

## **Site Assessment Forms**

Maulden



### **Contents**

| ALP023   | 3   |
|----------|-----|
| ALP051   | 5   |
| ALP053   | 14  |
| ALP055   | 16  |
| ALP116   | 18  |
| ALP151   | 27  |
| ALP153   | 34  |
| ALP250   | 41  |
| ALP326   | 43  |
| ALP327   | 45  |
| ALP394   | 47  |
| ALP409   | 49  |
| ALP415   | 58  |
| NLP016   | 65  |
| NLP053   | 66  |
| NLP055   | 75  |
| NLP087   | 76  |
| NLP129   | 83  |
| NLP131   | 92  |
| NLP233   | 101 |
| NLP253   | 110 |
| NLP270   | 119 |
| NLP276   | 126 |
| NLP287   | 133 |
| NLP289   | 140 |
| NLP320   | 147 |
| NLP342   | 149 |
| NLP367   | 156 |
| NLP377   | 157 |
| NLP390   | 164 |
| NLP416   | 166 |
| NII DAAE | 175 |

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

| Site details     |   |
|------------------|---|
| Reference Number | ALP023  |
| Site Name        | Land at Old Farm  |
| Site Address     | Land at Old Farm, Clophill Road, Maulden  |
| Settlement       | Maulden   |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: Not stated  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: Not stated   |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 11.86ha  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential   |
| Any other        | Parts of site covered by submissions NLP270, NLP276, NLP087. Adjacent to parcel |
| information      | NLP289  |

### 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.

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |  |
|-------|--|------------|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | Il or conf | lict with national policy designations.  |
|       | sional Site Capacity   | 1          |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  Not stated  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  213 dwellings |
| Flood | d Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.   |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No designations on site.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | No part of site covered by AONB.   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |            | Yes  |
|       |  |            |  |

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

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

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

|      | towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>2</sup> .  |   |  |  |
|------|---|---|--|--|
|      | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |  |
| 6    | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?  | R | The site borders the settlement envelope boundary to the south, west and east and is quite well related to existing development. A development of this scale in this location would promote an unsustainable growth pattern for Maulden. It may however be appropriate to consider a smaller development along the road frontage, the portion which is considered better related is covered by submissions NLP087, NLP270 and NLP276. Therefore this submission fails, and instead the portion of this site which is considered more appropriate will be assessed under submissions NLP270 and NLP276. |  |
| 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 | The site falls within a distinct village end to the east of Maulden that is separated from the main settlement by agricultural land. Although the site would not cause physical coalescence, the scale of site could result in visual coalescence with the main settlement. A portion of the site would reduce this potential impact.  |  |
| Does | the site continue to next stage?  |   | No   |  |

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

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>3</sup>

| Site details     |   |
|------------------|---|
| Reference Number | ALP051                                  |
| Site Name        | Land between 129A and 131 Clophill Road |
| Site Address     | Land between 129A and 131 Clophill Road |
| Settlement       | Maulden                                 |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 0.96ha      |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 1.08 ha      |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 1.02 ha              |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                             |
| Any other        |   |
| information      |   |

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

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

|       | STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT  |            |   |  |
|-------|--|------------|---|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  25 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  23 dwellings |  |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential 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.  |  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | Does border Maulden Wood SSSI   |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an 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>3</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

| provid | towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>4</sup> .  |   |  |  |
|--------|---|---|--|--|
| Relati | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |  |
| 6      | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | O | Site borders the settlement<br>envelope boundary and is well<br>related to this part of Maulden and<br>to Clophill also, but not to the main<br>centre of Maulden due to<br>Maulden's linear nature. |  |
| 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   |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |  |

| STAG   | GE 1C ASSESSMENT  |         |  |
|--------|---|---------|--|
| This s | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able | to meet | their critical infrastructure needs <sup>5</sup> . |
| Critic | al Infrastructure   |         |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure             | R/A/G   | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014               |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>6</sup> ?     |         |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?                          |         | Yes  |

| STAG   | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |           |                               |  |  |
|--------|---|-----------|-------------------------------|--|--|
|        | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for |           |                               |  |  |
|        | opment where there are no legal or ownership problems   | s and the | landowner has expressed an    |  |  |
|        | ion to develop the site.  |           |                               |  |  |
| Availa | ability   |           |                               |  |  |
| 9      | What is the existing use of the site?   | G         | Agricultural arable land      |  |  |
|        | Would the existing use limit the development  |           |                               |  |  |
|        | potential?  |           |                               |  |  |
| 10     | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner   | G         | Sole land owner               |  |  |
|        | who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   |           |                               |  |  |
| 11     | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could  | G         |                               |  |  |
|        | delay or prevent development?   |           |                               |  |  |
|        | If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically   |           |                               |  |  |
|        | overcome?   |           |                               |  |  |
| 12     | Does the site already have planning permission for  | G         | 17/00981/OUT decision not yet |  |  |
|        | the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red   |           | available.                    |  |  |
|        | because it's not eligible for allocation.   |           |                               |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |           | Yes                           |  |  |

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf</a>)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

### **STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT**

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

| Green | nbelt  |     |                               |
|-------|--|-----|-------------------------------|
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not located in the Green Belt |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable                |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable                |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.7   | N/A | Not applicable                |
| 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

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| Comr   | nunity   |       |   |
|--------|--|-------|---|
| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in   | No    | Designated but no draft plan  |
|        | designated areas)  |       |   |
|        | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an   |       |   |
|        | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?   |       |   |
| 18     | Community Consultation   | N/A   | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014                                    |
|        | Has any community consultation taken place?  | , , . |   |
|        | If yes, provide brief details on the form this   |       |   |
|        | consultation took and any overall community  |       |   |
|        | response.  |       |   |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement   | No    | Field   |
|        | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of  |       |   |
|        | the settlement through the loss of services and  |       |   |
|        | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public  |       |   |
|        | house etc)   |       |   |
| Cumu   | lative Impact  |       |   |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10   | Α     | Number of houses in 2006: 1268  |
|        | years, what has been the level of housing growth in  |       | Number of houses in 2016: 1340  |
|        | the parish?  |       | Percentage growth: 5.68%  |
|        | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>  |       |   |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)   |       |   |
|        | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>   |       |   |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of  |       |   |
|        | completions over the last ten years as a percentage  |       |   |
|        | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using  |       |   |
|        | census and completions data).  |       |   |
| 21     | What level of housing growth would there be if all the   | G     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340  |
|        | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to   |       | Number of outstanding completions                                       |
|        | be completed?  |       | in 2016: 24   |
|        | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>  |       | Percentage growth: 1.79%  |
|        | <ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>   |       |   |
|        | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>   |       |   |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of  |       |   |
|        | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as  |       |   |
|        | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April   |       |   |
|        | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions   |       |   |
|        | data).   |       |   |
|        | cal Constraints  |       |   |
| 22     | Are there any physical constraints or permanent  | G     | No physical constraints identified.                                     |
|        | features that affect the site's developability?  |       |   |
|        | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment  |       |   |
| Dalati | works, topography or wind turbines.  |       |   |
|        | Mould development of the cite he complementary to  | Ι Λ   | Only a partian of this site would be                                    |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to  | Α     | Only a portion of this site would be suitable due to the need to retain |
|        | 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 |       | separation from the SSSI.   |
|        | form?  |       |   |
| Agric  | ultural Land Quality   |       |   |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality   | G     | Non agricultural  |
| ~~     | agricultural land?   | ~     | 1 ton agricultural  |
|        | 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)   |       |   |
|        | <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>  |       |   |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 35, 4 or 3 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>       |       |   |
|        | ■ JU/0 UI IIIUIE III GIAUE I, Z UI JA (K)  |       |   |

### 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.

|     | e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance   |            |                                   |
|-----|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
|     | sport and Access to Services   |            |                                   |
| 25  | Facilities and services Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit. | of the sit | e for housing. It links to the    |
|     | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  | 1          |                                   |
| 25a | <ul><li>Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li><li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li></ul>                  | G          | Yes                               |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | Not in the settlement or an adjoining  |            |                                   |
| 051 | settlement (R)   | •          | Long districtions of the control  |
| 25b | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if   | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |
|     | <ul><li>applicable)?</li><li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li></ul>  |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)   |            |                                   |
| 25c | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper  | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |
|     | school?  |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)   |            |                                   |
| 25d | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical  | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |
|     | centre?  |            |                                   |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  Yes, proposed on part of the development (C)   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>     |            |                                   |
|     | <ul><li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li><li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li></ul>               |            |                                   |
|     | settlement (R)   |            |                                   |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?   | Α          | Convenience store                 |
|     | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)   |            |                                   |
|     | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent  |            |                                   |
|     | (A)  |            |                                   |
|     | None (R)   |            |                                   |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at  | G          | 108.77m                           |
|     | least hourly at peak times):   |            |                                   |
|     | • Less than 400m (G)   |            |                                   |
|     | • 400m-800m (A)  |            |                                   |
|     | <ul><li>Over 800m (R)</li><li>OR submission form stated that improved</li></ul>  |            |                                   |
|     | public transport facilities could be provided as   |            |                                   |
|     | part of the development (G)  |            |                                   |
| 28  | Distance to nearest train station:   | R          |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | • 800m-1200m (A)   |            |                                   |
|     | • Over 1200m (R)   |            |                                   |
| 29  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | G          | Access from Clophill Road         |
|     | ol Capacity  |            |                                   |
| 30  | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?   | Α          | Small amount of capacity existing |

|             |   | ı          |   |
|-------------|---|------------|---|
|             |   |            | at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.   |
| 31          | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | А          | Nothing on submission form  |
| Water       | TUtilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc   | ture will  | be assessed at a later stage)   |
| 32          | Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   | R/A/G      | Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required. |
|             | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  |            |   |
| 33          | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  | G          | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  |
|             | onmental Health   |            |   |
| 34          |   |            |   |
|             | Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G      | Awaiting comments.  |
| 35          | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | R/A/G<br>G | Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues   |
| 35<br>Envir | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  | G          | No immediate issues   |
| 35          | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  |            | J   |
| 35<br>Envir | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural | G          | No immediate issues  Site enables attractive views of farmland and to Maulden Woods; important buffer between Maulden   |

|      | What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  |     | to Maulden Woods SSSI and CWS. Site lies within Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area and given it's immediately adjacent to CWS and SSSI it MUST be able to demonstrate a net gain for biodiversity   |
|------|---|-----|--|
| 39   | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/R | No Loss of Open Space Direct impact on adj Maulden Wood. Increased usage will impact on capacity and quality of site. Protection, increase and enhancement required. Adjacent to Maulden Wood SSSI, and within Greensand NIA. Developable area would be limited by need to include extensive buffering and extension to Maulden Wood, possibility for limited development at front of site, if high quality habitat enhancement of rest of site delivered. |
|      | rals and Waste  |     |  |
| 40   | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G   | No Issue   |
|      | ning History  |     |  |
| 41   | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |     | 15/03434/OUT withdrawn<br>17/00981/OUT awaiting decision.  |
| Does | the site continue to next stage?  |     | Yes  |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

Development of this site would need to be sensitive to the SSSI, and therefore it is likely that only a portion of the site is suitable for development with the portion fronting onto the SSSI acting as a buffer. There are some education capacity issues identified in this area. The landscaping of the site enables attractive views of farmland and into Maulden Woods, whilst also providing an important buffer between Maulden and Water End so there would be some landscape concerns in the development of the site. To preserve the ecology of the site, an appropriate buffer zone must be enforced for the site and a net gain must be demonstrated for biodiversity. Further work would be required to understand whether it would be possible to provide necessary mitigation whilst also providing 10 dwellings or more; however a portion of the site will remain in the process at this stage.

### **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.

| Viabi | lity  |   |   |
|-------|---|---|---|
| 43    | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low? | G | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area |

|    | High (O) Device bereath level 1 (1)   | and at this seals would succed  |
|----|---|---|
|    | <ul> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value</li> </ul> | and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower   |
|    | Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual  | benchmark land values and as  |
|    | land value close to benchmark land value  | such the report indicates that such   |
|    | <ul> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below</li> </ul>                               | development would likely be viable.   |
|    | benchmark land value  |   |
|    | vability  | The Council's Desidential   |
| 44 | Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?                                 | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential property figures between 2013 and 2016. The housing market within Central Bedfordshire has seen significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.  This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically |
|    |   | successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East-West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; 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  | 0 to 5 years  |
|    | delivery?   |   |
|    | 0 to 5 years (deliverable)      6 to 10 years   |   |
|    | • 6 to 10 years   |   |
|    | <ul><li>11 to 15 years</li><li>15 to 20 years</li></ul>   |   |
|    | <ul> <li>Outside Plan Period</li> </ul>   |   |
| 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   |

|                                | permiss | eived detailed planning<br>sion a single housebuilder<br>kely take one year to build<br>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>8</sup>

| Site details     |                                   |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Reference Number | ALP053                            |
| Site Name        | Land East of Ampthill             |
| Site Address     | Land East of Ampthill             |
| Settlement       | Maulden parish (adjoins Ampthill) |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 26ha  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 34.4ha |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 34.76ha        |
| Proposed Use     | Residential Development           |
| Any other        | Similar submission: NLP390        |
| information      |                                   |

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

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

| STAC  | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | ict with national policy designations.  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  500 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  468 dwellings |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ntial Test)   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No designations on site.  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | No part of site covered by AONB.  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |            | Yes   |

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

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

<sup>8</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

| Relat | tionship to Settlement  |   |  |
|-------|---|---|--|
| 6     | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The lies adjacent to the existing settlement of Ampthill and there are no barriers between the site and Ampthill.  |
| 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. | R | The site lies between Ampthill and Maulden in an important gap which is designated Green Belt.  Development of this site would cause coalescence between Maulden and Ampthill across the Green Belt and therefore would not be acceptable. |
| Doos  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | No   |



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led\_garden\_villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf</a> )

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

| Site details     |                                    |
|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Reference Number | ALP055                             |
| Site Name        | Land adjoining Kingsbrook          |
| Site Address     | Kingsbrook, Limbersey Lane         |
| Settlement       | Maulden                            |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 2.5 ha |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.35 ha |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 3.9 ha          |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                        |
| Any other        |                                    |
| information      |                                    |

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

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

|       | SE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
|       | tage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma  | ll or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   | T          |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  75 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  45 dwellings |
| Flood | I Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located ion 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.  |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S  | stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not within an 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>10</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

| 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 borders a small part of the settlement envelope and Limbersey Lane but is largely separated from the existing settlement by small parcels of land and the Brache. It is therefore not strongly related to the |
|--|---|--|
| 7 Does the site cause coalescence between an   |   | existing settlement.   |
| 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.  |



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

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>12</sup>

| Site details     |   |
|------------------|---|
| Reference Number | ALP116                                  |
| Site Name        | Land between 129A and 131 Clophill Road |
| Site Address     | Land between 129A and 131 Clophill Road |
| Settlement       | Maulden                                 |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 0.96ha      |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 1.08 ha      |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 1.02 ha              |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                             |
| Any other        |   |
| information      |   |

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

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

|       | STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT  |            |   |  |
|-------|--|------------|---|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  25 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  23 dwellings |  |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.  |  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | Does border Maulden Wood SSSI   |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not within an AONB.   |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |            | Yes   |  |

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</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 13.  Relationship to Settlement |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | O | Site borders the settlement<br>envelope boundary and is well<br>related to this part of Maulden and<br>Clophill also, but not to the main<br>settlement of Maulden |
| 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   |
| 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>14</sup> . |  |       |                     |                    |  |
| Critic   | Critical Infrastructure                                |       |                     |                    |  |
| 8  | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure          | R/A/G | Not asked for in Ca | all for Sites 2014 |  |
|  | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>15</sup> ? |       |                     |                    |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?                       |       | Yes                 |                    |  |

| STAC   | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |          |                                       |  |  |
|--------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| This   | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not avai   | lable. A | site is considered available for      |  |  |
|        | opment where there are no legal or ownership problems   | s and th | e landowner has expressed an          |  |  |
| intent | ion to develop the site.  |          |                                       |  |  |
| Avail  | ability   |          |                                       |  |  |
| 9      | What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?   | G        | Agricultural arable 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        | No known legal or ownership problems. |  |  |
| 12     | Does the site already have planning permission for<br>the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red<br>because it's not eligible for allocation.  | G        | None                                  |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |          | Yes                                   |  |  |

### STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

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 )

14 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.

