$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>59</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	NLP176
Site Name	Land at Wharley Farm, Cranfield
Site Address	Land at Wharley Farm, College Road, Wharley End, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 10.94ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 10.94ha
	Measured GIS Area: 10.94ha
Proposed Use	Residential and education/community facilities
Any other The site adjoins Cranfield University. Adjoins NLP173 and NLP293	
information	

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAGE	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
This sta	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
	ional Site Capacity				
	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 160 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 197 dwellings		
Flood I	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Nationa	ally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
	Does the site continue to next stage? Yes				

# **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

 $<sup>{}^{\</sup>rm Page}85$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>60</sup> . <b>Relationship to Settlement</b>				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	R	The site is not of a sufficient scale to be self contained and does not relate well to the existing settlement of Cranfield as defined by the settlement envelope. The site does have some relationship to the University, but the Airfield separates the site from the main Cranfield settlement.	
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No	

 ${}^{\rm Page}86$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>61</sup>

Site details		
Reference Number	NLP198	
Site Name	The Glebe, Cranfield	
Site Address	Land at Rear of High St, Cranfield	
Settlement	Cranfield	
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 7ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 7ha Measured GIS Area: 6.99ha	
Proposed Use	Residential	
Any other information	Part of site submitted as ALP353	

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provi	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 59-200 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 126 dwellings		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

Page8,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>62</sup> .			
	onship to Settlement		
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	Although the site does not adjoin the settlement envelope, it adjoins a housing allocation which is currently in the process of being built out. As part of the Local Plan, settlement envelopes will be updated to take account of new allocations, and in this instance it is highly likely that the boundary would be extended to include this allocation. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.
Does	Does the site continue to next stage? Yes		

### **STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needsCritical Infrastructure8Can the site meet the critical infrastructureGForm states that the only criticalForm states that will enable deliver 642

requirements that will enable delivery <sup>64</sup> ?	infrastructure requirements are for access and services. The relevant boxes for this have been ticked to state that development of the site is capable of supporting these facilities.
Does the site continue to next stage?	Yes

### STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site.

 Availability

 9
 What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development
 G
 Site is greenfield.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
 <sup>63</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

	potential?		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted by an agent on behalf of the sole landowner. Intention to develop is stated.
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	The submission form states that there are no legal issues or tenancies which would delay development.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	No.
Does	s the site continue to next stage?		Yes

#### **STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT** This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan. Greenbelt 13 Is the site located within the Green Belt? No 14 If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie N/A within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2. 15a Does the site have all of the following merits that N/A may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances? Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit) Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway) Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.\* N/A 15b Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Does the site continue to next stage?

**STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT) STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT** This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance. **Previously Developed Land** No part of the site is PDL. Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance 16 R with the NPPF definition? 76% - 100% (G) 26 - 75% (A) 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R) Community 17 Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in No Cranfield is not a parish which has designated areas) been designated for a Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an Neighbourhood Plan. emerging Neighbourhood Plan? 18 **Community Consultation** No community consultation No Has any community consultation taken place? appears to have taken place at the If yes, provide brief details on the form this point of submission. consultation took and any overall community response. 19 Sustainability of Settlement No The site is currently in agricultural Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of use. the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc) **Cumulative Impact** Considering housing completions over the past 10 20 А Number of houses in 2006: 1.818 years, what has been the level of housing growth in Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 the parish? Percentage growth: 15.57% • Less than 5% growth (G) 5% to 20% growth (A) More than 20% growth (R) This is calculated by working out the total number of completions over the last ten years as a percentage of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using census and completions data). 21 What level of housing growth would there be if all the А Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to Number of outstanding completions be completed? in 2016: 346 Percentage growth: 16.47% Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) More than 20% growth (R) This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). **Physical Constraints** R 22 Are there any physical constraints or permanent Site is adjacent to the airfield features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. **Relationship to Settlement** 

Yes

23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	G	No issues identified.
Agric	cultural Land Quality		
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.

	GE 2 ASSESSMENT	_	
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme		
	juestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		ed at this stage as the ratings across
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).	
Trans	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the si	te for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.
	centre?	_	
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)	-	
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
	• None (R)		
		L	1

 $_{\text{Page}}91$ 

		1	<u> </u>
27	<ul> <li>Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):</li> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as</li> </ul>	A	708.3m
	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
20	Less than 800m (G)		
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
	• Over 1200m (R)		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	A	It is proposed that the site be
			accessed the adjoining allocation
			which is currently being built out.
Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Cumulative impact of a number of
			smaller developments would be a
			concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	A	Significant level of development in Cranfield. A new lower school site was provided within the Land rear of Central Garage development and this could potentially
			accommodate a further form of
			entry, equivalent to around 500 –
			700 additional dwellings. The
			middle school is already at
			capacity. Pupils historically travel to
			Wootton Upper School in Beds
			Borough from year 9 onwards.
			Financial contributions would be
			required and potential new lower
			and middle school sites. No
			commitment made on submission.
Wato	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	turo will	
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a
52	infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	NAG	statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent
			future development. Any
			infrastructure upgrades required
			will depend on the quantum and
			location of growth falling within
			each catchment area. Whilst the
			Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April
			2017) identifies the current capacity
			of existing water infrastructure, a
			Stage 2 study will be prepared to
			test the cumulative effect of sites
			that have been shortlisted for
			allocation in the Local Plan and
			identify the nature and timing of
Dert	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te		

 ${}^{\rm Page}92$ 

22	What is the conclusion of the acquantial approach to	G	Site is at limited risk of surface
33	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	G	
	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?		water flooding, assessment is
	No assessment required (G)		unlikely to be required
	<ul> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>		
	Further Assessment Required (R)		
	onmental Health		
34	Contamination	G	No significant features
	Are there any contamination constraints on site and		
	will there be any remediation required?		
35	Adjoining uses	А	Aircraft Noise
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
	noise and smell)		
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Not suitable for development in
	What would the impacts of development be on the		landscape terms – important spatial
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		open plateau between village and
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		university.
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	Her:	Site has multi-period
	What would the impacts of development be on any	G	archaeological potential but this
	heritage assets and their setting?	Arch:	would not prevent allocation
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	A	providing appropriate mitigation is
	these assets?		undertaken. No Heritage comment.
38	Ecological Assets	А	Arable land, need to maintain,
	What would the impacts of development be on any		buffer and enhance hedgerow
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		corridors. Potential impact on
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		farmland species
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	G	No aspirations identified for site
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		itself in parish GI plan. Footpath
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		along western edges – parish GI
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space		plan aspiration to upgrade to
	and green infrastructure?		cycleway. Site within Marston Vale
	ů		- 30% tree cover would be
			required. No loss of LS open
			space.
Miner	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	No issues
	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including		
	mineral safeguarding sites?		
Plann	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		None
••	planning applications and submissions to previous		
	Allocations Plans)		
Gyne	y and Traveller Provision		
	the site continue to next stage?		No
Dues	The site continue to next stage?		

### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The sites proximity to the airfield makes it inappropriate for residential development; when considering the large amount of sites which the Council has had submitted it is not considered necessary to take forward sites such as this which would present noise issues for residents and may also present constraints for the Cranfield Airport in the future if it wished to expand businesses operations. It is also not appropriate because it forms an important spatial plateau, further to this there may also be a potential impact on farmland species.

 $_{\rm Page}93$ 

There have also been significant concerns raised by education in relation to the development of small sites in Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. The site also has multi-period archaeological potential, though this does not preclude allocation. In summary the site's proximity to the airfield and landscape value make it inappropriate to consider the site any further within this process.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>66</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	NLP202
Site Name	Land at Horseshoe Farm
Site Address	Bourne End, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.71ha
	Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.71ha
	Measured GIS Area: 1.22ha
Proposed Use	Mixed use – residential and employment
Any other	
information	

# STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAGE 1A AS	SESSMENT		
		ll or conf	lict with national policy designations
This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations. Provisional Site Capacity			
1 Is the side dwelling Work of using di depend services areas o Site Siz	te likely to accommodate less than 10 gs? ut the number of new homes from site size ensity of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % ing on site size of land for infrastructure and s, take into account topography or significant f undevelopable land. e Gross to net ratio standards Up to 0.4 hectare 100% 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% 2 hectares or above 60% or this calculation use the submitted	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 10 units Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 17 units
this is s			
	Il sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the		ential l'est)
2 Is more or 3?	than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2	No	
3 Is more water fl	than 50% of the site at risk from surface ooding?	No	
	nificant designations (All sites which reach S	stage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)
4 Is more significa Scientif	than 50% of the site covered by nationally ant designations? These are: Sites of Special ic Interest, National Nature Reserves, led Monuments, Registered Parks and	No	No designations on site.
	than 50% of the site located within the Area tanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.
Does the site of	continue to next stage?		Yes

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

 $_{\rm Page}95$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>67</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	R	The site is isolated and lies some distance from the main settlement of Cranfield. Any development here would be poorly related to the existing settlement.	
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No	

 $_{\text{Page}}96$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>68</sup>

Site details			
Reference Number	NLP260		
Site Name	Land at Wharley Farm, Cranfield		
Site Address	Land at Wharley Farm, College Road, Wharley End, Cranfield		
Settlement	Cranfield		
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 14.14ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 88ha		
	Measured GIS Area: 14.65ha		
Proposed Use	Residential and education/community facilities		
Any other	her The site adjoins Cranfield University. Very similar site to ALP188.		
information			

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	E 1A ASSESSMENT			
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.			
Provis	sional Site Capacity			
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 425 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 255 dwellings	
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	e Seque	ntial Test)	
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)	
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.	
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

# **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

Page9,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

provid	towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>69</sup> . <b>Relationship to Settlement</b>			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	R	The site is not of a sufficient scale to be self contained and does not relate well to the existing settlement of Cranfield as defined by the settlement envelope. The site does have some relationship to the University, but the Airfield separates the site from the main Cranfield settlement.	
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No	

 $_{\rm Page}98$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>70</sup>

Site details			
Reference Number	NLP261		
Site Name	Land at Broad Green Farm		
Site Address	Land at Broad Green Farm Broad Green Farm, Cranfield		
Settlement	Cranfield		
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 4.52ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 20.78ha Measured GIS Area: 4.51ha		
Proposed Use	Residential		
Any other information	Very similar to ALP185		

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	E 1A ASSESSMENT			
		ll or conf	lict with national policy designations	
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations. Provisional Site Capacity			
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10	No	Number of proposed dwellings as	
•	dwellings?	INO	per proforma:	
	Work out the number of new homes from site size		per protorma.	
			150 dwallinga	
	using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 %		150 dwellings	
	depending on site size of land for infrastructure and			
	services, take into account topography or significant			
	areas of undevelopable land.		Number of proposed dwellings as	
	Site Size Gross to net ratio standards		per CBC methodology:	
	• Up to 0.4 hectare 100%			
	<ul> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> </ul>		81 dwellings	
	<ul> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul>			
	Note: for this calculation use the submitted			
	Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if			
	this is smaller.			
Flood	I Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the	ne Seque	ntial Test)	
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2	No		
	or 3?			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface	No		
	water flooding?			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)	
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally	No	No designations on site.	
	significant designations? These are: Sites of Special			
	Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves,			
	Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and			
	Gardens.			
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area	No	No part of site covered by AONB.	
	of Outstanding Natural Beauty?			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

 $_{\rm Page}99$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>71</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the southern boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

	GE 1C ASSESSMENT stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able	to meet	their critical infrastructure needs <sup>72</sup>	
	al Infrastructure			
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>73</sup> ?	G	Form states that improvements to the site access will be required, but ticked the box stating that new road links was something the site could support.	
Does	Does the site continue to next stage? Yes			

**STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site. Availability

9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	Site is currently used for Agricultural purposes; submission form states that no relocation or demolition would be required.
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted on behalf of the sole landowner. Intention to develop is stated.
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	The submission form states that there are no legal issues or tenancies which would delay development.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	No.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>72</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.		
Does the site continue to next stage?	Yes	

#### **STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT** This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan. Greenbelt 13 Is the site located within the Green Belt? No 14 If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie N/A within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2. 15a Does the site have all of the following merits that N/A may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances? Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit) Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway) Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.\* 15b N/A Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in guestion 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.74 Does the site continue to next stage? Yes

STAG	SE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)		
STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT			
This s	This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any		
quest	question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across		
Stage	Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.		
Previously Developed Land			
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	No part of the site is PDL.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

	with the NPPF definition?		
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Comn	nunity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has
	designated areas)		been designated for a
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Neighbourhood Plan.
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		3
18	Community Consultation	No	The submission form states that no
	Has any community consultation taken place?		consultation has yet taken place.
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	The site is currently in agricultural
15	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		use.
	the settlement through the loss of services and		use.
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
Cum	Ilative Impact	[	
20		Δ	Number of bounce in 2006; 1,919
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	А	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		in 2016: 346
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>		Percentage growth: 16.47%
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	Outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions		
Physi	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data).		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data).	G	There are no obvious physical
Physi 22	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). cal Constraints Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	There are no obvious physical
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). <b>cal Constraints</b> Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability?	G	There are no obvious physical constraints.
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). <b>cal Constraints</b> Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment	G	
22	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). cal Constraints Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	G	
22 Relati	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). <b>cal Constraints</b> Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. <b>ionship to Settlement</b>		constraints.
22	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). <b>cal Constraints</b> Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. <b>ionship to Settlement</b> Would development of the site be complementary to	G	
22 Relati	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). <b>cal Constraints</b> Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. <b>ionship to Settlement</b> Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		constraints.
22 Relati	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). cal Constraints Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. ionship to Settlement Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		constraints.
22 Relati	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). <b>cal Constraints</b> Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. <b>ionship to Settlement</b> Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		constraints.
22 Relati 23	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). <b>cal Constraints</b> Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. <b>ionship to Settlement</b> Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?		constraints.
22 Relati 23 Agric	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). ical Constraints Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. ionship to Settlement Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form? ultural Land Quality	G	No issues identified.
22 Relati 23	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). cal Constraints Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. ionship to Settlement Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form? ultural Land Quality Would the development impact on high quality		Constraints. No issues identified. The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural
22 Relati 23 Agric	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). ical Constraints Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. ionship to Settlement Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form? ultural Land Quality	G	constraints.

