

# Site Assessment Forms

Gravenhurst



**Contents**

ALP150 ..... 3  
ALP243 ..... 6  
ALP467 ..... 14  
NLP101 ..... 23  
NLP404 ..... 32  
NLP466 ..... 40

DRAFT

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

| Site details          |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Reference Number      | ALP150   |
| Site Name             | Land rear of 7-37 Barton Road, Upper Gravenhurst   |
| Site Address          | Land rear of 7-37 Barton Road, Upper Gravenhurst   |
| Settlement            | Gravenhurst  |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area:0.97ha<br>Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.97ha<br>Measured GIS Area:1.02 |
| Proposed Use          | Residential Development  |
| Any other information | CB/15/04081/OUT – for 24 units approved  |

### 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

|   |  |    |  |
|---|--|----|--|
| 1 | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?<br>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.<br>Site Size Gross to net ratio standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul> <i>Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.</i> | No | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:<br><br>24        |
|   |  |    | Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:<br><br>24 |

#### 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 | Not in flood zone 2 or 3                |
| 3 | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding? | No | Not at risk from surface water flooding |

#### Nationally significant designations (All sites which reach Stage 2 be 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 | Not in designated area |
| 5                                     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No | Not in AONB            |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |  |    | Yes                    |

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

### 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 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>.

#### 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 | Site relates well to existing settlement and is a logical extension without any identified constraints. |
| 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 identified.  |
| 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>3</sup>.

#### Critical Infrastructure

|                                       |  |   |                                       |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 8                                     | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery</b> <sup>4</sup> ? | G | No critical infrastructure identified |
| 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 | Redundant scrubland |
| 10 | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?  | G | Sole land owner     |
| 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 | None apparent       |
| 12 | Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red   | R | 15/4081 - approved  |

<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/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) )

<sup>3</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.

|                                       |   |  |    |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|----|
|                                       | because it's not eligible for allocation. |  |    |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   |  | No |

DRAFT

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>5</sup>

| Site details          |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Reference Number      | ALP243   |
| Site Name             | Land at Barton Road  |
| Site Address          | Land at Barton Road  |
| Settlement            | Gravenhurst  |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area: 0.6ha<br>Submitted Whole Site Area 0.6ha<br>Measured GIS Area: 1.5ha |
| Proposed Use          | Residential Development  |
| 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

|   |  |    |   |
|---|--|----|---|
| 1 | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?<br>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.<br>Site Size Gross to net ratio standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul> <i>Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.</i> | No | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:<br><br>18<br><br>Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:<br><br>36 |
|---|--|----|---|

#### 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 | Not in flood zone 2 or 3                 |
| 3 | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding? | No | Not at risk from surface water flooding. |

#### Nationally significant designations (All sites which reach Stage 2 be 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 | Not in designated area |
| 5                                     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No | Not in AONB            |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |  |    | Yes                    |

<sup>5</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

### 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 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>6</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 | Site relates well to existing settlement and is a logical extension without any identified constraints. |
| 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 identified   |
| 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>7</sup>.

#### Critical Infrastructure

|                                       |  |   |                                       |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 8                                     | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery</b> <sup>8</sup> ? | G | No critical infrastructure identified |
| 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 | Stabling, pasture/scrub. |
| 10 | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?  | G | Sole land owner          |
| 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 | None apparent            |
| 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 | None apparent            |

<sup>6</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/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) )

<sup>7</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>8</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 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 be considered for allocation in the Plan.

#### Greenbelt

|                                       |  |           |                   |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------|-------------------|
| <b>13</b>                             | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No        | Not in Green Belt |
| <b>14</b>                             | 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.  | Yes or No | Details           |
| <b>15a</b>                            | 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 access (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> </ul> 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.* | Yes or No | Details           |
| <b>15b</b>                            | 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>9</sup>   | Yes       | 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.