15 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.

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

| Greer | nbelt  |     |                        |
|-------|--|-----|------------------------|
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within Green Belt. |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable.        |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable.        |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.16  | N/A | Not applicable.        |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |     | Yes                    |

### STAGE 2: SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

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

### Community

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| 17    | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No   | Designated but no draft plan         |
|-------|---|------|--------------------------------------|
|       | designated areas)   |      |                                      |
|       | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |      |                                      |
| 1.0   | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  | 21/2 |                                      |
| 18    | Community Consultation  | N/A  | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014 |
|       | Has any community consultation taken place?   |      |                                      |
|       | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |      |                                      |
|       | consultation took and any overall community response.   |      |                                      |
| 19    | Sustainability of Settlement  | No   | Field                                |
| 13    | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   | INO  | i ieiu                               |
|       | the settlement through the loss of services and   |      |                                      |
|       | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |      |                                      |
|       | house etc)  |      |                                      |
| Cumi  | ulative Impact  |      |                                      |
| 20    | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | A    | Number of houses in 2006: 1268       |
|       | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   |      | Number of houses in 2016: 1340       |
|       | the parish?   |      | Percentage growth: 5.68%             |
|       | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>   |      |                                      |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |      |                                      |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)  |      |                                      |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |      |                                      |
|       | completions over the last ten years as a percentage   |      |                                      |
|       | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using   |      |                                      |
| 24    | census and completions data).   | G    | Number of houses in 2016: 1340       |
| 21    | What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to | G    | Number of outstanding completions    |
|       | be completed?   |      | in 2016: 24                          |
|       | Less than 5% growth (G)   |      | Percentage growth: 1.79%             |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |      | Teresmage gremm 111 676              |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)  |      |                                      |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |      |                                      |
|       | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as   |      |                                      |
|       | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April  |      |                                      |
|       | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions  |      |                                      |
|       | data).  |      |                                      |
|       | ical Constraints  |      |                                      |
| 22    | Are there any physical constraints or permanent   | G    | No constraints identified.           |
|       | features that affect the site's developability?   |      |                                      |
|       | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |      |                                      |
| Delet | works, topography or wind turbines.   |      |                                      |
| 23    | ionship to Settlement  Would development of the site be complementary to                                  | Α    | Only a portion of this site would be |
| 23    | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   | ^    | suitable due to retain separation    |
|       | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |      | with the SSSI.                       |
|       | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |      | With the Goot.                       |
|       | form?   |      |                                      |
| Agric | cultural Land Quality   |      |                                      |
| 24    | Would the development impact on high quality  | G    | Non agricultural                     |
|       | agricultural land?  |      |                                      |
|       | 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  |      |                                      |
|       | • 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)   |      |                                      |
|       | • 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)   |      |                                      |
|       |   | 1    | ı                                    |

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.

|     | Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.                                     |     |                                   |  |  |
|-----|---|-----|-----------------------------------|--|--|
|     | Transport and Access to Services  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 25  | Facilities and services   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     |   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   | 1 _ |                                   |  |  |
| 25a | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  | G   | Yes                               |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>                                  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>                                      |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | settlement (R)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 25b | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if  | Α   | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |
|     | applicable)?  |     | , ,                               |  |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>                                  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>                                      |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>  | _   |                                   |  |  |
| 25c | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper   | Α   | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |
| 230 | school?   |     | in adjoining semement             |  |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     |   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 25d | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical   | Α   | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |
|     | centre?   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>                                  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>                                      |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | settlement (R)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α   | Convenience store                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>                                   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | (A)   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | None (R)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at   | G   | 246.94m                           |  |  |
|     | least hourly at peak times):  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | • 400m-800m (A)   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | • Over 800m (R)   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | OR submission form stated that improved   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | public transport facilities could be provided as  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | part of the development (G)   |     |                                   |  |  |
| 28  | Distance to nearest train station:  | R   |                                   |  |  |
|     | Less than 800m (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | • 800m-1200m (A)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | • Over 1200m (R)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 29  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | G   | Access from Clopbill Pood         |  |  |
|     | ol Capacity   | l G | Access from Clophill Road         |  |  |
| 30  |   | Α   | Small amount of canacity existing |  |  |
| 30  | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | ^   | Small amount of capacity existing |  |  |
|     |   | l   | at Maulden lower, which is        |  |  |

|       |  |       | expected to be taken up by            |
|-------|--|-------|---------------------------------------|
|       |  |       | development already planned in        |
|       |  |       | the area, so a new site/ additional   |
|       |  |       | land may be required. Middle and      |
|       |  |       | upper schools have already been       |
|       |  |       | expanded.                             |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address          | Α     | Nothing on the submission form        |
| 31    | ·  | A     | Nothing on the submission form        |
| \A/-4 | this?  | 4!!!  | he conserved at a later story.)       |
|       | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc |       |                                       |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required          | R/A/G | Water utilities companies have a      |
|       | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?      |       | statutory duty to supply water and    |
|       |  |       | waste water infrastructure to new     |
|       |  |       | development sites and a lack of       |
|       |  |       | available capacity does not prevent   |
|       |  |       | future development. Any               |
|       |  |       | infrastructure upgrades required      |
|       |  |       | will depend on the quantum and        |
|       |  |       | location of growth falling within     |
|       |  |       | each catchment area. Whilst the       |
|       |  |       |                                       |
|       |  |       | Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April      |
|       |  |       | 2017) identifies the current capacity |
|       |  |       | of existing water infrastructure, a   |
|       |  |       | Stage 2 study will be prepared to     |
|       |  |       | test the cumulative effect of sites   |
|       |  |       | that have been shortlisted for        |
|       |  |       | allocation in the Local Plan and      |
|       |  |       | identify the nature and timing of     |
|       |  |       | any upgrades required.                |
| Drain | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te   | st)   | any upgrado roquiros.                 |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to   | G     | Site is at limited risk of surface    |
|       | site allocations, in regards to flood risk?            |       | water flooding, assessment is         |
|       |  |       | unlikely to be required               |
|       | No assessment required (G)                             |       | unikely to be required                |
|       | Consider Further Assessment (A)                        |       |                                       |
|       | Further Assessment Required (R)                        |       |                                       |
|       | onmental Health  |       |                                       |
| 34    | Contamination  | R/A/G | Awaiting comments.                    |
|       | Are there any contamination constraints on site and    |       |                                       |
|       | will there be any remediation required?                |       |                                       |
| 35    | Adjoining uses   | G     | No immediate issues                   |
|       | Would any adjoining uses have the potential to         |       |                                       |
|       | cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;    |       |                                       |
|       | noise and smell)                                       |       |                                       |
| Envir | onmental Constraints                                   |       |                                       |
| 36    |  | R     | Site enables attractive views of      |
| 30    | Landscape character                                    | T.    |                                       |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on the        |       | farmland and to Maulden Woods;        |
|       | landscape character or setting of the area or any      |       | important buffer between Maulden      |
|       | designated landscapes? Would there be any direct       |       | and Water End.                        |
|       | or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural    |       |                                       |
|       | Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?                 |       |                                       |
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology                                  | Her:G | No heritage comment.                  |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any        | Arch: | Site is considered to have low        |
|       | heritage assets and their setting?                     | G     | archaeological potential. No          |
|       | Are there any opportunities for enhancement of         |       | objection to allocation               |
|       | these assets?  |       | Objection to anotation                |
| 20    |  | Λ     | Adiagont to CCCL Charies of           |
| 38    | Ecological Assets                                      | Α     | Adjacent to SSSI, Species of          |
|       | What would the imposts of development he on any        | I     | I Principal Importance known          |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any        |       | Principal Importance known            |

|       | biological, geological or ecological assets and are   |     | present- requires mitigation but  |
|-------|---|-----|---|
|       | there any opportunities for their enhancement?  |     | possible to achieve net gains.  |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/R | No Loss of Open Space Adjacent to Maulden Wood SSSI, and within Greensand NIA. Developable area would be limited by need to include extensive buffering and extension to Maulden Wood, possibility for limited development at front of site, if high quality habitat enhancement of rest of site delivered. |
| Miner | rals and Waste  |     |   |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G   | No Issue  |
| Plann | ning History  |     |   |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |     | None  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |     | Yes   |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

Development of this site would need to be sensitive to the SSSI, and therefore it might be the case that only a portion of the site is suitable for development with the portion fronting onto the SSSI acting as a buffer. There are some education capacity issues identified in this area. The landscaping of the site enables attractive views of farmland and into Maulden Woods, whilst also providing an important buffer between Maulden and Water End so there would be some landscape concerns in the development of the site. To preserve the ecology of the site, an appropriate buffer zone must be enforced for the site and a net gain must be demonstrated for biodiversity. Further work would be required to understand whether it would be possible to provide necessary mitigation whilst also providing 10 dwellings or more; however a portion of the site will remain in the process at this stage.

### **STAGE 3: ACHIEVABILITY**

This section assesses whether the site is Achievable in line with NPPG Guidance:

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

| Viabil | Viability   |   |  |  |  |
|--------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 43     | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?  • High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value  • Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value  • Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value | G | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable. |  |  |
| Achie  | vability  |   |  |  |  |
| 44     | Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?   |   | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential  |  |  |

| 45   | When can the scheme realistically commence delivery?  • 0 to 5 years (deliverable) • 6 to 10 years • 11 to 15 years | property figures between 2013 and 2016. The housing market within Central Bedfordshire has seen significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.  This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East-West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements. It is considered that as such infrastructure projects progress that property prices within the Local Authority will likely continue to increase which has and will increase viability/deliverability of development not only in the higher value areas but also the lower value areas of the Authority.  O to 5 years |
|------|---|---|
|      | <ul> <li>11 to 15 years</li> <li>15 to 20 years</li> <li>Outside Plan Period</li> </ul>                             |   |
| Does | What is the indicative build out time of the site?  the site pass this stage?                                       | 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.   |

### SUMMARY

### 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>17</sup>

| Site details     |                                    |   |
|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Reference Number | ALP151                             |   |
| Site Name        | Land North of Clophill Road        |   |
| Site Address     | Land North of Clophill Road        |   |
| Settlement       | Maulden                            |   |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 0.90ha |   |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.96ha  |   |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 0.92ha          |   |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                        |   |
| Any other        | Also part of NLP287                | • |
| 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  |            |   |  |  |
|-------|--|------------|---|--|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  25 to 30 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  22 dwellings |  |  |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located in Flood Zones 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.  |  |  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not within an AONB.   |  |  |
| Does  | Does the site continue to next stage?  |            |   |  |  |

### **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>17</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 18.   |   |  |  |  |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Relat | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |  |  |
| 6     | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site borders the settlement envelope and is well related to Maulden.   |  |  |
| 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 | The site is placed such that development of it would bridge the gap between distinctly separate settlement envelopes of Maulden in this location. Development of this site would cause coalescence between what are currently two distinct parts of Maulden. |  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |  |  |

|        | GE 1C ASSESSMENT   |       |                    |                    |  |
|--------|--|-------|--------------------|--------------------|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>19</sup> . |       |                    |                    |  |
| Critic | al Infrastructure  |       |                    |                    |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure  | R/A/G | Not asked for in C | all for Sites 2014 |  |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>20</sup> ?   |       |                    |                    |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?   |       | Yes                |                    |  |

| STAC   | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |           |                                       |  |  |
|--------|---|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| This   | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for |           |                                       |  |  |
| devel  | opment where there are no legal or ownership problems   | s and the | e landowner has expressed an          |  |  |
| intent | tion to develop the site.   |           |                                       |  |  |
| Avail  | ability   |           |                                       |  |  |
| 9      | What is the existing use of the site?   | G         | Agricultural use                      |  |  |
|        | Would the existing use limit the development potential?   |           |                                       |  |  |
| 10     | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner   | G         | Sole owner intent on developing       |  |  |
|        | who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   |           | the site                              |  |  |
| 11     | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?                      | G         | No known legal or ownership problems. |  |  |
|        | If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically   |           | problems.                             |  |  |
|        | overcome?   |           |                                       |  |  |
| 12     | Does the site already have planning permission for  | G         | None.                                 |  |  |
|        | the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red   |           |                                       |  |  |
|        | because it's not eligible for allocation.   |           |                                       |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |           | Yes                                   |  |  |

### STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

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 )

19 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.

20 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.

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

| Greer | Greenbelt  |     |                            |  |  |
|-------|--|-----|----------------------------|--|--|
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt. |  |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable             |  |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable             |  |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>21</sup>  | N/A | Not applicable             |  |  |
| 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**

| IICAI | Treviously beveloped Land                           |   |              |  |  |
|-------|---|---|--------------|--|--|
| 16    | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R | Agricultural |  |  |
|       | with the NPPF definition?                           |   |              |  |  |
|       | • 76% - 100% (G)                                    |   |              |  |  |
|       | • 26 - 75% (A)                                      |   |              |  |  |
|       | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)                         |   |              |  |  |
| _     | •   |   |              |  |  |

### Community

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| 17 No    | eighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No  | Designated but no draft plan                                |
|----------|--|-----|---|
|          | esignated areas)   | 140 | Designated but no drait plan                                |
|          | the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |     |   |
|          | merging Neighbourhood Plan?  |     |   |
|          | ommunity Consultation  | N/A | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014                        |
|          | as any community consultation taken place?   |     |   |
|          | yes, provide brief details on the form this  |     |   |
|          | onsultation took and any overall community   |     |   |
|          | sponse.  |     |   |
|          | ustainability of Settlement  | No  | Field   |
|          | ould this proposal impact on the sustainability of e settlement through the loss of services and         |     |   |
|          | cilities (for example, employment, retail, public  |     |   |
|          | ouse etc)  |     |   |
|          | tive Impact  |     |   |
|          | onsidering housing completions over the past 10  | A   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268                              |
| ye       | ears, what has been the level of housing growth in   |     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                              |
| th       | e parish?  |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%                                    |
|          | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>  |     |   |
|          | • 5% to 20% growth (A)   |     |   |
|          | More than 20% growth (R)   |     |   |
|          | his is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |   |
|          | ompletions over the last ten years as a percentage   |     |   |
|          | f the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using ensus and completions data).                          |     |   |
|          | That level of housing growth would there be if all the   | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                              |
|          | utstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to  |     | Number of outstanding completions                           |
| 1        | e completed?   |     | in 2016: 24   |
|          | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>  |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%                                    |
|          | <ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>   |     |   |
|          | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>   |     |   |
|          | his is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |   |
|          | utstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as   |     |   |
| 1 -      | ercentage of the total number of dwellings in April  |     |   |
| 1        | 016 (as calculated using census and completions ata).  |     |   |
|          | I Constraints  |     |   |
|          | re there any physical constraints or permanent   | G   | No physical constraints identified.                         |
|          | atures that affect the site's developability?  |     | The projection content and recommedia                       |
|          | or example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |     |   |
| W        | orks, topography or wind turbines.   |     |   |
|          | ship to Settlement   |     |   |
|          | ould development of the site be complementary to   | R   | This would further exaggerate the                           |
|          | e existing settlement pattern, and would it have an  |     | linear nature of Maulden and close                          |
|          | dverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive naracteristics of the settlement's built or natural |     | the gap between what are currently                          |
|          | rm?  |     | two very distinct parts of Maulden with separate settlement |
| 10       | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |     | envelopes.  |
| Agricult | ural Land Quality  |     |   |
|          | ould the development impact on high quality  | R   | Site is in Grade 2.   |
|          | gricultural land?  |     |   |
|          |  | 1   | 1   |
|          | <ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul>   |     |   |
|          | <ul><li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li><li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</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.