 ${\rm Page}102$ 

•	50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)
---	-------------------------------------

• 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)

classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.

STAG	E 2 ASSESSMENT			
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	nto from	tochnical chacialists. A rad rating for	
	question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across			
	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance			
	sport and Access to Services			
25	Facilities and services	<b>.</b>		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	te for housing. It links to the	
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.			
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately			
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.	
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)			
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining			
	settlement (R)			
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes	
200	applicable)?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>			
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)			
05	Other catchment school available (A)			
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Other catchment school available	
	school?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Other catchment school available (A)			
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.	
	centre?			
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining			
	settlement (R)			
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.	
	<ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>			
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent			
	(A)			
	None (R)			
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	А	612.45m	
	least hourly at peak times):			
	Less than 400m (G)			
	• 400m-800m (A)			
	<ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as</li> </ul>			
28	part of the development (G) Distance to nearest train station:	R		
20		R		
	Less than 800m (G)			

 ${}^{\rm page}103$ 

	• 800m 1200m (A)		
	<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	R	Although submission states that site can be accessed from highway, it's not clear how suitable access would be achieved.
	ol Capacity	T	1
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Cumulative impact of a number of smaller developments would be a concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	A	Significant level of development in Cranfield. A new lower school site was provided within the Land rear of Central Garage development and this could potentially accommodate a further form of entry, equivalent to around 500 – 700 additional dwellings. The middle school is already at capacity. Pupils historically travel to Wootton Upper School in Beds Borough from year 9 onwards. Financial contributions would be required and potential new lower
			and middle school sites.
	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc		
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	1	
	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	A	Ordinary Watercourse present, JFlow modelling required to confirm
33	<ul> <li>site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>		flood risk
	<ul> <li>site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>	G	

 $_{\rm Page}104$ 

35	Adjoining uses	G	
00	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to	Ŭ	
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
	noise and smell)		
Envi	ronmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	А	Some scope for limited
	What would the impacts of development be on the		development only if set within
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		landscape mitigation.
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	Her: R	Unsuitable for allocation in
	What would the impacts of development be on any	Arch:	archaeological terms, site lies
	heritage assets and their setting?	R	immediately adjacent to a
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of		Scheduled Monument. Heritage
	these assets?		comment next to SAM
38	Ecological Assets	А	Need to maintain, buffer and
	What would the impacts of development be on any		enhance hedgerow corridors and
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		central pond, potential impact on
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?	_	farmland species.
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	R	Parish GI plan identifies aspiration
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		for allotments on this site. Adjacent
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		to Moat Farm monument. Site
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space		within Marston Vale – 30% tree
	and green infrastructure?		cover would be required. No loss of
Mino	erals and Waste		LS open space.
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	No issues
40	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including	9	110 1350/25
	mineral safeguarding sites?		
Plan	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		None
	planning applications and submissions to previous		
	Allocations Plans)		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is not considered worthy of further assessment. Assessment has identified the presence of an Ordinary Watercourse; further assessment would be required to confirm flood risk. Potential issues with educational capacity have also been identified in Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. The site is not appropriate for allocation because it is adjacent to a Scheduled Monument. In addition to this the parish plan identifies an aspiration for allotments on this site and it is not clear how access could be achieved for this site. There is also a potential impact on farmland species from development of this site. This site will not be assessed any further as part of this process.

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>75</sup>

Site details			
Reference Number	NLP266		
Site Name	Land situated between Crawley Road and Bourne End Road		
Site Address	Land situated between Crawley Road and Bourne End Road, Cranfield		
Settlement	Cranfield		
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 6.13ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 9.18ha Measured GIS Area: 9.25ha		
Proposed Use	Residential		
Any other information	Very similar to submission ALP135		

### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT			
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.			
Provi	sional Site Capacity			
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 198 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 110 dwellings	
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)	
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No		
	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)	
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.	
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.	
Does	Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>76</sup>.

Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the majority of its southern boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.	
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

	STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT			
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>77</sup> .			
Critical Infrastructure				
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery78?	G	Form states that improvements to the site access will be required, but ticked the box stating that road improvements was something the site could support.	
Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site.

Availability 9 What

9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	Site is greenfield.
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	A	The site has been submitted by an agent on behalf of a developer. The landowner's names are provided and intention to develop is stated. No further details on landowner addresses are provided.
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically	G	The submission form states that there are no legal issues or tenancies which would delay

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

Page 1

Ied garden villages towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>77</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.
<sup>78</sup> This is an assessment based on the information based on the information based on the information of the information of the information.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>78</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

	overcome?		development.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	Planning Applications for residential development recently refused. See application numbers CB/16/02039/OUT CB/17/00976/OUT
Does	Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes

STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan.

Greenbelt			
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.	N/A	
15a 15b	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> <li>Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject</li> </ul>	N/A N/A	
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage $2.^{79}$		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

#### **STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)**

# STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any

08 Page **L** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.
	e 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance iously Developed Land		
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? • 76% - 100% (G) • 26 - 75% (A)	R	No part of the site is PDL.
Com	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
	munity	Ne	Cranfieldie net e nerich which has
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas) Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has been designated for a Neighbourhood Plan.
18	<b>Community Consultation</b> Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community	Yes	Consultation took place for planning application, including community event and meeting with parish council.
19	response. Sustainability of Settlement Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc)	No	The site is currently in agricultural use.
Cum	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) <i>This is calculated by working out the total number of</i> <i>completions over the last ten years as a percentage</i> <i>of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using</i> <i>census and completions data).</i> What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) <i>This is calculated by working out the total number of</i> <i>outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as</i> <i>percentage of the total number of dwellings in April</i> 2016 (as calculated using census and completions <i>data</i> ).	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818 Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Percentage growth: 15.57% Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 346 Percentage growth: 16.47%
Phys	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	R	Proximity of the site to airfield and flight path.
	tionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	R	Development of this site would extend Cranfield into what is currently predominantly open countryside with some low-density housing, set back from the road, to

 $_{\rm Page}109$ 

			the south and forming the edge of this settlement and setting Cranfield within the wider countryside.		
Agric	Agricultural Land Quality				
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.		