#### Previously Developed Land

|           |  |   |            |
|-----------|--|---|------------|
| <b>16</b> | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 76% - 100% (G)</li> </ul> | R | Greenfield |
|-----------|--|---|------------|

<sup>9</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

|                                   |   |    |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|----|--|
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 26 - 75% (A)</li> <li>• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>   |    |  |
| <b>Community</b>                  |   |    |  |
| 17                                | <b>Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas)</b><br>Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  | No | No NP in place   |
| 18                                | <b>Community Consultation</b><br>Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.   | No | None apparent  |
| 19                                | <b>Sustainability of Settlement</b><br>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 | No sustainability issues   |
| <b>Cumulative Impact</b>          |   |    |  |
| 20                                | Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>• 5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>• More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <i>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).</i>                               | A  | No. Houses 2006: 238<br>No. Houses 2016: 243<br>% Growth: 2.10%                              |
| 21                                | What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>• 5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>• More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <i>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).</i> | A  | No. Houses 2016: 243<br>Outstanding Completions: 4<br>% Growth: 1.65%                        |
| <b>Physical Constraints</b>       |   |    |  |
| 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  |
| <b>Relationship to Settlement</b> |   |    |  |
| 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  | The site abuts the settlement envelope and would complement the existing settlement pattern. |
| <b>Agricultural Land Quality</b>  |   |    |  |
| 24                                | Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>  | R  | Grade 2 agricultural land  |

**STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

**Transport and Access to Services**

|            |  |   |   |
|------------|--|---|---|
| <b>25</b>  | <b>Facilities and services</b><br>Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.<br><br>Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |   |   |
| <b>25a</b> | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>                             | G | Gravenhurst Lower                           |
| <b>25b</b> | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>                                    | A | Robert Bloomfield Academy                   |
| <b>25c</b> | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>  | A | Samuel Whitbread Academy                    |
| <b>25d</b> | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>                    | R | Closest is Shefford Health Centre           |
| <b>26</b>  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> <li>• Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)</li> <li>• None (R)</li> </ul>  | R | None  |
| <b>27</b>  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 part of the development (G)</li> </ul> | G | Less than 400m to service 200 – Biggleswade |
| <b>28</b>  | Distance to nearest train station:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>• 800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>• Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>   | R | Over 1200m                                  |
| <b>29</b>  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | G | Barton Road                                 |

| <b>School Capacity</b>   |   |       |   |
|--|---|-------|---|
| 30   | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A     | Lower school may be an issue – additional land may be required to enable an expansion. Middle and upper school places could be managed through a financial contribution.  |
| 31   | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | A     | None identified   |
| <b>Water Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastructure will be assessed at a later stage)</b> |   |       |   |
| 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. |
| <b>Drainage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Test)</b>                                      |   |       |   |
| 33   | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>             | R/A/G | Awaiting comment  |
| <b>Environmental Health</b>  |   |       |   |
| 34   | <b>Contamination</b><br>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G | Awaiting comment  |
| 35   | <b>Adjoining uses</b><br>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | A     | Potential road noise  |
| <b>Environmental Constraints</b>   |   |       |   |
| 36   | <b>Landscape character</b><br>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     | Very limited scope for development would need to be small scale – site is part of rural setting characterised by small fields and hedged boundaries. Need to conserve hedgerows.  |
| 37   | <b>Heritage/ Archaeology</b><br>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?<br>Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?  |       | This site lies in close proximity to the historic cores of the settlements of Upper and Lower Gravenhurst (as recorded on the CBC Historic Environment Record), therefore it has  |

|                                       |   |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
|                                       |   |   | archaeological potential. Archaeological potential does not prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate mitigation strategy in line with para 141 of the NPPF was implemented. Any planning submission would need to be accompanied by the results of an intrusive archaeological field evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF. Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability. Heritage: Wider distant setting views from the church South of the site. |
| <b>38</b>                             | <b>Ecological Assets</b><br>What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | A | Grade 2 agric land. Potential impact on species of principal importance, some opportunity for ecological enhancement   |
| <b>39</b>                             | <b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b><br>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 | Close proximity to Wrest Park parkland – visual impact would need to be mitigated. Drainage ditch and hedgerow on western edge, and hedgerow network would need to be enhanced.  |
| <b>Minerals and Waste</b>             |   |   |  |
| <b>40</b>                             | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G | No issues  |
| <b>Planning History</b>               |   |   |  |
| <b>41</b>                             | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |   | No relevant planning history   |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   |   | Yes/ No  |

### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

**On planning balance this site could potentially be considered further. There would need to be appropriate mitigation measures due to landscape impacts.**

**A portion of the site with road frontage would be therefore more suitable for development as this would respect the settlement pattern and local character of the area and would avoid adverse landscape impacts.**

### 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.

| <b>Viability</b>     |  |   |   |
|----------------------|--|---|---|
| <b>43</b>            | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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.  |
| <b>Achievability</b> |  |   |   |
| <b>44</b>            | Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?  |   | <p>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%.</p> <p>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; and potential A1 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.</p> |

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>10</sup>

| Site details          |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Reference Number      | ALP467   |
| Site Name             | The Pyghtle  |
| Site Address          | The Pyghtle  |
| Settlement            | Gravenhurst  |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area: 1.2HA<br>Submitted Whole Site Area 1.2HA:<br>Measured GIS Area:1.1HA |
| Proposed Use          | Residential Development  |
| Any other information | Proposed housing number not identified<br>adj to 17/00106/OUT - approved<br>Similar to NLP101    |

### 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

|   |  |    |  |
|---|--|----|--|
| 1 | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?<br>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.<br>Site Size Gross to net ratio standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul> <i>Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.</i> | No | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:<br><br>Not specified |
|   |  |    | Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:<br><br>28     |

#### 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 | Not in flood zone 2 or 3                 |
| 3 | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding? | No | Not at risk from surface water flooding. |

#### Nationally significant designations (All sites which reach Stage 2 be 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 | Not in designated area |
| 5                                     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No | Not in AONB            |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |  |    | Yes                    |

<sup>10</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

### 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 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>11</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 | Site relates well to existing settlement and is a logical infill extension without any constraints identified |
| 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 identified   |
| 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>12</sup>.

#### Critical Infrastructure

|                                       |   |   |                 |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 8                                     | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery</b> <sup>13</sup> ? | G | None identified |
| 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 | Rough/Pasture land |
| 10 | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?  | G | Sole land owner    |
| 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 | None apparent      |
| 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 | None apparent      |

<sup>11</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/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) )

<sup>12</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>13</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 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 be considered for allocation in the Plan.

#### Greenbelt

|                                       |  |           |                   |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------|-------------------|
| <b>13</b>                             | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No        | Not in Green Belt |
| <b>14</b>                             | 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.  | Yes or No | Details           |
| <b>15a</b>                            | 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 access (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> </ul> 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.* | Yes or No | Details           |
| <b>15b</b>                            | 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>14</sup>  | Yes       | 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.

#### Previously Developed Land

|           |  |   |              |
|-----------|--|---|--------------|
| <b>16</b> | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 76% - 100% (G)</li> </ul> | R | Pasture land |
|-----------|--|---|--------------|

<sup>14</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

|                                   |   |    |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|----|--|
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 26 - 75% (A)</li> <li>• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>   |    |  |
| <b>Community</b>                  |   |    |  |
| <b>17</b>                         | <b>Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas)</b><br>Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  | No | No NP in place   |
| <b>18</b>                         | <b>Community Consultation</b><br>Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.   | No | None apparent  |
| <b>19</b>                         | <b>Sustainability of Settlement</b><br>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 | No sustainability issues   |
| <b>Cumulative Impact</b>          |   |    |  |
| <b>20</b>                         | Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>• 5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>• More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <i>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).</i>                               | A  | No. Houses 2006: 238<br>No. Houses 2016: 243<br>% Growth: 2.10%                              |
| <b>21</b>                         | What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>• 5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>• More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <i>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).</i> | A  | No. Houses 2016: 243<br>Outstanding Completions: 4<br>% Growth: 1.65%                        |
| <b>Physical Constraints</b>       |   |    |  |
| <b>22</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.   | G  | None identified  |
| <b>Relationship to Settlement</b> |   |    |  |
| <b>23</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?  | G  | The site abuts the settlement envelope and would complement the existing settlement pattern. |
| <b>Agricultural Land Quality</b>  |   |    |  |
| <b>24</b>                         | Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>• 50% or more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>• 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>  | R  | Grade 2 agricultural land  |

**STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

**Transport and Access to Services**

|            |  |   |   |
|------------|--|---|---|
| <b>25</b>  | <b>Facilities and services</b><br>Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.<br><br>Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |   |   |
| <b>25a</b> | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>                             | G | Gravenhurst Lower                           |
| <b>25b</b> | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>                                    | A | Robert Bloomfield Academy                   |
| <b>25c</b> | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>  | A | Samuel Whitbread Academy                    |
| <b>25d</b> | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>                    | R | Closest is Shefford Health Centre           |
| <b>26</b>  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> <li>• Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)</li> <li>• None (R)</li> </ul>  | R | None  |
| <b>27</b>  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 part of the development (G)</li> </ul> | G | Less than 400m to service 200 – Biggleswade |
| <b>28</b>  | Distance to nearest train station:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>• 800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>• Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>   | R | Over 1200m from Arlesey Station             |
| <b>29</b>  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | G | Shillington Road                            |

| <b>School Capacity</b>   |   |       |   |
|--|---|-------|---|
| 30   | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A     | Similar to Flitton and Greenfield, Lower school may be an issue – additional land may be required to enable an expansion. Middle and upper school places could be managed through a financial contribution.   |
| 31   | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | A     | None identified   |
| <b>Water Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastructure will be assessed at a later stage)</b> |   |       |   |
| 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. |
| <b>Drainage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Test)</b>                                      |   |       |   |
| 33   | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>             | G     | No issues   |
| <b>Environmental Health</b>  |   |       |   |
| 34   | <b>Contamination</b><br>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G | Awaiting comments   |
| 35   | <b>Adjoining uses</b><br>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G     | No issues   |
| <b>Environmental Constraints</b>   |   |       |   |
| 36   | <b>Landscape character</b><br>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     | Limited opportunity for development of site; elevated location within distinctive settlement set on knoll. Need to conserve rural setting / views. Need to include PROW within appropriate landscape setting. Any development must respect views to settlement and church tower via layout, build height and appropriate landscape mitigation. Recommend any development  |

|                                       |   |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                                       |   |   | must provide appropriate and effective landscape mitigation to southern site area especially and include PROW within landscape setting as part of public realm.   |
| <b>37</b>                             | <b>Heritage/ Archaeology</b><br>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?<br>Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?  | A | Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken. This site contains part of the historic core of the settlement of Upper Gravenhurst and, therefore, it has archaeological potential. Archaeological potential does not prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate mitigation strategy in line with para 141 of the NPPF was implemented. Any planning submission would need to be accompanied by the results of an intrusive archaeological field evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF. This site also lies in the wider setting of the Church Panel medieval moat, Scheduled Monument; therefore consideration must also be given to the impact of the proposals on the setting of the Scheduled Monument (required by paras 132 - 134 of the NPPF). Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability. |
| <b>38</b>                             | <b>Ecological Assets</b><br>What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | A | Retain hedgerows and corridors to wider countryside.  |
| <b>39</b>                             | <b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b><br>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 | Existing ROW across western edge, development would need to enhance and relate to.  |
| <b>Minerals and Waste</b>             |   |   |   |
| <b>40</b>                             | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G | No issues   |
| <b>Planning History</b>               |   |   |   |
| <b>41</b>                             | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |   | Adjoins 17/00106 approved   |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   |   | Yes   |

## STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

On balance the site is to be considered further.

- There are no major constraints to development on the site.
- The site would not have an adverse impact on the settlement pattern and character as an application adjoining the site has been approved for residential development.
- Due to the potential impacts on the landscape, any development must provide effective landscape mitigation to the south and include rights of way as part of the development.
- Further information is required on access.