|      | Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.  |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|------|--|------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|      | Transport and Access to Services   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
| 25   | Facilities and services Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit. | of the sit | e for housing. It links to the    |  |  |  |
|      | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  | T _        |                                   |  |  |  |
| 25a  | <ul> <li>Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>               | G          | Yes                               |  |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | <ul><li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li><li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li></ul>               |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | settlement (R)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
| 25b  | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?  | A          | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
| 25.5 | Other catchment school available (A)  Dead the cattlement because Consendant (University).                             | ^          | In adjaining a still as out       |  |  |  |
| 25c  | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?  | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |  |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | Other catchment school available (A)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
| 25d  | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical  | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |  |
|      | centre?  |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  Not in the pattlement or an adjoining.                                       |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining<br/>settlement (R)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
| 26   | What retail provision does the settlement offer?   | Α          | Convenience store                 |  |  |  |
|      | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)   | ' `        | Convenience stere                 |  |  |  |
|      | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent  |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | (A)  |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | None (R)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
| 27   | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at  | G          | 202.96m                           |  |  |  |
|      | least hourly at peak times):   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | • Less than 400m (G)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | <ul><li>400m-800m (A)</li><li>Over 800m (R)</li></ul>  |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>                                     |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | public transport facilities could be provided as   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | part of the development (G)  |            |                                   |  |  |  |
| 28   | Distance to nearest train station:   | R          |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | <ul><li>Less than 800m (G)</li></ul>   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | • 800m-1200m (A)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
|      | Over 1200m (R)   |            |                                   |  |  |  |
| 29   | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | G          | Fronts Clophill Road              |  |  |  |
|      | Ol Capacity  | Ι Δ        | Cmall amount of consoits estation |  |  |  |
| 30   | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?   | Α          | Small amount of capacity existing |  |  |  |

|                                  |  |                     | at Maulden lower, which is   |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
|                                  |  |                     | expected to be taken up by   |
|                                  |  |                     | development already planned in   |
|                                  |  |                     | the area, so a new site/ additional  |
|                                  |  |                     | land may be required. Middle and   |
|                                  |  |                     | upper schools have already been  |
|                                  |  |                     | expanded.  |
| 31                               | If not, has a commitment been made to address  | Α                   | Nothing on submission form   |
| 14/-1                            | this?  | 1                   | ha a a a a a da a da da a da a da a da   |
|                                  | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc   |                     |  |
| 32                               | Is there the capacity to provide all required  | R/A/G               | Water utilities companies have a   |
|                                  | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?  |                     | statutory duty to supply water and   |
|                                  |  |                     | waste water infrastructure to new  |
|                                  |  |                     | development sites and a lack of  |
|                                  |  |                     | available capacity does not prevent  |
|                                  |  |                     | future development. Any  |
|                                  |  |                     | infrastructure upgrades required   |
|                                  |  |                     | will depend on the quantum and   |
|                                  |  |                     | location of growth falling within  |
|                                  |  |                     | each catchment area. Whilst the  |
|                                  |  |                     | Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April   |
|                                  |  |                     | 2017) identifies the current capacity  |
|                                  |  |                     | of existing water infrastructure, a  |
|                                  |  |                     | Stage 2 study will be prepared to  |
|                                  |  |                     | test the cumulative effect of sites  |
|                                  |  |                     | that have been shortlisted for   |
|                                  |  |                     |  |
|                                  |  |                     | allocation in the Local Plan and   |
|                                  |  |                     | identify the nature and timing of  |
|                                  |  |                     | hany unaradoc roduirod   |
| D:                               | and and Flagding (All alter publication Occurrential Ta  | -1)                 | any upgrades required.   |
|                                  | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te   |                     |  |
| Drain<br>33                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to   | est)                | Site is at limited risk of surface   |
|                                  | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?   |                     | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is   |
|                                  | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  • No assessment required (G)   |                     | Site is at limited risk of surface   |
|                                  | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?   |                     | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is   |
|                                  | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  • No assessment required (G)   |                     | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is   |
| 33                               | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A)   |                     | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is   |
| 33                               | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)   |                     | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is   |
| 33<br>Envir                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  | Ğ                   | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required   |
| 33<br>Envir                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health Contamination  | Ğ                   | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required   |
| 33<br>Envir                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination  Are there any contamination constraints on site and  | Ğ                   | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required   |
| Envir                            | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.   |
| Envir                            | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to   | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.   |
| Envir                            | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;   | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.   |
| 33<br>Envir<br>34                | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.   |
| Envir<br>34                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  |
| 33<br>Envir<br>34                | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  commental Constraints  Landscape character  | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to  |
| Envir<br>34                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the  | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set   |
| Envir<br>34                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any   | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration   |
| Envir<br>34                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct   | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to  |
| Envir<br>34                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural   | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to south – important to retain open   |
| Envir<br>34                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct   | R/A/G               | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to south – important to retain open views to greensand dipslope and   |
| 33<br>Envir<br>35<br>Envir<br>36 | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  | R/A/G G             | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to south – important to retain open views to greensand dipslope and Flit Valley   |
| Envir<br>34                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  Heritage/ Archaeology   | R/A/G G Her:G       | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to south – important to retain open views to greensand dipslope and Flit Valley  No Heritage comment.   |
| 33<br>Envir<br>35<br>Envir<br>36 | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  numerial Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  numerial Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  Heritage/ Archaeology  What would the impacts of development be on any  | R/A/G G Her:G Arch: | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to south – important to retain open views to greensand dipslope and Flit Valley  No Heritage comment.  Site has multi-period  |
| 33<br>Envir<br>35<br>Envir<br>36 | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  Heritage/ Archaeology  What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?   | R/A/G G Her:G       | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to south – important to retain open views to greensand dipslope and Flit Valley  No Heritage comment.  Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this                              |
| 33<br>Envir<br>35<br>Envir<br>36 | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  Heritage/ Archaeology  What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?  Are there any opportunities for enhancement of | R/A/G G Her:G Arch: | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to south – important to retain open views to greensand dipslope and Flit Valley  No Heritage comment.  Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation |
| 33<br>Envir<br>35<br>Envir<br>36 | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  Heritage/ Archaeology  What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?   | R/A/G G Her:G Arch: | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments.  No immediate issues  Very little scope for development to the north of Clophill Road, if set within strong screening integration to protect views from north. Land to south – important to retain open views to greensand dipslope and Flit Valley  No Heritage comment.  Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this                              |

| 38    | Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | G   | Potential to deliver net gain , retain and enhance hedgerow corridor                      |
|-------|---|-----|---|
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/G | No Loss of Open Space<br>Within Greensand NIA, would need<br>to deliver habitat net gain. |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |     |   |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G   | No Issue  |
| Plani | ning History  |     |   |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |     | None.   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |     | No  |

### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is not appropriate for development. This site is mostly Grade 2 agricultural land and lies between two distinctly separate settlement envelopes. Development here would fill in a gap in the settlement pattern which is distinctive and unique to the historical pattern of Maulden, development could have an unacceptable impact on the character of the settlement. In additional potential issues with education capacity have been raised.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>22</sup>

| Site details     |                                      |  |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Reference Number | ALP153                               |  |
| Site Name        | High Gables Farm                     |  |
| Site Address     | Land South of Clophill Road, Maulden |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden                              |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area:2.27 ha   |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area:2.27 ha    |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 2.27ha            |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                          |  |
| Any other        | Part of NLP287                       |  |
| 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  |            |   |  |
|-------|--|------------|---|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  50-60 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  41 dwellings. |  |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ntial Test)   |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not within Flood Zones 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.  |  |
| Natio | 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         | No nationally significant designations.   |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not within an 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>22</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>23</sup> . |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| Relat   | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site borders the settlement envelope and is well related to Maulden.   |
| 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 | The site is placed such that development of it would bridge the gap between distinctly separate settlement envelopes of Maulden in this location. Development of this site would cause coalescence between what are currently two distinct parts of Maulden. |
| Does the site continue to next stage?   |   |   | Yes  |

|  | GE 1C ASSESSMENT  |     |   |
|--|---|-----|---|
| This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>24</sup> . |   |     |   |
| Critical Infrastructure  |   |     |   |
| 8  | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure</b> requirements that will enable delivery <sup>25</sup> ? | N/A | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014 Form says new access from Clophill Road needed |
| 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? Agricultural arable land G Would the existing use limit the development potential? 10 G Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner Sole land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site? 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G No known legal or ownership delay or prevent development? problems. If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? 12 Does the site already have planning permission for G None. the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation. Does the site continue to next stage? Yes

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-

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{\text{led garden villages}}{\text{24}} \text{ towns and cities.pdf} \,)$  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.

25 This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure

requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

### **STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT**

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

| Greenbelt |  |     |                                    |
|-----------|--|-----|------------------------------------|
| 13        | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not located within the Green Belt. |
| 14        | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable.                    |
| 15a       | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable.                    |
| 15b       | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>26</sup>  | N/A | Not applicable.                    |
| Does      | 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 |   |   |              |
|---------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| 16                        | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R | Agricultural |
|                           | with the NPPF definition?                           |   |              |
|                           | • 76% - 100% (G)                                    |   |              |
|                           | • 26 - 75% (A)                                      |   |              |
|                           | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)                         |   |              |

<sup>26</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| Comr   | nunity  |         |  |  |  |  |
|--------|---|---------|--|--|--|--|
| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No      | Designated but no draft plan   |  |  |  |
|        | designated areas)   |         | 3  |  |  |  |
|        | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |         |  |  |  |  |
| 18     | Community Consultation  | N/A     | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014   |  |  |  |
|        | Has any community consultation taken place?   | 1 477 1 | The content of the co |  |  |  |
|        | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | consultation took and any overall community   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | response.   |         |  |  |  |  |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement  | No      | Site is currently a field.   |  |  |  |
| '3     | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   | 140     | One is currently a field.  |  |  |  |
|        | the settlement through the loss of services and   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | house etc)  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Cumi   | Ilative Impact  |         |  |  |  |  |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | Α       | Number of houses in 2006: 1268   |  |  |  |
| 20     | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   | ~       | Number of houses in 2016: 1340   |  |  |  |
|        | the parish?   |         | Percentage growth: 5.68%   |  |  |  |
|        | Less than 5% growth (G)   |         | 1 Groonlage growth. 0.0076   |  |  |  |
|        |   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |         | The state of the s |  |  |  |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)  This is a level to deliver a series of the series of th |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | 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   |         |  |  |  |  |
| 21     | census and completions data).   | G       | Number of houses in 2016: 1340   |  |  |  |
| 2      | What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to   | G       |  |  |  |  |
|        |   |         | Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 24  |  |  |  |
|        | be completed?   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | • Less than 5% growth (G)   |         | Percentage growth: 1.79%   |  |  |  |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)  |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April  |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Dhye   | Physical Constraints  |         |  |  |  |  |
| 22     |   | G       | No constraints identified.   |  |  |  |
|        | Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability?   | G       | TNO CONSTITUTES INCITUTED.   |  |  |  |
|        | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | works, topography or wind turbines.   |         |  |  |  |  |
| Relati | Relationship to Settlement  |         |  |  |  |  |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to   | R       | This would further exaggerate the  |  |  |  |
|        | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   |         | linear nature of Maulden and close   |  |  |  |
|        | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |         | the gap between what are currently   |  |  |  |
|        | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |         | two very distinct parts of Maulden   |  |  |  |
|        | form?   |         | with separate settlement   |  |  |  |
|        |   |         | envelopes.   |  |  |  |
| Agric  | ultural Land Quality  |         |  |  |  |  |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality  | R       | Site is Grade 2  |  |  |  |
|        | agricultural land?  |         | _  |  |  |  |
|        | 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>   |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 35, 4 or 3 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>  |         |  |  |  |  |
|        | - 30 /0 of more in Grade 1, 2 of 3a (N)   |         |  |  |  |  |

# **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.

|      | uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically<br>2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance |     | ed at this stage as the ratings across |
|------|---|-----|--|
|      | sport and Access to Services  |     |  |
| 25   | Facilities and services   |     |  |
|      | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the                   |     |  |
|      | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   | 00  | g                                      |
|      | ,   |     |  |
|      | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |     |  |
| 25a  | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  | G   | Yes                                    |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>   |     |  |
|      | settlement (R)  |     |  |
| 25b  | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if  | Α   | In adjoining settlement                |
|      | applicable)?  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
| 25c  | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper   | Α   | In adjoining settlement                |
|      | school?   |     |  |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  |     |  |
|      | Other catchment school available (A)  |     |  |
| 25d  | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical   | Α   | In adjoining settlement                |
|      | centre?   |     |  |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)  Yes, proposed as part of the development (C)  |     |  |
|      | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  No. but as a distribute and leave (A)                                 |     |  |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  Not in the settlement or an adjoining.                                    |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining<br/>settlement (R)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
| 26   | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α   | Convenience store                      |
| 20   | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)  | / \ | Convenience store                      |
|      | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent   |     |  |
|      | (A)   |     |  |
|      | None (R)  |     |  |
| 27   | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at   | G   | 275.54m                                |
|      | least hourly at peak times):  |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>  |     |  |
|      | • 400m-800m (A)   |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>   |     |  |
|      | <ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>   |     |  |
|      | public transport facilities could be provided as  |     |  |
|      | part of the development (G)   |     |  |
| 28   | Distance to nearest train station:  | R   |  |
|      | <ul><li>Less than 800m (G)</li></ul>  |     |  |
|      | • 800m-1200m (A)  |     |  |
|      | Over 1200m (R)  |     |  |
| 29   | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | G   | Access from Clophill Road              |
| Scho | ol Capacity   |     |  |

| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | А                       | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.   |
|-------|---|-------------------------|---|
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | Α                       | Nothing on submission form  |
| Water | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  | ture will               | be assessed at a later stage)   |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   | R/A/G                   | Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required. |
|       | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | st)                     |   |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G)  Consider Further Assessment (A)  Further Assessment Required (R)  | G                       | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  |
| 34    | onmental Health Contamination   | D/A/C                   | Augiting comments   |
| 34    | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G                   | Awaiting comments.  |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G                       | No immediate issues   |
|       | onmental Constraints  |                         |   |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | R                       | Unsuitable for development in landscape terms, important to retain open views to greensand dipslope and Flit Valley.  |
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?   | Her:<br>G<br>Arch:<br>A | No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken  |

| 38    | Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | G   | Potential to deliver net gain, retain and enhance hedgerow corridor  |
|-------|---|-----|--|
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/G | Within Greensand NIA, would need to deliver habitat net gain and retain / enhance existing habitats. No Loss of Open Space |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |     |  |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | A   | Within MSA   |
| Plani | ning History  |     |  |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |     | None   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |     | No   |

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is not appropriate for development; it forms an important gap between what are currently two distinct parts of Maulden. Maulden has a distinctive and historical settlement pattern which consists of a number of separate parts with important landscape gaps defining distinct parts and maintaining a rural character. Development of this site would close one of these important gaps and thus change the distinctive character of Maulden, instead making it a linear settlement. In addition to this the site is important in landscape terms, providing open views to greensand dip slope and the Flit Valley. In addition, potential issues with education capacity have been raised and the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. The site has multi-period archaeological potential, but this would not prevent allocation provided that appropriate mitigation was undertaken.