STAG	SE 2 ASSESSMENT					
This s	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	nts from	technical specialists. A red rating for			
any q	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically	exclude	d at this stage as the ratings across			
Stage	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance					
Trans	Transport and Access to Services					
25	Facilities and services					
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the			
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.					
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately					
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.			
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>					
	settlement (R)					
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes			
	applicable)?					
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>					
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)					
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>					
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available			
	school?					
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>					
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)					
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>					
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.			
	centre?					
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>					
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)					
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>					
	settlement (R)					
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.			
	<ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>					
	(A)					
	None (R)					
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R				
	least hourly at peak times):					

 $_{\rm Page} 110$ 

	Consider Further Assessment (A)		
	<ul> <li>site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>		JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk
33	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	A	Ordinary Watercourse present,
	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te		statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
	Is there the capacity to provide all required	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a
31 Wate 32	If not, has a commitment been made to address this? r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc Is there the capacity to provide all required	1	Significant level of development in Cranfield. A new lower school site was provided within the Land rear of Central Garage development and this could potentially accommodate a further form of entry, equivalent to around 500 – 700 additional dwellings. The middle school is already at capacity. Pupils historically travel to Wootton Upper School in Beds Borough from year 9 onwards. Financial contributions would be required and potential new lower and middle school sites. <b>be assessed at a later stage</b> )
<u>Scho</u> 30	ol Capacity Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Cumulative impact of a number of smaller developments would be a concern.
	·		Bourne End Road.
28 29	Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G) • 800m-1200m (A) • Over 1200m (R) Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	R G	Site fronts onto Crawley Road and
20	<ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		

	Further Assessment Required (R)		
Envi	ronmental Health		
34	Contamination	G	No significant features
	Are there any contamination constraints on site and		
	will there be any remediation required?		
35	Adjoining uses	G	Noise from Airfield / Football Club
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
	noise and smell)		
Envi	ronmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	А	Some scope if well integrated and
	What would the impacts of development be on the		respected scale of Gossards Green
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		and character of clay plateau to
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		west.
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	Her:	Site has been evaluated and found
	What would the impacts of development be on any	G	to have low archaeological
	heritage assets and their setting?	Arch:	potential. No objection to allocation.
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	G	No heritage comments.
	these assets?		
38	Ecological Assets	A/G	Arable land with grazed paddock in
	What would the impacts of development be on any		east. Nice hedges and boundary
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		trees would need to be retained
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		and well buffered. Likely of value
			for farmland birds with records of
			Brown Hare, BAP species.
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	G	Limited aspirations identified in
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		PGIP, and not part of GI network in
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		Mid Beds GI plan. Site within the
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space		Forest of Marston Vale, so we
	and green infrastructure?		would seek 30% tree cover across
			the site. No loss of LS Open space.
	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	No issues
	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including		
	mineral safeguarding sites?		
	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		Planning application refused
	planning applications and submissions to previous		(CB/16/02039/OUT and
	Allocations Plans)		CB/17/00976/OUT).
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is not considered worthy of further assessment. Assessment has identified the presence of an Ordinary Watercourse; further assessment would be required to confirm flood risk. Potential issues with educational capacity have also been identified in Cranfield. The site itself is constrained by it's proximity to the airfield and indeed the flightpath.

Development of this site would extend Cranfield into what is currently open countryside. This area is currently rural in nature and development of this site would represent urbanisation of this rural fringe. This would change significantly the historical and unique settlement pattern of Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. It is also considered that a residential development of this scale would not be appropriate considering the proximity of the site to the airfield. Due to the large number of sites

which the Council has had submitted, at this stage it is not considered necessary to take forward sites such as this which would present noise issues for residents and may also present constraints for the Cranfield Airport in the future if it wished to expand businesses operations.

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>80</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	NLP315
Site Name	East End Farm
Site Address	East End Farm, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 4ha
	Submitted Whole Site Area: 4ha
	Measured GIS Area: 4.61ha
Proposed Use	Residential
Any other	Very similar to ALP109, site also included in larger submission NLP104
information	

#### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provisional Site Capacity					
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10	No	Number of proposed dwellings as		
	dwellings?		per proforma:		
	Work out the number of new homes from site size				
	using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 %		75 dwellings		
	depending on site size of land for infrastructure and				
	services, take into account topography or significant				
	areas of undevelopable land.				
	Site Size Gross to net ratio standards		Number of proposed dwellings as		
	<ul> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> </ul>		per CBC methodology:		
	• 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%		72 dwellings		
	<ul> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul>		_		
	Note: for this calculation use the submitted				
	Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if				
	this is smaller.				
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2	No			
	or 3?				
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface	No			
	water flooding?				
	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S				
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally	No	No designations on site.		
	significant designations? These are: Sites of Special				
	Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves,				
	Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and				
	Gardens.				
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
	of Outstanding Natural Beauty?				
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

#### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

 $P_{age}114$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>80</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>81</sup>

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site adjoins the settlement envelope along the western boundary. There are no major constraints separating the site from the existing settlement.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

STA	STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT				
This	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>82</sup> .				
Criti	Critical Infrastructure				
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure	G	Submission states no critical		
	requirements that will enable delivery <sup>83</sup> ?		infrastructure required.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

	<b>STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT</b> This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for				
	•				
	opment where there are no legal or ownership problems	s and the	e landowner has expressed an		
intent	ion to develop the site.				
Availa	ability				
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	Site is currently in agricultural use, submission states no relocation required but isn't clear about demolition.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	Site has been submitted on behalf of sole land owner, intention to develop is stated.		
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	Submission states no legal or ownership issues.		
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	No.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

<sup>81</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locallyled garden villages towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>82</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development. <sup>83</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure

requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

STAC				
STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT				
This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional				
	nstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined			
Plan.	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circu	unistance	es to considered for allocation in the	
	a halt			
Green		Na		
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No		
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A		
	within one of the parcels which have been identified			
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt			
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no			
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage			
	2.			
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A		
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which			
	may contribute to identification of exceptional			
	circumstances?			
	<ul> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the</li> </ul>			
	following key local services - convenience			
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper			
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,			
	library (use settlement audit)			
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>			
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA			
	Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement			
	that has a mainline rail station or direct			
	assess (junction) to the strategic road			
	network (A road or motorway)			
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14			
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not			
	progress any further in this assessment of			
	suitability.*			
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	No		
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted			
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject			
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the			
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress			
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage			
	2. <sup>84</sup>			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	
0003	ine site continue to next stage:			

#### STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.

Previ	Previously Developed Land				
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	No part of site is PDL.		
	with the NPPF definition?				
	• 76% - 100% (G)				
	• 26 - 75% (A)				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>84</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Page **1** 

	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
Com	munity	1	
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas) Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?	N/A	Cranfield is not a parish which has been designated for a Neighbourhood Plan.
18	<b>Community Consultation</b> Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.	No	The submission form states that no consultation has yet taken place.
19 Cum	Sustainability of Settlement Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc) ulative Impact	No	The site is currently in agricultural use.
			Number of houses in 2000; 1,010
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? • Less than 5% growth (G) • 5% to 20% growth (A) • More than 20% growth (R) This is calculated by working out the total number of completions over the last ten years as a percentage of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using census and completions data).	A	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818 Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Percentage growth: 15.57%
21	<ul> <li>What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> </li> <li>This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data).</li> </ul>	A	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101 Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 346 Percentage growth: 16.47%
Phys	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	A	The topography of the site is uneven. This would impact any development of the site.
	tionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	G	No impact
	cultural Land Quality		
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.