## 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

|    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 43 | <p>Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 | <p>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.</p> |
|----|---|---|---|

### Achievability

|    |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|---|
| 44 | <p>Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?</p> |  | <p>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%.</p> <p>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-</p> |
|----|--|--|---|

|                                |   |  |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                |   |  | West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; and potential A1 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                             | When can the scheme realistically commence delivery? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> |  | 0 to 5 years   |
| 46                             | What is the indicative build out time of the site?  |  | 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.  |
| 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

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>15</sup>

| Site details          |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Reference Number      | <b>NLP101</b>   |
| Site Name             | Land at Upper Gravenhurst   |
| Site Address          | Land at Upper Gravenhurst   |
| Settlement            | Gravenhurst   |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area: 1.5HA<br>Submitted Whole Site Area 1.5HA<br>Measured GIS Area:1.5HA |
| Proposed Use          | Residential Development   |
| Any other information | adj to 17/00106/OUT - approved similar to ALP467  |

### 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

|          |  |    |   |
|----------|--|----|---|
| <b>1</b> | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?<br>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.<br>Site Size Gross to net ratio standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul> <i>Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.</i> | No | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:<br><br>45<br><br>Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:<br><br>36 |
|----------|--|----|---|

#### Flood Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the Sequential Test)

|          |   |    |  |
|----------|---|----|--|
| <b>2</b> | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?        | No | Not in flood zone 2 or 3                 |
| <b>3</b> | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding? | No | Not at risk from surface water flooding. |

#### Nationally significant designations (All sites which reach Stage 2 be subject to detailed assessment)

|                                       |  |    |                        |
|---------------------------------------|--|----|------------------------|
| <b>4</b>                              | 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 | Not in designated area |
| <b>5</b>                              | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No | Not in AONB            |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |  |    | Yes                    |

<sup>15</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

### 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 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>16</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 | Site relates well to existing settlement and is a logical infill extension without any constraints identified |
| 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 identified   |
| 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>17</sup>.

#### Critical Infrastructure

|                                       |   |   |                 |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 8                                     | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery</b> <sup>18</sup> ? | G | None identified |
| 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 | Rough/Pasture land |
| 10 | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?  | G | Sole land owner    |
| 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 | None apparent      |
| 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 | None apparent      |

<sup>16</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/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) )

<sup>17</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>18</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 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 be considered for allocation in the Plan.

#### Greenbelt

|                                       |  |           |                   |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------|-------------------|
| <b>13</b>                             | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No        | Not in Green Belt |
| <b>14</b>                             | 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.  | Yes or No | Details           |
| <b>15a</b>                            | 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 access (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> </ul> 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.* | Yes or No | Details           |
| <b>15b</b>                            | 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>19</sup>  | Yes       | 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.

#### Previously Developed Land

|           |  |   |              |
|-----------|--|---|--------------|
| <b>16</b> | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 76% - 100% (G)</li> </ul> | R | Pasture land |
|-----------|--|---|--------------|

<sup>19</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

|                                   |   |    |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|----|--|
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 26 - 75% (A)</li> <li>• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>   |    |  |
| <b>Community</b>                  |   |    |  |
| 17                                | <b>Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas)</b><br>Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  | No | No NP in place   |
| 18                                | <b>Community Consultation</b><br>Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.   | No | None apparent  |
| 19                                | <b>Sustainability of Settlement</b><br>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 | No sustainability issues   |
| <b>Cumulative Impact</b>          |   |    |  |
| 20                                | Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>• 5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>• More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <i>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).</i>                               | A  | No. Houses 2006: 238<br>No. Houses 2016: 243<br>% Growth: 2.10%                              |
| 21                                | What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>• 5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>• More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <i>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).</i> | A  | No. Houses 2016: 243<br>Outstanding Completions: 4<br>% Growth: 1.65%                        |
| <b>Physical Constraints</b>       |   |    |  |
| 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  |
| <b>Relationship to Settlement</b> |   |    |  |
| 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  | The site abuts the settlement envelope and would complement the existing settlement pattern. |
| <b>Agricultural Land Quality</b>  |   |    |  |
| 24                                | Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>• 50% or more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>• 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>  | R  | Grade 2 agricultural land  |

**STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

**Transport and Access to Services**

|            |  |   |   |
|------------|--|---|---|
| <b>25</b>  | <b>Facilities and services</b><br>Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.<br><br>Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |   |   |
| <b>25a</b> | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>                             | G | Gravenhurst Lower                           |
| <b>25b</b> | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>                                    | A | Robert Bloomfield Academy                   |
| <b>25c</b> | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>  | A | Samuel Whitbread Academy                    |
| <b>25d</b> | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>                    | R | Closest is Shefford Health Centre           |
| <b>26</b>  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> <li>• Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)</li> <li>• None (R)</li> </ul>  | R | None  |
| <b>27</b>  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 part of the development (G)</li> </ul> | G | Less than 400m to service 200 – Biggleswade |
| <b>28</b>  | Distance to nearest train station:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>• 800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>• Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>   | R | Over 1200m from Arlesey Station             |
| <b>29</b>  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | G | Shillington Road                            |

| <b>School Capacity</b>   |   |       |   |
|--|---|-------|---|
| 30   | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A     | Similar to Flitton and Greenfield, Lower school may be an issue – additional land may be required to enable an expansion. Middle and upper school places could be managed through a financial contribution.   |
| 31   | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | A     | None identified   |
| <b>Water Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastructure will be assessed at a later stage)</b> |   |       |   |
| 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. |
| <b>Drainage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Test)</b>                                      |   |       |   |
| 33   | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>             | G     | No issues   |
| <b>Environmental Health</b>  |   |       |   |
| 34   | <b>Contamination</b><br>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G | Awaiting comments   |
| 35   | <b>Adjoining uses</b><br>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G     | No issues   |
| <b>Environmental Constraints</b>   |   |       |   |
| 36   | <b>Landscape character</b><br>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     | Limited opportunity for development of site; elevated location within distinctive settlement set on knoll. Need to conserve rural setting / views. Need to include PROW within appropriate landscape setting. Any development must respect views to settlement and church tower via layout, build height and appropriate landscape mitigation. Recommend any development  |

|                                       |   |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
|                                       |   |   | must provide appropriate and effective landscape mitigation to southern site area especially and include PROW within landscape setting as part of public realm.  |
| <b>37</b>                             | <b>Heritage/ Archaeology</b><br>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?<br>Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?  | A | Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken.<br>This site contains part of the historic core of the settlement of Upper Gravenhurst and, therefore, it has archaeological potential. Archaeological potential does not prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate mitigation strategy in line with para 141 of the NPPF was implemented. Any planning submission would need to be accompanied by the results of an intrusive archaeological field evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF. This site also lies in the wider setting of the Church Panel medieval moat, Scheduled Monument; therefore consideration must also be given to the impact of the proposals on the setting of the Scheduled Monument (required by paras 132 - 134 of the NPPF). Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability. |
| <b>38</b>                             | <b>Ecological Assets</b><br>What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | A | Retain hedgerows and corridors to wider countryside.   |
| <b>39</b>                             | <b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b><br>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 | Existing ROW across western edge, development would need to enhance and relate to  |
| <b>Minerals and Waste</b>             |   |   |  |
| <b>40</b>                             | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G | No issues  |
| <b>Planning History</b>               |   |   |  |
| <b>41</b>                             | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |   | adj to 17/00106/OUT - approved   |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   |   | Yes  |

## STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

On balance the site is to be considered further.

- There are no major constraints to development on the site.
- The site would not have an adverse impact on the settlement pattern and character as an application adjoining the site has been approved for residential development.
- Due to the potential impacts on the landscape, any development must provide effective landscape mitigation to the south and include rights of way as part of the development.
- Further information is required on access.

## 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

|    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 43 | <p>Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 | <p>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.</p> |
|----|---|---|---|

### Achievability

|    |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|---|
| 44 | <p>Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?</p> |  | <p>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%.</p> <p>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-</p> |
|----|--|--|---|

|                                |   |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
|                                |   | West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; and potential A1 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                             | When can the scheme realistically commence delivery? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> | 0 to 5 years   |
| 46                             | What is the indicative build out time of the site?  | 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.  |
| 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