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

| Site details     | Site details  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Reference Number | ALP250  |  |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land adjacent to North Limbersey Farm                 |  |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land adjacent to North Limbersey Farm, Limbersey Lane |  |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden   |  |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area:1 ha                       |  |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area:1.2 ha                      |  |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 0.75 ha                            |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential   |  |  |  |
| Any other        |   |  |  |  |
| information      |   |  |  |  |

# STAGE 1: SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

| STAG  | STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT   |           |   |  |  |
|-------|---|-----------|---|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.  |           |   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity  |           |   |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if | No        | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  15 to 20 dwellings.  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  18 dwellings. |  |  |
| Floor | this is smaller.  Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the  | e Segue   | Intial Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?  | No        | Not located 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.  |  |  |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.  | No        | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?   | No        | Not within an AONB.   |  |  |
| Does  | Does the site continue to next stage?   |           |   |  |  |

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

|       | provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>28</sup> .   |   |  |  |  |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Relat | tionship to Settlement  |   |  |  |  |
| 6     | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | R | This site is separated from the main settlement along a road/lane. It is isolated, lying some distance from the rest of Maulden. |  |  |
| 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.  |  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | ١  |  |  |



led garden villages towns and cities.pdf)

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

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>29</sup>

| Site details   |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Reference Number   | ALP326                                  |  |  |  |
| Site Name  | Land to the north of Snow Hill, Maulden |  |  |  |
| Site Address   | Land to the north of Snow Hill, Maulden |  |  |  |
| Settlement   | Maulden                                 |  |  |  |
| Size   | Submitted Developable Area: 10.5ha      |  |  |  |
|  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 10.8ha       |  |  |  |
|  | Measured GIS Area: 10.8ha               |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use   | Residential                             |  |  |  |
| Any other ALP326 and NLP445 are very similar submissions but with slightly different |   |  |  |  |
| information boundaries and different land owner/ promoter details.                   |   |  |  |  |

# 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   |            |  |  |  |
|-------|---|------------|--|--|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma  | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.  |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity  |            |  |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?  Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land.  Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  2 hectares or above 60%  Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  250-300 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  189 dwellings. |  |  |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the  | ne Seque   | ntial Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?  | No         | Not located 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.   |  |  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S  | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)  |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.  | No         | No nationally significant designations.  |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?   | No         | Not within an AONB.  |  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |            | Yes  |  |  |

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

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

| Relat | tionship to Settlement  |   |  |
|-------|---|---|--|
| 6     | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site lies adjacent to the existing settlement of Maulden. No barriers exist between the site and Maulden.  |
| 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. | R | The site lies between Ampthill and Maulden in an important gap which is designated Green Belt. Development of this site would cause coalescence between Maulden and Ampthill within the Green Belt and therefore would no be acceptable. |
| Jooe  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | No   |



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

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>31</sup>

| Site details     | Site details                      |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Reference Number | ALP327                            |  |  |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land to the West of Flitwick Road |  |  |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land to the West of Flitwick Road |  |  |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden                           |  |  |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 3.8ha |  |  |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.8ha  |  |  |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 3.8ha          |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                       |  |  |  |  |
| Any other        |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| information      |                                   |  |  |  |  |

# STAGE 1: SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

| _     | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma     | II or cont | lict with national policy designations. |
|       | isional Site Capacity  |            | N                                       |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10               | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as         |
|       | dwellings?   |            | per proforma:                           |
|       | Work out the number of new homes from site size              |            |   |
|       | using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 %                |            | 90-120 dwellings.                       |
|       | depending on site size of land for infrastructure and        |            |   |
|       | services, take into account topography or significant        | · ·        |   |
|       | areas of undevelopable land.                                 |            | Number of proposed dwellings as         |
|       | Site Size Gross to net ratio standards                       |            | per CBC methodology:                    |
|       | <ul> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> </ul>                   |            |   |
|       | • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%                                      |            | 68 dwellings.                           |
|       | <ul> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul>                  |            |   |
|       | Note: for this calculation use the submitted                 |            |   |
|       | Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if             |            |   |
|       | this is smaller.   |            |   |
| Floo  | d Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the | ne Seque   |   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2         | No         | Not located in Flood Zone 2 or 3.       |
|       | or 3?  |            |   |
| 3     | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface            | No         | Not at risk from surface water          |
|       | water flooding?  |            | flooding.                               |
| Natio | pnally significant designations (All sites which reach S     |            |   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally           | No         | No nationally significant               |
|       | significant designations? These are: Sites of Special        |            | designations.                           |
|       | Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves,               |            |   |
|       | Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and                    |            |   |
|       | Gardens.   |            |   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area         | No         | Not within an AONB.                     |
|       | of Outstanding Natural Beauty?                               |            |   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?                             |            | Yes                                     |

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

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

<sup>31</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>32</sup> .   |   |   |  |  |
| Relati | onship to Settlement  |   |   |  |  |
| 6      | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | A | The site adjoins Maulden's settlement envelope however development of this site would constitute backland development which would be poorly related to the settlement, with no frontage and lengthy access roads.                         |  |  |
| 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. | R | The site lies between Ampthill and Maulden in an important gap which is designated Green Belt. Development of this site would cause coalescence between Maulden and Ampthill within the Green Belt and therefore would not be acceptable. |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | No  |  |  |

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

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>33</sup>

| Site details     | Site details                     |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Reference Number | ALP394                           |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land at The Barns                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land at The Barns, New Road      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden                          |  |  |  |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 5ha  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 5ha   |  |  |  |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 2.67ha        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Mixed residential and employment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any other        |                                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| information      |                                  |  |  |  |  |  |

# STAGE 1: SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |           |   |  |  |  |
|-------|--|-----------|---|--|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.   |           |   |  |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   | ,         |   |  |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No        | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  15 dwellings.  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  48 dwellings. |  |  |  |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque  | ential Test)  |  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No        | Not within 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.  |  |  |  |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S  | Stage 2 b | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No        | No designations   |  |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No        | Not within 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>33</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

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



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

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>35</sup>

| Site details     |  |
|------------------|--|
| Reference Number | ALP409   |
| Site Name        | Land to the rear of Gardeners Close  |
| Site Address     | Land to the rear of Gardeners Close  |
| Settlement       |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 2.5ha  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 2.67ha  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 2.8 ha  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential  |
| Any other        | Proposed Extension to HA24 allocation, does overlap a small part of HA24. Includes |
| information      | NLP129   |

# STAGE 1: SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

| STAC  | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |           |   |  |  |  |
|-------|--|-----------|---|--|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.   |           |   |  |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |           |   |  |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No        | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  75 dwellings.  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  45 dwellings. |  |  |  |
| Floor | d Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque  | ntial Test)   |  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No        | Not within 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.  |  |  |  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No        | No nationally significant designations present.   |  |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No        | Not within an 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

 $^{35}$  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>36</sup> . |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
|   | onship to Settlement  |   |   |  |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site lies on the boundary of the existing settlement envelope. If access can be achieved from Moor Lane then there is potential for the site to be well related to Maulden and within walking distance of a number of facilities. |  |
| 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  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes   |  |

|        | GE 1C ASSESSMENT   |  |     |       |                                  |
|--------|--|--|-----|-------|----------------------------------|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>37</sup> . |  |     |       |                                  |
| Critic | Critical Infrastructure  |  |     |       |                                  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure</b>   |  | N/A | Not a | asked for in Call for Sites 2014 |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>38</sup> ?   |  |     |       |                                  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?   |  |     | Yes   |                                  |

| STAG   | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |   |                             |  |  |  |
|--------|---|---|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for |   |                             |  |  |  |
| devel  | development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an           |   |                             |  |  |  |
| intent | ion to develop the site.  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| Avail  | ability   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 9      | What is the existing use of the site?   | G | Mainly Agricultural         |  |  |  |
|        | Would the existing use limit the development  |   |                             |  |  |  |
|        | potential?  | _ |                             |  |  |  |
| 10     | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner   | G | Part land owners intent on  |  |  |  |
|        | who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   |   | developing the site         |  |  |  |
| 11     | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could  | G | No known legal or ownership |  |  |  |
|        | delay or prevent development?   |   | problems.                   |  |  |  |
|        | If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically   |   |                             |  |  |  |
|        | overcome?   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 12     | Does the site already have planning permission for  | G | None.                       |  |  |  |
|        | the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red   |   |                             |  |  |  |
|        | because it's not eligible for allocation.   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes                         |  |  |  |

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

37 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.

38 This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

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

| ı ıaıı.   | i idii.  |     |                            |  |  |  |
|-----------|--|-----|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Greenbelt |  |     |                            |  |  |  |
| 13        | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt. |  |  |  |
| 14        | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable.            |  |  |  |
| 15a       | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable.            |  |  |  |
| 15b       | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>39</sup>  | N/A | Not applicable.            |  |  |  |
| 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**

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

|        | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)  |     |   |
|--------|--|-----|---|
| Comr   | nunity   |     |   |
| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas) Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?   | No  | Designated but no draft plan  |
| 18     | Community Consultation Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.  | N/A | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014  |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc)  | No  | Currently a field   |
|        | ulative Impact   |     |   |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish?  • Less than 5% growth (G)  | A   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268<br>Number of houses in 2016: 1340<br>Percentage growth: 5.68%  |
|        | <ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>  |     |   |
| 21     | What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed?  • Less than 5% growth (G)  • 5% to 20% growth (A)  • More than 20% growth (R)  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). | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340 Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 24 Percentage growth: 1.79%   |
| Physi  | ical Constraints   |     |   |
| 22     | Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.  | G   | No constraints identified.  |
| Relati | ionship to Settlement  |     |   |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to<br>the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an<br>adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive<br>characteristics of the settlement's built or natural<br>form?   | G   | No issues identified.   |
| Agric  | ultural Land Quality   |     |   |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?  • 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  • 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)  • 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)  | А   | The site is fully within Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub-classify Grades 3a and 3b. Therefore site must be rated Amber. |

#### **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.

| Stage | ge 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.   |            |  |
|-------|--|------------|--|
| Trans | sport and Access to Services   |            |  |
| 25    | Facilities and services  Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability  Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   | of the sit | te for housing. It links to the        |
| 250   | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  | G          | Yes                                    |
| 25a   | <ul> <li>Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li> <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          | res                                    |
| 25b   | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Other catchment school available (A)  | A          | In adjoining settlement                |
| 25c   | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Other catchment school available (A)  | A          | In adjoining settlement                |
| 25d   | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)                                    | A          | In adjoining settlement                |
| 26    | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  Town Centre/ Supermarket (G) Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A) None (R)  | A          | Convenience store                      |
| 27    | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):  • Less than 400m (G)  • 400m-800m (A)  • Over 800m (R)  • OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)                 | G          | 311.21m                                |
| 28    | Distance to nearest train station:  • Less than 800m (G)  • 800m-1200m (A)  • Over 1200m (R)   | R          |  |
| 29    | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | R          | It is not clear how access to the site |
|       | i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i  | 1          |  |

|       |   |           | would be policyed. The eviction   |
|-------|---|-----------|---|
|       |   |           | would be achieved. The existing access from Moor Lane is a relatively narrow lane, whilst access through the back of Gardeners Close which would require demolition.  |
|       | ol Capacity   |           |   |
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A         | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.   |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | A         | Nothing on submission form  |
|       | Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  | ture will |   |
| 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. |
| Drain | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | et)       | ary apgraded required.  |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G)  Consider Further Assessment (A)  Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health | G         | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  |
| 34    | Contamination   | R/A/G     | Awaiting comments   |
|       | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   |           | Awaiting comments.  |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G         | No immediate issues   |
| Envir | onmental Constraints  |           |   |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any   | R         | Unsuitable for development in landscape terms. Land forms part of greensand dipslope in elevated  |
|       |   |           |   |

|       | designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural   |                         | highly visible position.   |
|-------|--|-------------------------|--|
| 37    | Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  Heritage/ Archaeology  What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?  Are there any opportunities for enhancement of                    | Her:<br>G<br>Arch:<br>A | No Heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation  |
|       | these assets?  |                         | providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken   |
| 38    | Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?   | A                       | NIA, opportunities for enhancement at low density.   |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets  Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/G                     | No Loss of Open Space Within Greensand NIA, would need to deliver habitat net gain and retain / enhance existing habitats and ROW corridor along edge. |
| Mine  | rals and Waste   |                         |  |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?  | G                       | No Issue   |
| Planr | ning History   |                         |  |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)  |                         |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |                         | Yes  |

#### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

Some concerns have been raised about educational capacity in the area. Significant concerns have been raised about the landscape impact that development of this site would have, the lands forms part of the greensand dip slope and is elevated to a highly visible position. The site has multiperiod archaeological potential, but this would not prevent allocation proving that appropriate mitigation is undertaken. The site lies within the Nature Improvement Area but the Council's Ecologist has suggests that a low density development may present opportunities for enhancement. Since no other constraints have yet been identified, the site will remain within the assessment process to understand the potential for mitigation in relation to the identified constraints.

#### **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.

| Viabi | Viability  |   |  |  |  |
|-------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 43    | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?  High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value  Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value  Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below | 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 |  |  |

|    | benchmark land value  | development would likely be viable.  |
|----|---|--|
|    | vability  |  |
| 45 | When can the scheme realistically commence delivers?  | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential property figures between 2013 and 2016. The housing market within Central Bedfordshire has seen significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.  This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East- West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; 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 of the Authority.  0 to 5 years |
|    | delivery?  • 0 to 5 years (deliverable)  • 6 to 10 years  • 11 to 15 years  • 15 to 20 years  • Outside Plan Period |  |
| 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 first completion and would build out the site at a rate of 40 dwellings per  |

|                                | annum there after. |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Does the site pass this stage? | Yes                |

# **SUMMARY**

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

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

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



#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>40</sup>

| Site details     |  |
|------------------|--|
| Reference Number | ALP415   |
| Site Name        | Land at Silsoe Road  |
| Site Address     | Land at Silsoe Road  |
| Settlement       | Maulden  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: Option A 2.02ha Option B 2.14ha                  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.15ha  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area:2.3 ha   |
| Proposed Use     | Residential  |
| Any other        | Part of NLP342. Option A – 86 and Option B – 85. Older persons accommodation |
| 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.

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |  |
|-------|--|------------|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | ll or conf | lict with national policy designations.  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   | ,          |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  4 or 3 private housing and 82 older persons units  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  41 dwellings |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Segue   | ential Test)   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.   |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S  | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations present.  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an 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

 $^{40}$  Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

|      | or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a sel   | lf-contain | ed site is defined as a site which will  |
|------|---|------------|--|
|      | de 1,500 homes or more <sup>41</sup> .  |            |  |
| 6    | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | A          | Site lies near to the settlement envelope boundary, but is separated by a field. Site doesn't have a very strong relationship with the centre of Maulden.  Development of this site would constitute poorly-related back-land development. |
| 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.  |
| Does | the site continue to next stage?  |            | Yes  |

| STAG   | GE 1C ASSESSMENT   |                                      |  |
|--------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>42</sup> . |                                      |  |
| Critic | cal Infrastructure   |                                      |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure</b> N/A   | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014 |  |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>43</sup> ?   |                                      |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?   | Yes                                  |  |

| This devel | GE 1D ASSESSMENT stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not availopment where there are no legal or ownership problems tion to develop the site. |   |  |
|------------|--|---|--|
| Avaii      | ability  |   |  |
| 9          | What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?  | G | Agricultural open fields                           |
| 10         | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?  | G | All owners intent on developing the site           |
| 11         | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?  If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?            | A | Potential issues for access.                       |
| 12         | Does the site already have planning permission for<br>the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red<br>because it's not eligible for allocation.             | A | Roadside portion of site approved for 4 dwellings. |

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 )

42 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.