Page 117

STAC	GE 2 ASSESSMENT			
This s	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents from	technical specialists. A red rating for	
any q	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically	/ exclude	ed at this stage as the ratings across	
Stage	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).		
Trans	sport and Access to Services			
25	Facilities and services			
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the si	te for housing. It links to the	
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.			
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately			
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.	
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>			
	settlement (R)			
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes	
	applicable)?			
	Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Other catchment school available (A)			
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Other catchment school available	
	school?			
	Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Other catchment school available (A)			
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.	
	centre?			
	Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>			
	settlement (R)			
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.	
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)			
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent			
	(A)			
	None (R)			
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	А	450.77m	
	least hourly at peak times):			
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>			
	• 400m-800m (A)			
	• Over 800m (R)			
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>			
	public transport facilities could be provided as			
	part of the development (G)			
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R		
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>			
	• 800m-1200m (A)			
	• Over 1200m (R)			
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Yes, access shown onto Bliss	

 ${}_{\rm Page}118$ 

<ul> <li>31 If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> <li>31 If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> <li>33 If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> <li>34 A</li> <li>35 Significant level of development in Cranfield. A new lower school site was provided within the Land rear of Central Garage development and this could potentially accommodate a further form of entry, equivalent to around 500 – 700 additional dwellings. The middle school is already at capacity. Pupis historically travel to Borough from year 9 onwards. Financial contributions would be required and potential new lower and middle school states. No commitment made in submission.</li> <li>Water Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastructure will be assessed at later stage)</li> <li>32 Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?</li> <li>R/A/G</li> <li>Statutory duy to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development. Any infrastructure to grave streage required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whist the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, any upgrades required to allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required to confirm flood risk.</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and Are floading any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> </ul>				Avenue.
31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A         31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A         32       Significant level of development in the Land rear of Central Garage development and this could potentially accommodate a further form of entry, equivalent to around 500 – 700 additional dwellings. The middle school is already at capacity. Pupies historically travel to Wootton Upper School in Beds Borough from year 9 onwards. Financial contributions would be a sensed at later stage)         32       Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?       R/A/G         32       Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?       R/A/G         33       What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.       Ordinary Watercourse present, JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk.         33       What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.       A         34       Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and Adjoining uses have the potential to consider further Assessment (A)       Contamination Adjoining uses have the potential to cause confilm flood risk.         35       Adjoining uses have the potential to cause confilm the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)       G	Scho	ol Capacity		
this?       Cranfield. A new lower school site was provided within the Land rear of Central Garage development and this could potentially accommodate a further form of entry, equivalent to around 500 – 700 additional dwellings. The middle school is already at capacity. Pupils historically travel to Wootton Upper School in Bed's Borough from year 9 onwards. Financial contributions would be required and potential new lower and middle school is already at capacity. Pupils historically travel to Wootton Upper School in Bed's Borough from year 9 onwards. Financial contributions would be required and potential new lower and middle school sites. No commitment made in submission.         Water Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastructure will be assessed at a later stage)       R/A/G         32       Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?       R/A/G         8/A/G       Water Utilities comparies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development. Any infrastructure for waste water and potable water?       R/A/G         8/A/G       Water Utilities comparies from a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure, a stage 2 study will be prepared to the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycles Stud (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of its that have been shortlisted for allocations, in regards to flood risk?         33       What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to its allocations, in regards to flood risk?       A         94       Ordinary Watercourse present, JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk.       Contareat	30		A	smaller developments would be a concern.
<ul> <li>32 Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?</li> <li>Algorithm of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?</li> <li>G</li> <li>No significant features</li> <li>G</li> <li>No significant features</li> </ul>	31	this?		Cranfield. A new lower school site was provided within the Land rear of Central Garage development and this could potentially accommodate a further form of entry, equivalent to around 500 – 700 additional dwellings. The middle school is already at capacity. Pupils historically travel to Wootton Upper School in Beds Borough from year 9 onwards. Financial contributions would be required and potential new lower and middle school sites. No commitment made in submission.
infrastructure for waste water and potable water?       statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocations in regards to flood risk?         33       What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?       A         ordinary Water course present, if each cast segment required (G)       Consider Further Assessment (A)       Drainage and Flooding required to confirm flood risk.         Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocations, in regards to flood risk?       Ordinary Watercourse present, JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk.         33       What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?       A       Ordinary Watercourse present, JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk.         34       Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?       G       No significant features         35       Adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)       G				
<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?         <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Environmental Health         <ul> <li>Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?</li> <li>Adjoining uses Mave the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>Grdinary Watercourse present, JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		infrastructure for waste water and potable water?		statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of
site allocations, in regards to flood risk?JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk.• No assessment required (G) • Consider Further Assessment (A) • Further Assessment Required (R)JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk.Environmental HealthGNo significant features34Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?GNo significant features35Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)GG	Drain	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	est)	
<ul> <li>34 Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?</li> <li>35 Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>G No significant features</li> <li>G</li> </ul>	33	<ul> <li>site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	A	JFlow modelling required to confirm
Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?       G         35       Adjoining uses       G         Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)       G	Envir	onmental Health		
35 Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	34	Are there any contamination constraints on site and	G	No significant features
Environmental Constraints	35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	G	
	Envir	onmental Constraints		

Page 119

36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	R	Development not acceptable in landscape terms– site integral to open slopes of the Cranfield clay ridge.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?	Her: G Arch: A	Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken. No Heritage comment.
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Need to buffer and enhance southern hedgerow corridor. Potential impact on farmland species
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	A	No specific aspirations for site in parish GI plan. RoW on south and west sides. Adjacent to existing woodland – would need buffering and extending. Site within Marston Vale – 30% tree cover would be required. No loss of LS Open Space.
	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues
	ning History	-	
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is considered worthy of further assessment. Whilst the topography of the site is slightly uneven in places and it is on the edge of an important clayland scarp slope, there is potential for a portion of the site to be developed. This portion would need to provide mitigation to address landscape impact, and buffering would be required to protect and enhance the southern hedgerow corridor. The site would also need to be well designed to integrate with the ROW which is clearly well used and popular with the community. In addition an Ordinary Watercourse has been identified; further modelling will be required to confirm the flood risk. The site has multi-period archaeological potential; this would not prevent allocation providing that appropriate mitigation was undertaken. A potential issue with education capacity was identified, this may also require mitigation.