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>20</sup>

| Site details          |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Reference Number      | <b>NLP404</b>  |
| Site Name             | Land west of Shillington Road  |
| Site Address          | Land west of Shillington Road  |
| Settlement            | Upper Gravenhurst  |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area:1.45ha<br>Submitted Whole Site Area: 13ha<br>Measured GIS Area:13ha |
| Proposed Use          | Residential Development  |
| 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

|  |  |    |   |
|--|--|----|---|
| <b>1</b>   | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?<br>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.<br>Site Size Gross to net ratio standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul> <i>Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.</i> | No | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:<br><br>29<br><br>Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:<br><br>34 |
| <b>Flood Risk</b> (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the Sequential Test)                     |  |    |   |
| <b>2</b>   | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No | The site is not located within flood zone 2 or 3  |
| <b>3</b>   | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?  | No | The site is not at risk from surface water flooding   |
| <b>Nationally significant designations</b> (All sites which reach Stage 2 be subject to detailed assessment) |  |    |   |
| <b>4</b>   | 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 nationally significant designations on site  |
| <b>5</b>   | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No | Not in AONB   |
| Does the site continue to next stage?  |  |    | Yes   |

<sup>20</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

### 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 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>21</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?   | A | The proposed site extends the village south eastwards in a non-logical manner. As such it is considered the site would not be a logical extension to the village. However, only 1.4ha of the site is proposed for development and thus a small portion of the site would be considered more suitable. |
| 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. | A | Coalescence towards Lower Gravenhurst.  |
| 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>22</sup>.

#### Critical Infrastructure

|                                       |   |   |                                     |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 8                                     | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery</b> <sup>23</sup> ? | A | No critical 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 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?<br>Would the existing use limit the development potential?  | G | Arable land                          |
| 10 | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?                                 | G | Land owner intent on developing      |
| 11 | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?<br>If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically | G | No known legal or ownership problems |

<sup>21</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/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) )

<sup>22</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>23</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?  |   |                        |
| <b>12</b>                             | 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 planning permission |
| 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 be considered for allocation in the Plan.

#### Greenbelt

|                                       |  |           |                        |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------|------------------------|
| <b>13</b>                             | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No        | Site not on green belt |
| <b>14</b>                             | 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.  | Yes or No | Details                |
| <b>15a</b>                            | 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 access (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> </ul> 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.* | Yes or No | Details                |
| <b>15b</b>                            | 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>24</sup>  | Yes       | 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.

<sup>24</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>Previously Developed Land</b>  |  |    |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|----|--|
| <b>16</b>                         | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 76% - 100% (G)</li> <li>• 26 - 75% (A)</li> <li>• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>   | R  | Greenfield   |
| <b>Community</b>                  |  |    |  |
| <b>17</b>                         | <b>Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas)</b><br>Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?   | No | NA   |
| <b>18</b>                         | <b>Community Consultation</b><br>Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.  | No | No known community consultation  |
| <b>19</b>                         | <b>Sustainability of Settlement</b><br>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 | No impact on sustainability  |
| <b>Cumulative Impact</b>          |  |    |  |
| <b>20</b>                         | Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>• 5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>• More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <i>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).</i>                               | G  | There has been a 2.10% growth in new homes in Gravenhurst  |
| <b>21</b>                         | What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed?<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>• 5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>• More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <i>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).</i> | G  | There will be an additional 1.65% growth in new homes in Gravenhurst   |
| <b>Physical Constraints</b>       |  |    |  |
| <b>22</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.  | G  | No physical constraints.   |
| <b>Relationship to Settlement</b> |  |    |  |
| <b>23</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?   | R  | The scale of the site is large in comparison to Upper Gravenhurst and will have an adverse impact on the character of the village. |
| <b>Agricultural Land Quality</b>  |  |    |  |
| <b>24</b>                         | Would the development impact on high quality   | R  | Grade 2  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | agricultural land? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|

## STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

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

### Transport and Access to Services

|            |   |   |                      |
|------------|---|---|----------------------|
| <b>25</b>  | <b>Facilities and services</b><br>Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.<br><br>Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  |   |                      |
| <b>25a</b> | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>                             | G | In settlement        |
| <b>25b</b> | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>                                    | A | Adjoining settlement |
| <b>25c</b> | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>  | A | Adjoining settlement |
| <b>25d</b> | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>• Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>                    | A | Adjoining settlement |
| <b>26</b>  | What retail provision does the settlement offer? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> <li>• Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)</li> <li>• None (R)</li> </ul>  | R | None                 |
| <b>27</b>  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 part of the development (G)</li> </ul> | A | 604m                 |
| <b>28</b>  | Distance to nearest train station:  | R | Over 1200m           |

|  |   |       |   |
|--|---|-------|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>• 800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>• Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>  |       |   |
| <b>29</b>  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | G     | Barton and Shillington Road   |
| <b>School Capacity</b>   |   |       |   |
| <b>30</b>  | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | R     | No local capacity   |
| <b>31</b>  | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | R     |   |
| <b>Water Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastructure will be assessed at a later stage)</b> |   |       |   |
| <b>32</b>  | 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. |
| <b>Drainage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Test)</b>                                      |   |       |   |
| <b>33</b>  | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No assessment required (G)</li> <li>• Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>• Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>       | A     | OW present, JFlow modelling required to confirm flood risk  |
| <b>Environmental Health</b>  |   |       |   |
| <b>34</b>  | <b>Contamination</b><br>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G | Awaiting comments   |
| <b>35</b>  | <b>Adjoining uses</b><br>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | A     | Potential noise   |
| <b>Environmental Constraints</b>   |   |       |   |
| <b>36</b>  | <b>Landscape character</b><br>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     | <b>Not acceptable in landscape terms;</b> Exposed, rolling rural setting, any development would result in urban spill which cannot be mitigated.  |
| <b>37</b>  | <b>Heritage/ Archaeology</b><br>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?<br>Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?  | A     | Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation   |
| <b>38</b>  | <b>Ecological Assets</b>  | G     | Potential impact on farmland  |

|                                       |   |     |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----|---|
|                                       | What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  |     | species but low density so opportunity for enhancement.         |
| <b>39</b>                             | <b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b><br>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/G | RoW across site and along southern edges, would need enhancing. |
| <b>Minerals and Waste</b>             |   |     |   |
| <b>40</b>                             | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G   | No issues   |
| <b>Planning History</b>               |   |     |   |
| <b>41</b>                             | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |     | No relevant planning history                                    |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   |     | No  |

### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

**The existing scale of the site is not considered appropriate. The site would not be in keeping with the character of Upper Graveshurst and is of a disproportionate scale to the village.**

**There are landscape concerns with developing the site as the site is exposed in a rolling rural setting. Any development here would result in an urban spill which cannot be mitigated.**

**As such the site will not be considered further.**

|                                |   |  |   |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 45                             | When can the scheme realistically commence delivery? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> |  | 0 to 5 years  |
| 46                             | What is the indicative build out time of the site?  |  | 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. |
| 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

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>25</sup>

| Site details          |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Reference Number      | <b>NLP466</b>  |
| Site Name             | Land at Barton Rd  |
| Site Address          | Land at Barton Rd  |
| Settlement            | Gravenhurst  |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area:0.5ha<br>Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.5ha<br>Measured GIS Area:0.43ha |
| Proposed Use          | Residential Development  |
| 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

|          |  |    |  |
|----------|--|----|--|
| <b>1</b> | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?<br>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.<br>Site Size Gross to net ratio standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul> <i>Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.</i> | No | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:<br><br>10-15<br><br>Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:<br>10 |
|----------|--|----|--|

#### Flood Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the Sequential Test)

|          |   |    |  |
|----------|---|----|--|
| <b>2</b> | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?        | No | Not in flood zone 2 or 3                 |
| <b>3</b> | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding? | No | Not at risk from surface water flooding. |

#### Nationally significant designations (All sites which reach Stage 2 be subject to detailed assessment)

|                                       |  |    |                        |
|---------------------------------------|--|----|------------------------|
| <b>4</b>                              | 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 | Not in designated area |
| <b>5</b>                              | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No | Not in 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>25</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>26</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 located within Lower Gravenhurst, a small hamlet consisting of a very small number of residential properties and agricultural buildings. It is separated from the main settlement of Upper Gravenhurst by agricultural land. It does not provide a logical extension to the existing main 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 | The site does not cause coalescence.  |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   |   | No  |

<sup>26</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/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) )



# Central Bedfordshire

A great place to live and work

DRAFT