43 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 considered for allocation in the Plan.

| Green | nbelt  | Greenbelt |                        |  |  |  |
|-------|--|-----------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No        | Not within Green Belt. |  |  |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A       | Not applicable.        |  |  |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A       | Not applicable.        |  |  |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.44  | N/A       | Not applicable.        |  |  |  |
| 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

| IICAL | I reviously beveloped Land                          |   |              |  |
|-------|---|---|--------------|--|
| 16    | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R | Agricultural |  |
|       | with the NPPF definition?                           |   |              |  |
|       | • 76% - 100% (G)                                    |   |              |  |

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

|       | • 26 - 75% (A)  |     |   |
|-------|---|-----|---|
|       | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)   |     |   |
| Comr  | nunity  |     |   |
| 17    | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No  | Designated but no draft plan                  |
|       | designated areas)   |     | 2 co.g. acca wat no arant plant               |
|       | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |     |   |
|       | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |     |   |
| 18    | Community Consultation  | N/A | Not asked for in Call for Sites 2014          |
|       | Has any community consultation taken place?   |     |   |
|       | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |     |   |
|       | consultation took and any overall community   |     |   |
|       | response.   |     |   |
| 19    | Sustainability of Settlement  | No  | Currently a field                             |
|       | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   |     |   |
|       | the settlement through the loss of services and   |     |   |
|       | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |     |   |
|       | house etc)  |     |   |
|       | ulative Impact  | 17. |   |
| 20    | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | Α   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268                |
|       | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   |     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                |
|       | the parish?   |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%                      |
|       | Less than 5% growth (G)  The state of t |     |   |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |   |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)  |     |   |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |   |
|       | completions over the last ten years as a percentage   |     |   |
|       | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using   |     |   |
| 24    | census and completions data).   | 0   | Number of houses in 2010: 1210                |
| 21    | What level of housing growth would there be if all the  | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                |
|       | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed?  |     | Number of outstanding completions in 2016: 24 |
|       | ·   |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%                      |
|       | <ul><li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li><li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li></ul>  |     | 1 ercentage growth. 1.7976                    |
|       | <ul><li>More than 20% growth (R)</li></ul>  |     |   |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |   |
|       | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as   |     |   |
|       | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April  |     |   |
|       | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions  |     |   |
|       | data).  |     |   |
| Physi | ical Constraints  |     |   |
| 22    | Are there any physical constraints or permanent   | G   | No constraints identified.                    |
|       | features that affect the site's developability?   |     |   |
|       | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |     |   |
|       | works, topography or wind turbines.   |     |   |
| Relat | ionship to Settlement   |     |   |
| 23    | Would development of the site be complementary to   | R   | Development of this site would                |
|       | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   |     | constitute poorly-related back-land           |
|       | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |     | development. It could also visually           |
|       | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |     | close the gap between what are                |
|       | form?   |     | currently two very distinct parts of          |
|       |   |     | Maulden with separate settlement              |
|       |   |     | envelopes, setting the precedence             |
|       |   |     | for coalescence between these two             |
|       |   |     | distinct parts of Maulden.                    |
|       | ultural Land Quality  |     |   |
| 24    | Would the development impact on high quality  | R   | Site is Grade 2                               |
|       |   |     |   |

| agricultural land?   |  |
|--|--|
| <ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul> |  |
| <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>      |  |
| <ul> <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.

|      | question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across ge 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance. |     |                         |  |  |
|------|--|-----|-------------------------|--|--|
|      | Transport and Access to Services   |     |                         |  |  |
| 25   | Facilities and services  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.  |     |                         |  |  |
|      |  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  |     |                         |  |  |
| 25a  | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?   | G   | Yes                     |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>  |     | · ·                     |  |  |
|      | settlement (R)   |     |                         |  |  |
| 25b  | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if   | Α   | In adjoining settlement |  |  |
|      | applicable)?   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   | · · |                         |  |  |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Other catchment school available (A)   |     |                         |  |  |
| 25c  | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper  | Α   | In adjoining settlement |  |  |
|      | school?  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)   |     |                         |  |  |
| 05.1 | Other catchment school available (A)   | Δ.  |                         |  |  |
| 25d  | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical  | Α   | In adjoining settlement |  |  |
|      | centre?  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)  Yes, prepared as part of the development (C)  The settlement (G)  Yes, prepared as part of the development (C).                        |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  No, but an adjaining acttlement date (A)   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  Not in the settlement or on adjoining.   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | Not in the settlement or an adjoining     settlement (P)   |     |                         |  |  |
| 26   | settlement (R) What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α   | Convenience store       |  |  |
| 20   | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)   | ^   | Convenience store       |  |  |
|      | <ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | (A)  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | • None (R)   |     |                         |  |  |
| 27   | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at  | Α   | 619.74m                 |  |  |
|      | least hourly at peak times):   | ' \ | 013.7 4111              |  |  |
|      | Less than 400m (G)   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | • 400m-800m (A)  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | • Over 800m (R)  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | OR submission form stated that improved  |     |                         |  |  |
|      | public transport facilities could be provided as   |     |                         |  |  |
|      | part of the development (G)  |     |                         |  |  |
| 28   | Distance to nearest train station:   | R   |                         |  |  |
|      |  | 1   |                         |  |  |

| П     |  | I                                     |                                       |
|-------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|       | <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>                 |                                       |                                       |
|       | • 800m-1200m (A)                                       |                                       |                                       |
|       | <ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>                     |                                       |                                       |
| 29    | Is the site accessible from the existing road network? | G                                     | Access off Silsoe road                |
| Scho  | ol Capacity  |                                       |                                       |
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?       | Α                                     | Small amount of capacity existing     |
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers:       |                                       | at Maulden lower, which is            |
|       |  |                                       | I •                                   |
|       |  |                                       | expected to be taken up by            |
|       |  |                                       | development already planned in        |
|       |  |                                       | the area, so a new site/ additional   |
|       |  |                                       | land may be required. Middle and      |
|       |  |                                       | upper schools have already been       |
|       |  |                                       | expanded.                             |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address          | Α                                     | Nothing on submission form            |
| • •   | this?  | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | Trouming on additional form           |
| Mata  | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc | turo will                             | he assessed at a later stage)         |
|       |  |                                       |                                       |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required          | R/A/G                                 | Water utilities companies have a      |
|       | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?      |                                       | statutory duty to supply water and    |
|       |  |                                       | waste water infrastructure to new     |
|       |  |                                       | development sites and a lack of       |
|       |  |                                       | available capacity does not prevent   |
|       |  |                                       | future development. Any               |
|       |  |                                       | infrastructure upgrades required      |
|       |  |                                       | will depend on the quantum and        |
|       |  |                                       | location of growth falling within     |
|       |  |                                       |                                       |
|       |  |                                       | each catchment area. Whilst the       |
|       |  |                                       | Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April      |
|       |  |                                       | 2017) identifies the current capacity |
|       |  |                                       | of existing water infrastructure, a   |
|       |  |                                       | Stage 2 study will be prepared to     |
|       |  |                                       | test the cumulative effect of sites   |
|       |  |                                       | that have been shortlisted for        |
|       |  |                                       | allocation in the Local Plan and      |
|       |  |                                       | identify the nature and timing of     |
|       |  |                                       | any upgrades required.                |
| Drain | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential To   | ct)                                   | arry apgrades required.               |
|       | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te   |                                       | Oita is at limited vials of assuface  |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to   | G                                     | Site is at limited risk of surface    |
|       | site allocations, in regards to flood risk?            |                                       | water flooding, assessment is         |
|       | No assessment required (G)                             |                                       | unlikely to be required               |
|       | Consider Further Assessment (A)                        |                                       |                                       |
|       | Further Assessment Required (R)                        |                                       |                                       |
| Envir | onmental Health  |                                       |                                       |
| 34    | Contamination  | R/A/G                                 | Awaiting comments.                    |
| • •   | Are there any contamination constraints on site and    | 10700                                 | / Waiting commonts.                   |
|       | will there be any remediation required?                |                                       |                                       |
| 0.5   |  |                                       | No leave distribute                   |
| 35    | Adjoining uses   | G                                     | No immediate issues                   |
|       | Would any adjoining uses have the potential to         |                                       |                                       |
|       | cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;    |                                       |                                       |
|       | noise and smell)                                       |                                       |                                       |
| Envir | onmental Constraints                                   |                                       |                                       |
| 36    | Landscape character                                    | R                                     | Unsuitable for development in         |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on the        | ``                                    | landscape terms– land rises           |
|       | landscape character or setting of the area or any      |                                       | steeply from road; it is important to |
|       |  |                                       |                                       |
|       | designated landscapes? Would there be any direct       |                                       | avoid intrusion in views from         |
|       | or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural    |                                       | elevated ridge to north.              |
|       | Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?                 |                                       |                                       |
|       |  |                                       |                                       |

| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology                                 | Her:  | No Heritage comment.                 |
|-------|---|-------|--------------------------------------|
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any       | G     | Site has multi-period                |
|       | heritage assets and their setting?                    | Arch: | archaeological potential but this    |
|       | Are there any opportunities for enhancement of        | Α     | would not prevent allocation         |
|       | these assets?   |       | providing appropriate mitigation is  |
|       |   |       | undertaken                           |
| 38    | Ecological Assets                                     | R/G   | p/p 16/527, western part, prefer     |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any       |       | option B which allows net gain. R if |
|       | biological, geological or ecological assets and are   |       | option B which disturbs woodland.    |
|       | there any opportunities for their enhancement?        |       |                                      |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets                      | Α     | No Loss of Open Space                |
|       | Are there any potential conflicts with open space,    |       | Within Greensand NIA, would need     |
|       | leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there       |       | to deliver habitat net gain and      |
|       | capacity to provide the required levels of open space |       | retain / enhance /buffer / extend    |
|       | and green infrastructure?                             |       | existing habitats and ROW corridor   |
|       |   |       | along southern edge.                 |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |       |                                      |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on           | Α     | Within MSA                           |
|       | safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including       |       |                                      |
|       | mineral safeguarding sites?                           |       |                                      |
| Planr | ning History  |       |                                      |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example      |       | 16/00527 for 4 dwelling covers a     |
|       | planning applications and submissions to previous     |       | small part at the front of the site  |
|       | Allocations Plans)                                    |       |                                      |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?                      |       | No                                   |

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is not appropriate for development because it lies in an important gap between what are currently two distinct parts of Maulden. Maulden has a distinctive and historical settlement pattern which consists of a number of separate parts with important landscape gaps defining distinct parts and maintaining a rural character. Development of this site would join what are currently two distinctive separate parts of Maulden, instead making it a linear settlement. In addition to this the site is important in landscape terms; the land rises steeply from the road and it plays an important role in avoiding intrusion in the views from the elevate ridge to the north. Ecologically, no development would be acceptable which disturbed the woodland.

Though the site lies a small distance south of the parts of the settlement at danger of coalescence, development of only the eastern portion would not be well related to the existing settlement and would have a negative ecological impact and there is already planning permission for development of the western portion so there is no need to re-consider this portion under the Call for Sites process. The site will not be considered further as part of this process.

Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>45</sup>

| Site details     | Site details                                    |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|
| Reference Number | NLP016  |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land off A507 at Clophill                       |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land off A507, next to Pine View Park, Clophill |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden   |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 0.8 ha              |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 1.0 ha               |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 0.94 ha                      |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                                     |  |  |
| Any other        |   |  |  |
| information      |   |  |  |

# STAGE 1: SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT  |           |  |  |  |
|-------|---|-----------|--|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.  |           |  |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity  |           |  |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?  Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land.  Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  2 hectares or above 60%  Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No        | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  10 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  19 dwellings. |  |  |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the  | ne Seque  | ential Test)   |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?  | Yes       |  |  |  |
| 3     | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?   | Yes       | More than 50% of the site is as risk of surface water flooding (1/100 year occurrence)   |  |  |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b | e subject to detailed assessment)  |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.  | No        | No nationally significant designations.  |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?   | No        | Not within an AONB.  |  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |           | No   |  |  |

 $^{45}$  Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>46</sup>

| Site details     |                                   |  |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Reference Number | NLP053                            |  |
| Site Name        | Cobbitts Road                     |  |
| Site Address     | Cobbitts Road, Maulden            |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden                           |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area:1.2 ha |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area:1.6 ha  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 1.18 ha        |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                       |  |
| Any other        | Overlaps NLP233                   |  |
| information      |                                   |  |

# STAGE 1: SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

| STAC  | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | Il or conf | ict with national policy designations.  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  20 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  29 dwellings |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ntial Test)   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not within an 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>46</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>47</sup> . |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relat   | ionship to Settlement   |   |   |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site is well related to the existing settlement; the majority of the site is surrounded by the settlement envelope. |
| 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.   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes   |

| STAG                                  | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT  |     |                                     |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| This s                                | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>48</sup> . |     |                                     |  |  |
| Critical Infrastructure               |  |     |                                     |  |  |
| 8                                     | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure  | G   | None identified. Fairly near a road |  |  |
|                                       | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>49</sup> ?   |     | but will need access to it          |  |  |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |  | Yes |                                     |  |  |

| STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT  This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site. |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| Avail   | ability   |   |  |
| 9   | What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?   | G | Field                                    |
| 10  | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   | G | Sole owner intent on developing the site |
| 11  | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?  If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? | G | No known legal or ownership problems.    |
| 12  | Does the site already have planning permission for<br>the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red<br>because it's not eligible for allocation.  | G | None.                                    |
| Does the site continue to next stage?   |   |   |  |

# STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

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-

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>led garden villages towns and cities.pdf</u>)

48 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.

49 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.