#### **STAGE 3 : ACHIEVABILITY**

This section assesses whether the site is Achievable in line with NPPG Guidance: A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of the site, and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period.

## Viability43Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by<br/>consultants, is the probability of the site being viableG

The Council's Residential
Development Viability Report (Feb

Achie	<ul> <li>high, medium or low?</li> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value</li> <li>Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value</li> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value</li> </ul>	2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable
44	Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?	<ul> <li>The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential property figures between 2013 and 2016. The housing market within Central Bedfordshire has seen significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.</li> <li>This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East- West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements. It is considered that as such infrastructure projects progress that property prices within the Local Authority will likely continue to increase which has and will increase viability/deliverability of development not only in the higher value areas of the Authority.</li> </ul>
45	<ul> <li>When can the scheme realistically commence delivery?</li> <li>0 to 5 years (deliverable)</li> <li>6 to 10 years</li> <li>11 to 15 years</li> <li>15 to 20 years</li> <li>Outside Plan Period</li> </ul>	Submission states development could commence within 0-5 years.
46	Considering the size of the site and the number of potential housebuilders, what is the indicative build out time of the site?	Submission states development could be built out within 2 years.

 $_{\rm Page} 121$ 

	The Case Study Sites outlined within the Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that after the site has received detailed planning permission a single housebuilder would likely take one year to first completion and would build out the site at a rate of 50 dwellings per annum there after.
Does the site pass this stage?	Yes

#### SUMMARY

The sites that pass through this assessment process will not automatically be allocated for development in the Local Plan.

Sites will be selected with reference to a number of other factors including:

- The strategy, vision and objectives proposed in the draft plan
- Technical evidence studies
- The sustainability appraisal process
- The results of public consultation
- Flood Risk Sequential Approach
- Further transport modelling
- Consultation with neighbouring authorities

Page -

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>85</sup>

Site details		
Reference Number	NLP394	
Site Name	Land west of Mill Road, Cranfield	
Site Address	Land west of Mill Road, Cranfield	
Settlement	Cranfield	
Size	Submitted Developable Area: unknown Submitted Whole Site Area: 10.04ha Measured GIS Area: 9.44ha	
Proposed Use	Residential	
Any other information	Adjacent to ALP238, ALP253 and NLP198	

#### **STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)**

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: Unknown Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 170 dwellings		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	e Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

#### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>85</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

	towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>86</sup> .			
	ionship to Settlement			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	A	Whilst the site may not appear to be well related to the settlement, lying some distance from the settlement envelope; the parcel of land between the site and the settlement envelope has planning permission for 250 homes (14/05007). Site NLP394 is strongly related to the parcel with planning permission and would be well related to Cranfield once the parcel with permission has been built out.	
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

STAC	STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT			
This s	stage of the assessment rules out sites that are ne	ot able	to meet	their critical infrastructure needs <sup>87</sup> .
Critic	Critical Infrastructure			
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>88</sup> ?		A	The submission does not identify any critical infrastructure requirements.
Does	Does the site continue to next stage? Yes			

### STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site.

Avail	Availability			
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	The site is 100% Greenfield, the submission states that no demolition or relocation would be required.	
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted by a land promoter. It is not clear whether the site has been	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>87</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.
<sup>88</sup> This is an assessment based on the information leaves at this structure of the second second

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>88</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

			submitted on behalf of one or all of the landowners, but details of all landowners are provided. The submission states that all landowners are intent on developing the site.
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	The form states that there are no legal or ownership issues.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	No.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

#### **STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT**

This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan.

Greer	enbelt		
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.	N/A	
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A	
15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the	No	
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress		

 ${}^{\rm Page}125$ 

	through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>89</sup>	
Does	the site continue to next stage?	Yes

STAG	STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)			
STAG	STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT			
This s	This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any			
quest	ion does not mean that the site will be automatically exc	luded at	this stage as the ratings across	
Stage	2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).		
Previ	ously Developed Land			
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	No part of the site is PDL.	
	with the NPPF definition?			
	• 76% - 100% (G)			
	• 26 - 75% (A)			
	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)			
Comr	nunity			
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield is not a parish which has	
	designated areas)		been designated for a	
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Neighbourhood Plan.	
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?			
18	Community Consultation	No	The submission form states that no	
	Has any community consultation taken place?		consultation has yet taken place.	
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this			
	consultation took and any overall community			
	response.			
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	Site is 100% Greenfield.	
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of			
	the settlement through the loss of services and			
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public			
	house etc)			
	Ilative Impact	1	1	
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818	
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101	
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%	
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>			
	This is calculated by working out the total number of			
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage			
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using			
	census and completions data).			
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	А	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101	
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions	
	be completed?		in 2016: 346	
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage growth: 16.47%	
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)			
	More than 20% growth (R)			
	This is calculated by working out the total number of			
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as			
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April			
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions			
	data).			
Physi	cal Constraints			

 $_{\rm Page}126$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>89</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	R	Site adjoins airfield.
Relat	ionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	G	No impact identified.
Agric	cultural Land Quality		
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber.

STAC	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
This s	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	nts fror	n technical specialists. A red rating for
any q	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically	excluc	led at this stage as the ratings across
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		
Trans	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the s	site for housing. It links to the Council's
	Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes.
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
05	Other catchment school available (A)	•	
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Other established subject to the set of the</li></ul>		
25d	Other catchment school available (A)	G	Yes.
290	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?	0	165.
	Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	<ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement of an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
20	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)		

 ${}^{\rm Page}127$ 

	Organization of Oliver / Dept Office / Neuropean		
	<ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>		
	(A) • None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	
21	least hourly at peak times):	ĸ	
	• Less than 400m (G)		
	• 400m-800m (A)		
	• Over 800m (R)		
	OR submission form stated that improved		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	A	Access proposed through recently
			approved adjoin site, however site
			also fronts onto Bliss Avenue.
Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	А	Cumulative impact of a number of
			smaller developments would be a
			concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	А	Significant level of development in
	this?		Cranfield. A new lower school site
			was provided within the Land rear
			of Central Garage development
			and this could potentially
			accommodate a further form of
			entry, equivalent to around 500 –
			700 additional dwellings. The
			middle school is already at
			capacity. Pupils historically travel to
			Wootton Upper School in Beds
			Borough from year 9 onwards.
			Financial contributions would be
			required and potential new lower
			and middle school sites.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a
	infrastructure for waste water and potable water?		statutory duty to supply water and
			waste water infrastructure to new
			development sites and a lack of
			available capacity does not prevent
			future development. Any
			infrastructure upgrades required
			will depend on the quantum and
			location of growth falling within
			each catchment area. Whilst the
			Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April
			2017) identifies the current capacity
			of existing water infrastructure, a
			Stage 2 study will be prepared to
			test the cumulative effect of sites
			that have been shortlisted for
			allocation in the Local Plan and
			identify the nature and timing of