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

| Greenbelt |  |     |                            |  |  |
|-----------|--|-----|----------------------------|--|--|
| 13        | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt. |  |  |
| 14        | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable.            |  |  |
| 15a       | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable.            |  |  |
| 15b       | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.50  | N/A | Not applicable.            |  |  |
| 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

| 11041 | i i citodoly beveloped Edild                        |   |       |  |  |
|-------|---|---|-------|--|--|
| 16    | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R | Field |  |  |
|       | with the NPPF definition?                           |   |       |  |  |
|       | • 76% - 100% (G)                                    |   |       |  |  |
|       | • 26 - 75% (A)                                      |   |       |  |  |
|       | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)                         |   |       |  |  |
|       | •   |   |       |  |  |

#### Community

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| 17        | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No  | Designated but no draft plan        |
|-----------|---|-----|-------------------------------------|
| ''        | designated areas)   | 140 | Designated but no drait plan        |
|           | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |     |                                     |
|           | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |     |                                     |
| 18        | Community Consultation  | No  |                                     |
|           | Has any community consultation taken place?   |     |                                     |
|           | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |     |                                     |
|           | consultation took and any overall community   |     |                                     |
|           | response.   |     |                                     |
| 19        | Sustainability of Settlement  | No  |                                     |
|           | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   |     |                                     |
|           | the settlement through the loss of services and   |     |                                     |
|           | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc)  |     |                                     |
| Cumi      | Ilative Impact  |     |                                     |
| 20        | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | Α   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268      |
| 20        | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   |     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340      |
|           | the parish?   |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%            |
|           | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>   |     | 3 3 3                               |
|           | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |                                     |
|           | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>  |     |                                     |
|           | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |                                     |
|           | completions over the last ten years as a percentage   |     |                                     |
|           | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using   |     |                                     |
|           | census and completions data).   |     |                                     |
| 21        | What level of housing growth would there be if all the  | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340      |
|           | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to  |     | Number of outstanding completions   |
|           | be completed?   |     | in 2016: 24                         |
|           | • Less than 5% growth (G)   |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%            |
|           | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |                                     |
|           | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> <li>This is calculated by working out the total number of</li> </ul> |     |                                     |
|           | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as   |     |                                     |
|           | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April  |     |                                     |
|           | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions  |     |                                     |
|           | data).  |     |                                     |
|           | cal Constraints   |     |                                     |
| 22        | Are there any physical constraints or permanent   | G   | No constraints identified.          |
|           | features that affect the site's developability?   |     |                                     |
|           | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |     |                                     |
| Bolos     | works, topography or wind turbines.   |     |                                     |
| <b>23</b> | Would development of the site be complementary to   | G   |                                     |
| 23        | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   | G   |                                     |
|           | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |     |                                     |
|           | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |     |                                     |
|           | form?   |     |                                     |
| Agric     | ultural Land Quality  |     |                                     |
| 24        | Would the development impact on high quality  | Α   | The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural |
|           | agricultural land?  |     | Land. The most recent data from     |
|           | <ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul>  |     | Natural England does not sub-       |
|           | <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>   |     | classify Grades 3a and 3b.          |
|           | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>   |     | Therefore site must be rated        |
| 1         |   | l   | Amber.                              |

# **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.

| Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance. |  |            |                                     |  |  |
|---|--|------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Transport and Access to Services                              |  |            |                                     |  |  |
| 25  |  |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability   | of the sit | e for housing. It links to the      |  |  |
|   | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.  |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | January relations to connective are accessed connected.  |            |                                     |  |  |
| 25a   | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  | G          | Yes                                 |  |  |
| ZJa   | <ul><li>Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li><li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li></ul>  | G          | 165                                 |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>  |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | settlement (R)   |            |                                     |  |  |
| 25b   | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if   | Α          | In adjoining settlement             |  |  |
|   | applicable)?   |            | 3 1 1 1                             |  |  |
|   | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | Other catchment school available (A)   |            |                                     |  |  |
| 25c   | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper  | Α          | In adjoining settlement             |  |  |
|   | school?  |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)   |            |                                     |  |  |
| 054   | Other catchment school available (A)      One of the control | ^          |                                     |  |  |
| 25d   | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?  | Α          | In adjoining settlement             |  |  |
|   | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>  |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | settlement (R)   |            |                                     |  |  |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?   | Α          | Convenience store                   |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent  |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | (A)  |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | None (R)   |            |                                     |  |  |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at  | G          | 390.01m                             |  |  |
|   | least hourly at peak times):   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | • Less than 400m (G)   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | • 400m-800m (A)  |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | Over 800m (R)  OR submission form stated that improved   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved<br/>public transport facilities could be provided as</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | part of the development (G)  |            |                                     |  |  |
| 28  | Distance to nearest train station:   | R          |                                     |  |  |
|   | Less than 800m (G)   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | • 800m-1200m (A)   |            |                                     |  |  |
|   | • Over 1200m (R)   |            |                                     |  |  |
| 29  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | R          | Site accessed of Cobbitts road, but |  |  |
|   | •  |            | current access is not wide enough   |  |  |
|   |  |            | and potential to widen may be       |  |  |

|       |   |           | rootrioted by private gorden and   |
|-------|---|-----------|--|
|       |   |           | restricted by private garden and   |
| Calaa | al Canacity   |           | garage either side.  |
|       | ol Capacity   | Α         | One all agreement of a greenity and after a  |
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A         | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.  |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | Α         | Nothing on submission form   |
| Water | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  | ture will | he assessed at a later stage)  |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required   | R/A/G     | Water utilities companies have a   |
|       | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   |           | statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required. |
| Drain | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | st)       |  |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  | A         | Ordinary Watercourse present,<br>JFlow modelling required to confirm<br>flood risk   |
| Envir | onmental Health   |           |  |
| 34    | Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G     | Awaiting comments.   |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G         | No immediate issues  |
|       | onmental Constraints  |           |  |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | G         | Scope for development if designed to create a sense of place adjacent to key public access.  |
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any   | Her:<br>G | No heritage comment. Site has multi-period   |

|                  | heritage assets and their setting?                    | Arch: | archaeological potential but this   |  |
|------------------|---|-------|-------------------------------------|--|
|                  | Are there any opportunities for enhancement of        | Α     | would not prevent allocation        |  |
|                  | these assets?   |       | providing appropriate mitigation is |  |
|                  |   |       | undertaken                          |  |
| 38               | Ecological Assets                                     | R/A   | Rough grass / scrub, likely SPI     |  |
|                  | What would the impacts of development be on any       |       | present, hard to demonstrate net    |  |
|                  | biological, geological or ecological assets and are   |       | gain                                |  |
|                  | there any opportunities for their enhancement?        |       |                                     |  |
| 39               | Open space/leisure and GI assets                      | Α     | Adjacent to Greensand Ridge Walk    |  |
|                  | Are there any potential conflicts with open space,    |       | and within NIA. Development would   |  |
|                  | leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there       |       | need to enhance habitats and        |  |
|                  | capacity to provide the required levels of open space |       | Greensand Ridge Corridor            |  |
|                  | and green infrastructure?                             |       | No Loss of Open Space               |  |
| Mine             | rals and Waste  |       |                                     |  |
| 40               | What would the impacts of development be on           | G     | No Issue                            |  |
|                  | safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including       |       |                                     |  |
|                  | mineral safeguarding sites?                           |       |                                     |  |
| Planning History |   |       |                                     |  |
| 41               | What is the sites planning history? (For example      |       | None                                |  |
|                  | planning applications and submissions to previous     |       |                                     |  |
|                  | Allocations Plans)                                    |       |                                     |  |
| Does             | the site continue to next stage?                      |       | Yes                                 |  |

# STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

Concerns have been raised about educational capacity in the area. An Ordinary Watercourse has been identified on site, and as such further modelling will be required to confirm flood risk. There have been some ecology concerns raised about the site, the site is currently rough grass/scrub with a potential Species of Principle Importance and it would be difficult to demonstrate net gain here. The site has multi-period archaeological potential, but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation was undertaken. As no significant constraints have been identified, this site will stay within the assessment process.

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

This section assesses whether the site is Achievable in line with NPPG Guidance:

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

| Viabil | Viability   |   |  |  |  |  |
|--------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 43     | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?  • High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value  • Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value  • Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value | G | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable. |  |  |  |
| Achie  | vability  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 44     | Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?   |   | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential property figures between 2013 and 2016. The housing market within  |  |  |  |

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

#### **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 HOUSING51

| Site details     |                                       |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Reference Number | NLP055                                |
| Site Name        | Land South of Limbersey Lane          |
| Site Address     | Land South of Limbersey Lane, Maulden |
| Settlement       | Maulden                               |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 1.3ha     |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 1.5ha      |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 0.96 ha            |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                           |
| Any other        |                                       |
| information      |                                       |

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

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

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |           |   |  |  |
|-------|--|-----------|---|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.   |           |   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |           |   |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No        | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  40 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  23 dwellings |  |  |
| Floor | d Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Segue  | ential Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No        | Not located in Flood Zone 2 or 3.   |  |  |
| 3     | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?  | Yes       | More than 50% of the site is as risk of surface water flooding (1/100 year occurrence)  |  |  |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S  | Stage 2 b | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No        | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No        | Not located within an AONB.   |  |  |
| Does  | Does the site continue to next stage?  |           |   |  |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

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

| Site details     |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Reference Number | NLP087   |  |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land at Corner of Clophill Road and Green End Lane |  |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land at Corner of Clophill Road and Green End Lane |  |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden  |  |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area:0.7 ha                  |  |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.7 ha                  |  |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area:0.75 ha                          |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential  |  |  |  |
| Any other        | Inside ALP023                                      |  |  |  |
| 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  |            |   |  |  |
|-------|--|------------|---|--|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  20 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  17 dwellings |  |  |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located in Flood Zones 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.  |  |  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not within an AONB  |  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |            | Yes   |  |  |

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

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

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

| towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>53</sup> .  Relationship to Settlement |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | On the boundary of the settlement envelope. |
| 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.                             |
| Does the site continue to next stage?   |   |   | Yes   |

| STAC   | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT  |  |                    |     |  |
|--------|--|--|--------------------|-----|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>54</sup> . |  |                    |     |  |
| Critic | Critical Infrastructure  |  |                    |     |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure  | G  | None. On a main ro | oad |  |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>55</sup> ?   |  |                    |     |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?   | Does the site continue to next stage?  Yes |                    |     |  |

| STAC                                      | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |           |                                     |  |  |
|---|---|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
|   | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for |           |                                     |  |  |
|   | lopment where there are no legal or ownership problems  | s and the | landowner has expressed an          |  |  |
| intent                                    | tion to develop the site.   |           |                                     |  |  |
| Avail                                     | lability  |           |                                     |  |  |
| 9   | What is the existing use of the site?   | G         | Field                               |  |  |
|   | Would the existing use limit the development  |           |                                     |  |  |
|   | potential?  |           |                                     |  |  |
| 10  | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner   | G         | All owners intent on developing the |  |  |
|   | who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   |           | site                                |  |  |
| 11  | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could  | G         | No known legal or ownership         |  |  |
|   | delay or prevent development?   |           | issues.                             |  |  |
|   | If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically   |           |                                     |  |  |
|   | overcome?   |           |                                     |  |  |
| 12  | Does the site already have planning permission for  | G         | CB/17/00127/FULL – application      |  |  |
|   | the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red   |           | for 5 houses roadside granted.      |  |  |
|   | because it's not eligible for allocation.   |           | Only a portion of site              |  |  |
| Does the site continue to next stage? Yes |   |           |                                     |  |  |

#### STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

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 )

54 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.

55 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.

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

| Greer |  |     |                            |
|-------|--|-----|----------------------------|
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt. |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable             |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable             |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.56  | N/A | Not applicable             |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |     | Yes                        |

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

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

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

#### Community

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

|        |   | 1   |  |
|--------|---|-----|--|
| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No  | Designated but no draft plan             |
|        | designated areas)   |     |  |
|        | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |     |  |
| 18     | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  Community Consultation  | No  |  |
| 10     | Has any community consultation taken place?   | INO |  |
|        | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |     |  |
|        | consultation took and any overall community   |     |  |
|        | response.   |     |  |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement  | No  | No impact on sustainability.             |
|        | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   | ''  | The impact of editamasinty.              |
|        | the settlement through the loss of services and   |     |  |
|        | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |     |  |
|        | house etc)  |     |  |
| Cumi   | lative Impact   |     |  |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | A   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268           |
|        | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   |     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340           |
|        | the parish?   |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%                 |
|        | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>   |     |  |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |  |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)  |     |  |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |  |
|        | completions over the last ten years as a percentage   |     |  |
|        | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using   |     |  |
|        | census and completions data).   |     |  |
| 21     | What level of housing growth would there be if all the  | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340           |
|        | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to  |     | Number of outstanding completions        |
|        | be completed?   |     | in 2016: 24                              |
|        | • Less than 5% growth (G)   |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%                 |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |  |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)  This is coloulated by working out the total number of                       |     |  |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as |     |  |
|        | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April  |     |  |
|        | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions  |     |  |
|        | data).  |     |  |
| Physi  | ical Constraints  |     |  |
| 22     | Are there any physical constraints or permanent   | G   |  |
|        | features that affect the site's developability?   |     |  |
|        | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |     |  |
|        | works, topography or wind turbines.   |     |  |
|        | ionship to Settlement   |     |  |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to   | R   | Development of this site would           |
|        | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   |     | narrow a gap in Maulden that is          |
|        | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |     | distinctive and unique.                  |
|        | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |     |  |
| A -: • | form?   |     |  |
|        | ultural Land Quality  | В   | Months in Credo 2 Consultanent in        |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality  | R   | Mostly in Grade 2. Small part in Grade 1 |
|        | agricultural land?  |     | Giaue i                                  |
|        | • 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  |     |  |
|        | • 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)   |     |  |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>   | l   |  |

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.

|     | Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.                                     |     |                                   |  |  |
|-----|---|-----|-----------------------------------|--|--|
|     | ransport and Access to Services   |     |                                   |  |  |
| 25  | Facilities and services   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     |   |     |                                   |  |  |
| 250 | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |     | Vac                               |  |  |
| 25a | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  | G   | Yes                               |  |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>                                      |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Not in the settlement or an adjoining   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | settlement (R)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 25b | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if  | A   | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |
|     | applicable)?  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>                                  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>                                      |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)  |     | <u> </u>                          |  |  |
| 25c | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper   | Α   | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |
|     | school?   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>                                  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>                                      |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 25d | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical   | Α   | In adjoining settlement           |  |  |
|     | centre?   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>                                  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>                                      |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | settlement (R)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α   | Convenience store                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | (A)   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | None (R)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at   | G   | 125.51m                           |  |  |
|     | least hourly at peak times):  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | • Less than 400m (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | • 400m-800m (A)   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>   |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>                                       |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | public transport facilities could be provided as  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | part of the development (G)   |     |                                   |  |  |
| 28  | Distance to nearest train station:  | R   |                                   |  |  |
|     | • Less than 800m (G)  |     |                                   |  |  |
|     | • 800m-1200m (A)  |     |                                   |  |  |
| 0.0 | Over 1200m (R)  |     | <u> </u>                          |  |  |
| 29  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | G   | Yes. Site borders Clophill Road   |  |  |
|     | ol Capacity   | l a |                                   |  |  |
| 30  | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | А   | Small amount of capacity existing |  |  |
|     |   |     | at Maulden lower, which is        |  |  |

| 1                       |   |                              | and a stantification of the stantification o |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|
|                         |   |                              | expected to be taken up by   |
|                         |   |                              | development already planned in   |
|                         |   |                              | the area, so a new site/ additional  |
|                         |   |                              | land may be required. Middle and   |
|                         |   |                              | upper schools have already been  |
|                         |   |                              | expanded.  |
| 31                      | If not, has a commitment been made to address   | Α                            | Nothing on submission form   |
|                         | this?   | , ,                          | Treating on Submission form  |
| Wate                    | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  | ture will                    | he assessed at a later stage)  |
| 32                      | Is there the capacity to provide all required   | R/A/G                        | Water utilities companies have a   |
| 32                      | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   | IV/A/G                       | statutory duty to supply water and   |
|                         | Illinastructure for waste water and potable water!  |                              |  |
|                         |   |                              | 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.   |
| Droin                   | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | c+\                          | any upgrades required.   |
| 33                      | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to  | G                            | Site is at limited risk of surface   |
| 33                      |   | J                            |  |
| •                       | Leite allocations in regards to flood rick?   |                              | water flooding, accessment is  |
|                         | site allocations, in regards to flood risk?   |                              | water flooding, assessment is  |
|                         | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>  |                              | water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  |
|                         | <ul><li>No assessment required (G)</li><li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li></ul>  |                              |  |
|                         | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>  |                              |  |
|                         | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul> onmental Health  |                              | unlikely to be required  |
| Envir                   | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)     onmental Health     Contamination  | R/A/G                        |  |
|                         | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)     onmental Health     Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and  | R/A/G                        | unlikely to be required  |
| 34                      | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      onmental Health  Contamination  Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   |                              | unlikely to be required  |
|                         | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)     onmental Health     Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?     Adjoining uses   | R/A/G<br>G                   | unlikely to be required  |
| 34                      | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      onmental Health  Contamination  Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   |                              | unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments   |
| 34                      | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)     onmental Health     Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?     Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to  |                              | unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments   |
| 34                      | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      Onmental Health      Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?      Adjoining uses      Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;  |                              | unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments   |
| 35                      | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)     onmental Health     Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?     Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to  |                              | unlikely to be required  Awaiting comments   |
| 35                      | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)     mental Health     Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?     Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)     onmental Constraints  |                              | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues   |
| 34<br>35<br>Envir       | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      onmental Health      Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?      Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)      onmental Constraints  Landscape character   | G                            | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary  |
| 34<br>35<br>Envir       | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      Onmental Health      Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?      Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)      onmental Constraints      Landscape character     What would the impacts of development be on the   | G                            | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded  |
| 34<br>35<br>Envir       | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      Onmental Health      Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?      Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)      onmental Constraints      Landscape character     What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any   | G                            | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary  |
| 34<br>35<br>Envir       | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      Onmental Health      Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?      Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)      onmental Constraints      Landscape character     What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct  | G                            | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded  |
| 34<br>35<br>Envir       | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      onmental Health      Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?      Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)      onmental Constraints  Landscape character     What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural  | G                            | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded  |
| 35<br>Envir<br>36       | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      Onmental Health      Contamination     Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?      Adjoining uses     Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)      onmental Constraints      Landscape character     What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?   | G                            | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded green infrastructure secured.  |
| 34<br>35<br>Envir       | No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)     Further Assessment Required (R)      mental Health  Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  Adjoining uses  Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  onmental Constraints  Landscape character  What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  Heritage/ Archaeology  | G<br>G                       | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded green infrastructure secured.  No heritage comment.  |
| 35<br>Envir<br>36       | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>onmental Health</li> <li>Contamination         Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?     </li> <li>Adjoining uses</li> <li>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>onmental Constraints</li> <li>Landscape character</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?</li> <li>Heritage/ Archaeology</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any</li> </ul>  | G<br>G<br>Her:               | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded green infrastructure secured.  No heritage comment. Site has multi-period  |
| 35<br>Envir<br>36       | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>onmental Health</li> <li>Contamination</li> <li>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?</li> <li>Adjoining uses</li> <li>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>onmental Constraints</li> <li>Landscape character</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?</li> <li>Heritage/ Archaeology</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?</li> </ul>   | G<br>G<br>Her:<br>G<br>Arch: | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded green infrastructure secured.  No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this  |
| 35<br>Envir<br>36       | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>onmental Health</li> <li>Contamination</li> <li>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?</li> <li>Adjoining uses</li> <li>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>onmental Constraints</li> <li>Landscape character</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?</li> <li>Heritage/ Archaeology</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?</li> <li>Are there any opportunities for enhancement of</li> </ul> | G<br>G<br>Her:               | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded green infrastructure secured.  No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation   |
| 35<br>Envir<br>36       | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>onmental Health</li> <li>Contamination</li> <li>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?</li> <li>Adjoining uses</li> <li>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>onmental Constraints</li> <li>Landscape character</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?</li> <li>Heritage/ Archaeology</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?</li> </ul>   | G<br>G<br>Her:<br>G<br>Arch: | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded green infrastructure secured.  No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is   |
| 35<br>Envir<br>36       | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>onmental Health</li> <li>Contamination</li> <li>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?</li> <li>Adjoining uses</li> <li>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>onmental Constraints</li> <li>Landscape character</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?</li> <li>Heritage/ Archaeology</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?</li> <li>Are there any opportunities for enhancement of</li> </ul> | G<br>G<br>Her:<br>G<br>Arch: | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded green infrastructure secured.  No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation   |
| 34<br>35<br>Envir<br>36 | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> <li>onmental Health</li> <li>Contamination</li> <li>Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?</li> <li>Adjoining uses</li> <li>Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)</li> <li>onmental Constraints</li> <li>Landscape character</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?</li> <li>Heritage/ Archaeology</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?</li> <li>Are there any opportunities for enhancement of</li> </ul> | G<br>G<br>Her:<br>G<br>Arch: | Awaiting comments  No immediate issues  Scope for development if boundary features conserved and wooded green infrastructure secured.  No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is   |

|       | What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?   |     | trees, maintain connectivity to open countryside.  |
|-------|--|-----|--|
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets  Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/G | Within Greensand NIA, would need to deliver habitat net gain and retain / enhance existing habitats. No Loss of Open Space |
| Miner | rals and Waste   |     |  |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?  | A   | Within MSA   |
| Plann | ning History   |     |  |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)  |     | CB/17/00127/FULL – application for 5 houses roadside granted.  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |     | No   |

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is mostly Grade 2 agricultural land and concerns have been raised over educational capacity. Further to this the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area, and is within the Nature Improvement Area so buffer hedgerows and trees would have to be retained to maintain the connection to the open countryside. The site has multi-period archaeological potential though this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation was undertaken.

This site is not appropriate for development. Development here would fill in a gap in the settlement pattern which is distinctive and unique to the historical pattern of Maulden. Green End forms a gateway to Maulden Wood and thus developing either side of this would change the character of this rural area for the users of Maulden Wood. Whilst it is recognised that there is some low density development on the opposite side of the road, it is not considered to be an appropriate location for an allocation of 10 or more dwellings which would considerably change the nature of the settlement in this location.

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

| Site details          |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Reference Number      | NLP129   |  |  |  |  |
| Site Name             | Land to the rear of Gardeners Close  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Address          | Land to the rear of Gardeners Close  |  |  |  |  |
| Settlement            | Maulden  |  |  |  |  |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area:1.31 ha<br>Submitted Whole Site Area:1.31 ha<br>Measured GIS Area:1.31 ha |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use          | Residential  |  |  |  |  |
| Any other information |  |  |  |  |  |

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

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

| STAC   | STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT  |            |   |  |  |
|--------|--|------------|---|--|--|
| This s | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | Il or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |  |  |
| Provi  | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |  |  |
| 1      | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  Less than 30 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  31 dwellings |  |  |
| Flood  | d Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |  |  |
| 2      | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located within 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.  |  |  |
| Natio  | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4      | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5      | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not within the 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>57</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

| towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>58</sup> . |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| _   | onship to Settlement  |   |  |  |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | A | The site lies on the boundary of the existing settlement envelope. Though it is not clear how access to the site will be achieved, it is possible that development here could constitute poorly-related back-land development. |  |
| 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   |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |  |

|        | GE 1C ASSESSMENT   |   |                  |             |  |
|--------|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>59</sup> . |   |                  |             |  |
| Critic | cal Infrastructure   |   |                  |             |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure</b>   | G | Access via Garde | eners Close |  |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery 60?   |   |                  |             |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?   |   | Yes              |             |  |

| STAC   | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |           |  |  |  |  |
|--------|---|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| This   | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for   |           |  |  |  |  |
|        | lopment where there are no legal or ownership problems  | s and the | e landowner has expressed an             |  |  |  |
| intent | tion to develop the site.   |           |  |  |  |  |
| Avail  | ability   |           |  |  |  |  |
| 9      | What is the existing use of the site?  Would the existing use limit the development potential?  G Agricultural                                  |           |  |  |  |  |
| 10     | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   | G         | Sole owner intent on developing the site |  |  |  |
| 11     | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?  If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? | G         | No known legal or ownership issues.      |  |  |  |
| 12     | Does the site already have planning permission for<br>the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red<br>because it's not eligible for allocation.  | G         | None.                                    |  |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |           | Yes                                      |  |  |  |

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

led garden villages towns and cities.pdf )

59 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

significant delays in the delivery of development.

This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

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

| Gree | Greenbelt  |     |                            |  |  |
|------|--|-----|----------------------------|--|--|
| 13   | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt. |  |  |
| 14   | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable             |  |  |
| 15a  | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable             |  |  |
| 15b  | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.61  | N/A | Not applicable             |  |  |
| 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 16 Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? • 76% - 100% (G) • 26 - 75% (A)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

|       | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)  |          |  |
|-------|--|----------|--|
| Comr  | nunity   | 1        |  |
| 17    | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in   | No       | Designated but no draft plan                                   |
|       | designated areas)  |          |  |
|       | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an   |          |  |
|       | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?   |          |  |
| 18    | Community Consultation   | No       |  |
|       | Has any community consultation taken place?  |          |  |
|       | If yes, provide brief details on the form this   |          |  |
|       | consultation took and any overall community  |          |  |
| 10    | response.  |          |  |
| 19    | Sustainability of Settlement   | No       | No impact on sustainability.                                   |
|       | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of  |          |  |
|       | the settlement through the loss of services and  |          |  |
|       | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public  |          |  |
| Cumi  | house etc)   |          |  |
| 20    | Considering housing completions over the past 10   | A        | Number of houses in 2006: 1268                                 |
| 20    | Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in       | A        | Number of houses in 2006: 1268  Number of houses in 2016: 1340 |
|       | the parish?  |          | Percentage growth: 5.68%                                       |
|       | Less than 5% growth (G)  |          | 1 Groonlage growth. 0.0076                                     |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)   |          | ·  |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)   |          |  |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of  |          |  |
|       | completions over the last ten years as a percentage  |          |  |
|       | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using  |          |  |
|       | census and completions data).  |          |  |
| 21    | What level of housing growth would there be if all the   | G        | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                                 |
|       | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to   |          | Number of outstanding completions                              |
|       | be completed?  |          | in 2016: 24  |
|       | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>  |          | Percentage growth: 1.79%                                       |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)   |          |  |
|       | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>   |          |  |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of  |          |  |
|       | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as  |          |  |
|       | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April   |          |  |
|       | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions   |          |  |
|       | data).   |          |  |
|       | cal Constraints  |          |  |
| 22    | Are there any physical constraints or permanent  | G        | No constraints identified.                                     |
|       | features that affect the site's developability?  |          |  |
|       | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment  |          |  |
| Delet | works, topography or wind turbines.  |          |  |
|       | Movid development of the cite he complementers to  |          |  |
| 23    | Would development of the site be complementary to  | G        |  |
|       | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an  |          |  |
|       | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural |          |  |
|       | form?  |          |  |
| Agric | ultural Land Quality   |          |  |
| 24    | Would the development impact on high quality   | Α        | The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural                            |
| ~~    | agricultural land?   | <b> </b> | Land. The most recent data from                                |
|       | 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)   |          | Natural England does not sub-                                  |
|       | <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>  |          | classify Grades 3a and 3b.                                     |
|       | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 35, 4 or 3 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>       |          | Therefore site must be rated                                   |
|       | 5 July of Hote III Graue 1, 2 UI Ja (N)  |          | Amber.   |
|       |  | 1        |  |

#### **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.

| Stage | Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.  |   |  |  |  |
|-------|--|---|--|--|--|
|       | Transport and Access to Services   |   |  |  |  |
| 25    | Facilities and services  Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   |   |  |  |  |
| 25a   | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  | G | Yes                                    |  |  |
|       | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>   |   |  |  |  |
| 25b   | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Other catchment school available (A)                                    | A | In adjoining settlement                |  |  |
| 25c   | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Other catchment school available (A)  | A | In adjoining settlement                |  |  |
| 25d   | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)                    | А | In adjoining settlement                |  |  |
| 26    | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  Town Centre/ Supermarket (G) Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A) None (R)  | A | Convenience store                      |  |  |
| 27    | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):  • Less than 400m (G)  • 400m-800m (A)  • Over 800m (R)  • OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G) | G | 331.97m                                |  |  |
| 28    | Distance to nearest train station:  • Less than 800m (G)  • 800m-1200m (A)  • Over 1200m (R)   | R |  |  |  |
| 29    | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | R | It is not clear how access to the site |  |  |

|       |  | 1         | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |
|-------|--|-----------|---|
| Saha  | ol Conceity  |           | would be achieved. The existing access from Moor Lane is a relatively narrow lane, whilst access through the back of Gardeners Close which would require demolition.  |
|       | ol Capacity  | Т -       |   |
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?   | A         | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.   |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?  | A         | Submission form says contributions to education could be made   |
| Water | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc   | ture will | be assessed at a later stage)   |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?  | R/A/G     | Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required. |
| Ducin | and and Flooding (All sites subject to Convential To   | -4\       | arry upgrades required.   |
| 33    | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G)  Consider Further Assessment (A)  Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health | G         | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  |
|       | Contamination  | D/A/O     | Augiting comments   |
| 34    | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?  | R/A/G     | Awaiting comments.  |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)   | G         | No immediate issues   |
| Envir | onmental Constraints   |           |   |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any  | R         | Unsuitable for development in landscape terms – land forms part of greensand dipslope in elevated   |
|       | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |           | • •   |

|       | designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  |                         | highly visible position.   |
|-------|--|-------------------------|--|
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?  | Her:<br>G<br>Arch:<br>A | No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken |
| 38    | Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?   | A                       | 1.3Ha @ 30dph but <30proposed<br>@ this density opportunity for<br>enhancement is OK, in NIA   |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets  Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/G                     | Within Greensand NIA, would need<br>to deliver habitat net gain and<br>retain / enhance existing habitats.<br>No Loss of Open Space                      |
| Mine  | rals and Waste   |                         |  |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?  | G                       | No Issue   |
| Planr | ning History   |                         |  |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)  |                         | None   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |                         | Yes  |

#### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

Concerns have been raised about education provision in the area. There are also significant landscape concerns as the site forms part of the greensand dipslope and is elevated to a highly visible position. The site has multi-period archaeological potential, but providing that appropriate mitigation was undertaken this would not prevent allocation. Ecologically there would be opportunity for enhancement providing the site was developed at a low density.

Depending on how the site is proposed to be accessed, it may be that the site constitutes a poorlyrelated back-land development, further work would be needed to ascertain how well related an extension to the settlement in this location would be. The site will be assessed further, however there are concerns at this stage that the site would likely have a poor relationship with the existing settlement and in this instance would not be appropriate for development.

#### **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.

|       | 114   |   |  |
|-------|---|---|--|
| Viabi | lity  |   |  |
| 43    | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable      | G | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb      |
|       | high, medium or low?  |   | 2017) indicates that residual value                              |
|       | <ul> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably<br/>exceeded by likely residual value</li> </ul>               |   | of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed |
|       | <ul> <li>Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual<br/>land value close to benchmark land value</li> </ul> |   | both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as            |

|          | Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below<br>benchmark land value   | such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable.  |
|----------|---|--|
| Achie    | evability   | development would likely be viable.  |
| Achie 44 | Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?   | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential property figures between 2013 and 2016. The housing market within Central Bedfordshire has seen significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.  This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East-West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; 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 |
| 45       | When can the scheme realistically commence  | value areas but also the lower value areas of the Authority.  0 to 5 years   |
|          | delivery?  • 0 to 5 years (deliverable)  • 6 to 10 years  • 11 to 15 years  • 15 to 20 years  • Outside Plan Period |  |
| 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.  |

#### 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>62</sup>

| Site details     |                                    |
|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Reference Number | NLP131                             |
| Site Name        | Land off Moor Lane                 |
| Site Address     | Land off Moor Lane                 |
| Settlement       | Maulden                            |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 3.41ha |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.41ha  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area:3.38 ha          |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                        |
| Any other        |                                    |
| information      |                                    |

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

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

| STAG  | GE 1A ASSESSMENT  |            |   |
|-------|---|------------|---|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma  | Il or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity  |            |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  50 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  61 dwellings |
| Floor | this is smaller.  Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the  | e Segue    | untial Test)  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?  | No         | Not located within 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.  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S  | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.  | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?   | No         | Not located within an 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>62</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>63</sup> . |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| Relat   | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site is well related to the existing settlement envelope and adjoins the settlement envelope to the north. |
| 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   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |

|        | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT  |   |                       |                   |  |
|--------|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>64</sup> . |   |                       |                   |  |
| Critic | Critical Infrastructure  |   |                       |                   |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure  | G | No critical infrastru | cture required to |  |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>65</sup> ? facilitate delivery   |   |                       |                   |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?   |   | Yes                   |                   |  |

|       | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |         |  |  |
|-------|---|---------|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for   |         |  |  |
|       | opment where there are no legal or ownership problems   | and the | landowner has expressed an               |  |
|       | tion to develop the site.   |         |  |  |
| Avail | ability   |         |  |  |
| 9     | What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?   | G       | Agricultural                             |  |
| 10    | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   | G       | Sole owner intent on developing the site |  |
| 11    | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?  If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? | G       | No known legal or ownership issues.      |  |
| 12    | Does the site already have planning permission for<br>the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red<br>because it's not eligible for allocation.  | G       | None                                     |  |
| Does  | Does the site continue to next stage?   |         |  |  |

#### STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

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 )

64 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.