 $_{\rm Page} 128$ 

			any upgrades required.
Drai	nage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	est)	
33	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	A	Ordinary Watercourse present,
	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?		JFlow modelling required to confirm
	No assessment required (G)		flood risk
	<ul> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>		nood hak
<b>F</b> ast	Further Assessment Required (R) ronmental Health		
			No simplificant factures
34	Contamination	G	No significant features
	Are there any contamination constraints on site and		
0.5	will there be any remediation required?		
35	Adjoining uses	А	Football Club / Aircraft Noise
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
	noise and smell)		
	ronmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Not suitable for development in
	What would the impacts of development be on the		landscape terms- would reduce
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		scale of clay plateau to detriment of
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		landscape character.
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	Her:	Site has multi-period
	What would the impacts of development be on any	G	archaeological potential but this
	heritage assets and their setting?	Arch:	would not prevent allocation
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	А	providing appropriate mitigation is
	these assets?		undertaken. No heritage comment.
38	Ecological Assets	А	Arable land, need to maintain,
	What would the impacts of development be on any		buffer and enhance hedgerow
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		corridors. Potential impact on
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		farmland species
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	G	No aspirations identified in parish
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		GI plan. Site within Marston Vale –
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		30% tree cover would be required.
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space		No loss of LS open space
	and green infrastructure?		
Mine	erals and Waste	•	
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	No issues
	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including		
	mineral safeguarding sites?		
Plan	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		None
	planning applications and submissions to previous		
	Allocations Plans)		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No
2 3 3 0			1 · · · ·

#### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is not worthy of further assessment. The sites proximity to the airfield makes it inappropriate for residential development; when considering the large amount of sites which the Council has had submitted it is not considered necessary to take forward sites such as this which would present noise issues for residents and may also present constraints for the Cranfield Airport in the future if it wished to expand businesses operations. Built development on this site would reduce the scale of the clay plateau to the detriment of the landscape character and there would be a potential impact on farmland species. An Ordinary Watercourse has been identified and therefore further modelling would be required to understand flood risk. There have also been significant

concerns raised by education in relation to the development of small sites in Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. The site also has multi-period archaeological potential, though this does not preclude allocation. In summary the site's proximity to the airfield and landscape value make it inappropriate to consider the site any further within this process.

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>90</sup>

Site details	Site details		
Reference Number	NLP417		
Site Name	Stilliers Farm, Moulsoe Road, Cranfield		
Site Address	Stilliers Farm, Moulsoe Road, Cranfield		
Settlement	Cranfield		
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 2ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 2ha Measured GIS Area: 2.07ha		
Proposed Use	Residential		
Any other information			

#### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAC					
	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:		
	using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 %		40-50 dwellings		
	depending on site size of land for infrastructure and				
	services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land.				
	Site Size Gross to net ratio standards		Number of proposed dwellings as		
	<ul> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> </ul>		per CBC methodology:		
	<ul> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul>		36 dwellings		
	Note: for this calculation use the submitted				
	Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if				
	this is smaller.				
	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface	No			
Natio	water flooding?	togo 2 h	a subject to detailed appagement)		
4	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S				
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally	No	No designations on site.		
	significant designations? These are: Sites of Special				
	Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves,				
	Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.				
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area	No	No part of site sovered by AONP		
5		INU	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Deec	of Outstanding Natural Beauty?		Yes		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		res		

#### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

Page 13

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>90</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>91</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	R	The site lies to the south of Cranfield and is not well related to the existing settlement. It lies some distance from Cranfield and is separated by the Airfield.		
7	Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.	G	No coalescence issues.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No		

 ${}^{\rm Page}132$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>91</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf</a> )

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>92</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	NLP486
Site Name	Land at Cranfield Airport
Site Address	Cranfield Airport, Cranfield
Settlement	Cranfield
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 27.9ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 27.9ha
	Measured GIS Area: 27.9ha
Proposed Use	Residential and supporting commercial/community facilities.
Any other	The site adjoins Cranfield Airfield.
information	

#### STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

STAG	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provis	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 700 dwellings Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 502 dwellings		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	No designations on site.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	No part of site covered by AONB.		
Does the site continue to next stage? Yes					

#### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>92</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>93</sup> .				
<b>Relationship to Settlement</b>				
contained, is the site a settlement or are there	le A roads, rivers or railways)	G	The site is well related to the existing settlement, bordering the settlement envelope. There do not appear to be any major constraints which would separate the site from the existing settlement, but consideration would need to be given to integrate the site with the remaining Airfield.	
existing village or town or town? If yes, then g would be able to provi green wedges to mitig be possible for approp	balescence between an n and another existing village prade as Amber if the site de appropriate buffers or ate this, or Red if it would not priate buffers to be provided developable area based on the ne site.	G	No coalescence issues.	
Does the site continue to next stage?			Yes	

# STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>94</sup>. Critical Infrastructure 8 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>95</sup>? G The submission form states that a new access road would be required. The new road has been ticked as something development of the site could support. Does the site continue to next stage? Yes

#### **STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT**

11

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site.

**Availability** What is the existing use of the site? 9 G The site is currently part of Would the existing use limit the development Cranfield Airfield. However no demolition or relocation of uses potential? would be required. 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G The site has been submitted on who has expressed an intention to develop the site? behalf of the sole landowner and states the intention to develop.

Are there any legal or ownership problems that could

G

The submission states that there

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>93</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf</a>)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>94</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>95</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

		1	
	delay or prevent development?		are no legal or ownership issues.
	If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?		
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	No.
	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red		
	because it's not eligible for allocation.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?	<u> </u>	Yes
	<u> </u>		1
STAG	SE 1E ASSESSMENT		
This s	section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt F	Review a	nd also provides a preliminary
scree	ning of sites to determine whether they may be capable	of demo	Instrating Exceptional
Circu	mstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined	as suitab	ble based on the high level SHLAA
asses	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circ	umstance	es to considered for allocation in the
Plan.			
Green		-	
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A	
	within one of the parcels which have been identified		
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt		
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no		
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage		
	2.		
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A	
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which		
	may contribute to identification of exceptional		
	circumstances?		
	<ul> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the</li> </ul>		
	following key local services - convenience		
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper		
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,		
	library (use settlement audit)		
	Site makes a strong contribution to housing		
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA		
	Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement		
	that has a mainline rail station or direct		
	assess (junction) to the strategic road		
	network (A road or motorway)		
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14		
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not		
	progress any further in this assessment of		
	suitability.*		
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	No	
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted		
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject		
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the		
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress		

## STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT) STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any

 ${}^{\rm Page}135$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>96</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Prov	iously Developed Land		
<u>16</u>	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	G	The site is a redundant part of an
10	with the NPPF definition?	U	Airfield, which can be considered to
	• 76% - 100% (G)		be Previously Developed Land.
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
Com	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
<u>com</u> 17	munity Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Cranfield has not been designated
17		INO	Cranfield has not been designated
	designated areas)		for a Neighbourhood Plan.
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		
4.0	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?	N	The sector is a local to the the t
18	Community Consultation	Yes	The submission states that
	Has any community consultation taken place?		community consultation has taken
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		place but provides no further
	consultation took and any overall community		details.
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	No, whilst some of the airfield
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		would be lost the rest of the airfield
	the settlement through the loss of services and		and associated employment would
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		remain.
	house etc)		·
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	Number of houses in 2006: 1,818
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	the parish?		Percentage growth: 15.57%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	А	Number of houses in 2016: 2,101
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to	~	Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		in 2016: 346
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage growth: 16.47%
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions		
	data).		
	sical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	R	The site adjoins an Airfield; this
	features that affect the site's developability?		could present considerable
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		constraints in terms of mitigation
	works, topography or wind turbines.		measures.
	tionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	No issues identified.
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?		

 $_{\rm Page}136$ 

	cultural Land Quality		The second secon
4	Would the development impact on high quality	G	The majority of the site is classified
	agricultural land?		as non-agricultural land
	• 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)		
	• 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)		
	• 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)		
	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme		
-	question does not mean that the site will be automatically		d at this stage as the ratings across
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		
	sport and Access to Services		
5	Facilities and services		to for housing. It links to the
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	or the si	te for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
5a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	Yes
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining		
	settlement (R)		
5b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	G	Yes
	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Other catchment school available
	school?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)	_	
5d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	G	Yes.
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (D)</li> </ul>		
6	settlement (R)	<u> </u>	Supermarket
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	G	Supermarket.
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)     Convenience Store (Deat Office (Neurogent		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A) Nono (P)		
7	None (R)     Distance to bug stops with a frequent convice (at	G	305.44m
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	9	505.44III
	least hourly at peak times):		
	• Less than 400m (G)		
	• 400m-800m (A)		
	Over 800m (R)     OP submission form stated that improved		
	OR submission form stated that improved     public trapsport facilities could be provided as		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		

	rest of the development (0)	1	
	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	
	Less than 800m (G)		
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
	• Over 1200m (R)		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Site fronts onto High Street.
Scho	pol Capacity		U
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A/R	Cumulative impact of a number of
			smaller developments would be a
			concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	А	Significant level of development in
	this?		Cranfield. A new lower school site
1			was provided within the Land rear
			of Central Garage development
			and this could potentially
			accommodate a further form of
			entry, equivalent to around 500 -
			700 additional dwellings. The
			middle school is already at
			capacity. Pupils historically travel to
			Wootton Upper School in Beds
			Borough from year 9 onwards.
			Financial contributions would be
			required and potential new lower
			and middle school sites.
Wate	er Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a
	infrastructure for waste water and potable water?		statutory duty to supply water and
			waste water infrastructure to new
			development sites and a lack of
			available capacity does not prevent
			future development. Any
			infrastructure upgrades required
			will depend on the quantum and
			location of growth falling within
			each catchment area. Whilst the
			Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April
			2017) identifies the current capacity
			of existing water infrastructure, a
			Stage 2 study will be prepared to
			test the cumulative effect of sites
			that have been shortlisted for
			allocation in the Local Plan and
			identify the nature and timing of
			any upgrades required.
	nage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te		
33	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	A	Ordinary Watercourse present,
	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?		JFlow modelling required to confirm
	<ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>		flood risk
1	Consider Further Assessment (A)		
	Further Assessment Required (R)		
Envi	ronmental Health		
34	Contamination	А	On site:
	Are there any contamination constraints on site and		Former landfills
	will there be any remediation required?		Telephone exchange
	- · · ·		

 $_{\rm Page}138$ 

			Petrol station	
35	Adjoining uses	A	Noise from Aircraft	
55	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to	^		
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;			
	noise and smell)			
Envir	onmental Constraints			
36	Landscape character	R	Not suitable for development in	
•••	What would the impacts of development be on the		landscape terms-elevated plateau,	
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		key part of clayland landscape	
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		despite airfield. Airfield restrictions	
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		greatly restrict type of landscape	
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		mitigation.	
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	Her:	Site is known to contain	
	What would the impacts of development be on any	G	archaeological remains but this	
	heritage assets and their setting?	Arch:	would not prevent allocation	
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	A	providing appropriate mitigation is	
	these assets?		undertaken. No heritage	
			comments.	
38	Ecological Assets	А	Some trees / shrubs, open	
	What would the impacts of development be on any		grassland, potential foraging area	
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		for birds & mammals. Significant GI	
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		required.	
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	A	Parts of site identified in Parish GI	
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		plan for new open land and	
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		footpath with access from High	
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space		Street and Merchant Lane, sports	
	and green infrastructure?		field and green gym. Could be	
			incorporated within development. Site within Marston Vale – 30%	
			tree cover would be required. No	
			loss of LS open space.	
Mine	rals and Waste			
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	No issues	
	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including			
	mineral safeguarding sites?			
Planr	hing History			
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		None	
	planning applications and submissions to previous			
	Allocations Plans)			
Gypsy and Traveller Provision				
Does the site continue to next stage?			No	

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The sites proximity to the airfield makes it inappropriate for residential development; when considering the large amount of sites which the Council has had submitted it is not considered necessary to take forward sites such as this which would present noise issues for residents and may also present constraints for the Cranfield Airport in the future if it wished to expand businesses operations. There are potential contamination issues on site from former landfills, a telephone exchange and petrol station, and there would be noise pollution from the airfield. The site forms an elevated plateau and is a key part of the clayland landscape, mitigation opportunities would be greatly restricted by airfield restrictions. The open grassland in its current form is a potential foraging area for birds and mammals. An Ordinary Watercourse has been identified and therefore further modelling would be required to understand flood risk. There have also been significant concerns raised by education in relation to the development of small sites in Cranfield. There has also been a great deal of unplanned and planned development approved in

Cranfield recently and further sizeable development here could result in an unsustainable level of demand on infrastructure. The site also contains archaeological remains, though this does not preclude allocation. In summary the site's proximity to the airfield and landscape value make it inappropriate to consider the site any further within this process.

## Central Bedfordshire

A great place to live and work