65 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.

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

| Greer | Greenbelt  |     |                            |  |
|-------|--|-----|----------------------------|--|
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt. |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable             |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable             |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.66  | N/A | Not applicable             |  |
| 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**

| IICAI | i reviously beveloped Land                          |   |                    |  |  |
|-------|---|---|--------------------|--|--|
| 16    | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R | Agricultural field |  |  |
|       | with the NPPF definition?                           |   |                    |  |  |
|       | • 76% - 100% (G)                                    |   |                    |  |  |
|       | • 26 - 75% (A)                                      |   |                    |  |  |
|       | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)                         |   |                    |  |  |
|       | •   |   |                    |  |  |

#### Community

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| 47     | Najahhayahaad Dianning (anly annliaghla in                                     | NIa | Decimated but we dreft plan        |
|--------|--|-----|------------------------------------|
| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in                                     | No  | Designated but no draft plan       |
|        | designated areas)  |     |                                    |
|        | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an                           |     |                                    |
| 40     | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?   | NI- |                                    |
| 18     | Community Consultation   | No  |                                    |
|        | Has any community consultation taken place?                                    |     |                                    |
|        | If yes, provide brief details on the form this                                 |     |                                    |
|        | consultation took and any overall community                                    |     |                                    |
|        | response.  |     |                                    |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement   | No  | No impact on sustainability.       |
|        | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of                            |     |                                    |
|        | the settlement through the loss of services and                                |     |                                    |
|        | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public                            |     |                                    |
|        | house etc)   |     |                                    |
|        | lative Impact  |     |                                    |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10                               | A   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268     |
|        | years, what has been the level of housing growth in                            |     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340     |
|        | the parish?  |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%           |
|        | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>                                    |     |                                    |
|        | <ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>                                       |     |                                    |
|        | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>                                   |     |                                    |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of                          |     |                                    |
|        | completions over the last ten years as a percentage                            |     |                                    |
|        | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using                            |     |                                    |
|        | census and completions data).  |     |                                    |
| 21     | What level of housing growth would there be if all the                         | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340     |
|        | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to                             |     | Number of outstanding completions  |
|        | be completed?  |     | in 2016: 24                        |
|        | Less than 5% growth (G)  |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%           |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)   |     | 3.3.                               |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)   |     |                                    |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of                          |     |                                    |
|        | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as                                |     |                                    |
|        | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April                           |     |                                    |
|        | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions                               |     |                                    |
|        | data).   |     |                                    |
| Physi  | cal Constraints  |     |                                    |
| 22     | Are there any physical constraints or permanent                                | G   | No constraints identified.         |
|        | features that affect the site's developability?                                |     | No constraints identified.         |
|        | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment                                |     |                                    |
|        | works, topography or wind turbines.  |     |                                    |
| Polati | ionship to Settlement  |     |                                    |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to                              | G   |                                    |
| 23     | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an                          | ١   |                                    |
|        | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive                          |     |                                    |
|        | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural                           |     |                                    |
|        | form?  |     |                                    |
| Agric  |  |     |                                    |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality                                   | Ι Λ | The cite is fully within Crade 2   |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality                                   | Α   | The site is fully within Grade 3   |
|        | agricultural land?   |     | Agricultural Land. The most recent |
|        | 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  50% of more in One do Ok. Apr. 5 (A) |     | data from Natural England does not |
|        | • 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)  |     | sub-classify Grades 3a and 3b.     |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>                        |     | Therefore site must be rated       |
|        |  |     | Amber.                             |
|        |  | 1   |                                    |

#### 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.

|       | Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.  |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
| Trans | sport and Access to Services   |            |   |
| 25    | Facilities and services  Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability  Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   | of the sit | e for housing. It links to the  |
|       | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  | T =        |   |
| 25a   | <ul> <li>Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li> <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          | Yes   |
| 25b   | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Other catchment school available (A)  | A          | In adjoining settlement   |
| 25c   | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Other catchment school available (A)  | A          | In adjoining settlement   |
| 25d   | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)                                    | A          | In adjoining settlement   |
| 26    | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)  Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)  None (R)  | A          | Convenience store   |
| 27    | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):  • Less than 400m (G)  • 400m-800m (A)  • Over 800m (R)  • OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)                 | A          | 676.65m   |
| 28    | Distance to nearest train station:  • Less than 800m (G)  • 800m-1200m (A)  • Over 1200m (R)   | R          |   |
| 29    | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | A          | The submission proposes access from Moor Lane, however this is a very narrow road in parts and is |

|        |   |                    | more of a track in its southern part.  |
|--------|---|--------------------|--|
| Scho   | ol Capacity   | '                  | 3.00   |
| 30     | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A                  | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.  |
| 31     | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | G                  | Submission form says financial contributions will be offered   |
|        | Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  |                    | be assessed at a later stage)  |
| 32     | Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   | R/A/G              | Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of |
|        |   |                    | any upgrades required.   |
| Drain  | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | st)                |  |
| 33     | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G)  Consider Further Assessment (A)  Further Assessment Required (R)  | Á                  | Ordinary Watercourse present,<br>JFlow modelling required to confirm<br>flood risk   |
|        | onmental Health   |                    |  |
| 34     | Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G              | Awaiting comments.   |
| 35<br> | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G                  | No immediate issues  |
|        | onmental Constraints  |                    | Harvitala fa de de de  |
| 36     | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | R                  | Unsuitable for development in landscape terms – site is integral to the Flitt valley landscape, exhibits "fenny" characteristics and forms distinctive sense of place.   |
| 37     | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?  | Her;<br>G<br>Arch: | No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this   |

|       | Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?  | A   | would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken              |
|-------|---|-----|--|
| 38    | Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | A   | NIA, adjacent to CWS, need to buffer and enhance to achieve a net gain.                  |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/G | No Loss of Open Space<br>Within Greensand NIA, would need<br>to deliver habitat net gain |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |     |  |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G   | No Issue   |
| Planr | ning History  |     |  |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |     | None   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |     | Yes  |

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

Concerns have been raised about educational capacity in the area. An Ordinary Watercourse has been identified and therefore further assessment will be required to confirm flood risk. There are significant landscape concerns about the site, it is considered to be integral to the Flitt Valley landscape and exhibits 'fenny' characteristics and forms a distinctive sense of place. The site has multi-period archaeological potential, but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation was undertaken. The site is within the Nature Improvement Area and adjacent to a Country Wildlife Site and therefore it would be necessary to buffer any development to achieve a net gain. The site will be considered for further assessment.

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

This section assesses whether the site is Achievable in line with NPPG Guidance:

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

| Viabil | Viability   |   |  |  |  |
|--------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 43     | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?  • High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value  • Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value  • Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value | G | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable. |  |  |
| Achie  | evability   |   |  |  |  |
| 44     | Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?   |   | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential property figures between 2013 and 2016. The housing market within  |  |  |

|    |   | Central Bedfordshire has seen significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.  This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East-West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; 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?  • 0 to 5 years (deliverable)  • 6 to 10 years  • 11 to 15 years  • 15 to 20 years | 0 to 5 years   |
| 46 | Outside Plan Period  What is the indicative build out time of the site?  the site pass this stage?                                      | The Case Study Sites outlined within the Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that after the site has received detailed planning permission a single housebuilder would likely take one year to first completion and would build out the site at a rate of 50 dwellings per annum there after.  Yes   |

#### SUMMARY

#### 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>67</sup>

| Site details     | Site details                              |  |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Reference Number | NLP233                                    |  |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land in Cobbits Road                      |  |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land in Cobbits Road, Maulden             |  |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden                                   |  |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: none given ha |  |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: none given ha  |  |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 0.39 ha                |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                               |  |  |  |
| Any other        | Does overlap with NLP053                  |  |  |  |
| 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.

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT  |            |   |
|-------|---|------------|---|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma  | Il or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity  |            |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?  Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land.  Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  2 hectares or above 60%  Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  Up to 10 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  12 dwellings |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the  | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?  | No         | Not within Flood Zones 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.  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S  | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.  | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?   | No         | Not within an 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

 $^{67}$  Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

67

| 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>68</sup> . |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| _   | ionship to Settlement   |   |   |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site is well related to the existing settlement; the majority of the site is surrounded by the settlement envelope. |
| 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.   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes   |

| STAG   | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT  |   |                                    |  |
|--------|--|---|------------------------------------|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>69</sup> . |   |                                    |  |
| Critic | Critical Infrastructure  |   |                                    |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure</b>   | G | Submission form states that access |  |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>70</sup> ?   |   | will need to be provided.          |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?   |   | Yes                                |  |

| STAC  | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |          |                                     |  |  |
|-------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for   |          |                                     |  |  |
|       | opment where there are no legal or ownership problems   | s and th | e landowner has expressed an        |  |  |
|       | tion to develop the site.   |          |                                     |  |  |
| Avail | ability   |          |                                     |  |  |
| 9     | What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?   | G        | Paddock and dilapidated yard        |  |  |
| 10    | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   | G        | Intention to develop is stated.     |  |  |
| 11    | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?  If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? | G        | No known legal or ownership issues. |  |  |
| 12    | Does the site already have planning permission for<br>the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red<br>because it's not eligible for allocation.  | G        | None                                |  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |          | Yes                                 |  |  |

#### STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

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

led garden villages towns and cities.pdf)

69 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.

significant delays in the delivery of development.

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.

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

|       | 1 Idili  |     |                            |  |
|-------|--|-----|----------------------------|--|
| Greer |  |     |                            |  |
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt. |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable             |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable             |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.71  | N/A | Not applicable             |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |     | Yes                        |  |

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

26 - 75% (A)

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

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

### • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R) Community

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas)            | No  | Designated but no draft plan.       |
|--------|---|-----|-------------------------------------|
|        | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an                    |     |                                     |
|        | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |     |                                     |
| 18     | Community Consultation  | Yes |                                     |
|        | Has any community consultation taken place?                             |     |                                     |
|        | If yes, provide brief details on the form this                          |     |                                     |
|        | consultation took and any overall community                             |     |                                     |
|        | response.   |     |                                     |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement  | No  | No impact on sustainability.        |
|        | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of                     |     |                                     |
|        | the settlement through the loss of services and                         |     |                                     |
|        | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public house etc)          |     |                                     |
| Cumi   | Ilative Impact  |     |                                     |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10                        | Α   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268      |
|        | years, what has been the level of housing growth in                     |     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340      |
|        | the parish?   |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%            |
|        | Less than 5% growth (G)   |     | 5 5                                 |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |                                     |
|        | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>                            |     |                                     |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of                   |     |                                     |
|        | completions over the last ten years as a percentage                     |     |                                     |
|        | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using                     |     |                                     |
|        | census and completions data).   |     |                                     |
| 21     | What level of housing growth would there be if all the                  | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340      |
|        | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to                      |     | Number of outstanding completions   |
|        | be completed?   |     | in 2016: 24                         |
|        | <ul><li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li><li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li></ul>  |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%            |
|        | <ul><li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li><li>More than 20% growth (R)</li></ul> |     |                                     |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of                   |     |                                     |
|        | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as                         |     |                                     |
|        | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April                    |     |                                     |
|        | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions                        |     |                                     |
|        | data).  |     |                                     |
|        | cal Constraints   |     |                                     |
| 22     | Are there any physical constraints or permanent                         | G   |                                     |
|        | features that affect the site's developability?                         |     |                                     |
|        | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment                         |     |                                     |
| Polati | works, topography or wind turbines.                                     |     |                                     |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to                       | G   |                                     |
| 23     | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an                   |     |                                     |
|        | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive                   |     |                                     |
|        | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural                    |     |                                     |
|        | form?   |     |                                     |
|        | ultural Land Quality  |     |                                     |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality                            | Α   | The site is in Grade 3 Agricultural |
|        | agricultural land?  |     | Land. The most recent data from     |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul>            |     | Natural England does not sub-       |
|        | • 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)                                   |     | classify Grades 3a and 3b.          |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>                 |     | Therefore site must be rated Amber. |
|        |   |     | AIIIDEI.                            |

#### **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.

|             | Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.   |            |                                     |  |
|-------------|---|------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Trans       | Transport and Access to Services  |            |                                     |  |
| 25          | Facilities and services   | _          |                                     |  |
|             | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability  | of the sit | te for housing. It links to the     |  |
|             | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   |            |                                     |  |
|             |   |            |                                     |  |
|             | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |            |                                     |  |
| 25a         | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  | G          | Yes                                 |  |
|             | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                     |  |
|             | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  |            |                                     |  |
|             | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  |            |                                     |  |
|             | Not in the settlement or an adjoining   |            |                                     |  |
| 051         | settlement (R)  |            | La adiabata a attaga ant            |  |
| 25b         | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if  | Α          | In adjoining settlement             |  |
|             | applicable)?  |            |                                     |  |
|             | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                     |  |
|             | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  |            |                                     |  |
|             | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  Other actal month as a surjudite (A)  |            | Ť                                   |  |
| 25.0        | Other catchment school available (A)  Dead the cattlement because Consendant (University).  | ^          | Localisio in acastila assaut        |  |
| 25c         | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?   | Α          | In adjoining settlement             |  |
|             |   |            |                                     |  |
|             | Yes, in the settlement (G)  Yes, prepayed as part of the development (C)  The settlement (G)  Yes, prepayed as part of the development (C). |            |                                     |  |
|             | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                     |  |
|             | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  Other actobment asked available (A)   |            |                                     |  |
| 25d         | Other catchment school available (A)  December 2  | Α          | In adjoining settlement             |  |
| 25 <b>u</b> | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?   | A          | in adjoining settlement             |  |
|             | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                     |  |
|             | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                     |  |
|             | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                     |  |
|             | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |
|             | settlement (R)  |            |                                     |  |
| 26          | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α          | Convenience store                   |  |
|             | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)  |            |                                     |  |
|             | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent   |            |                                     |  |
|             | (A)   |            |                                     |  |
|             | None (R)  |            |                                     |  |
| 27          | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at   | G          |                                     |  |
|             | least hourly at peak times):  |            |                                     |  |
|             | <ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                     |  |
|             | • 400m-800m (A)   |            |                                     |  |
|             | <ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |
|             | <ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>   |            |                                     |  |
|             | public transport facilities could be provided as  |            |                                     |  |
|             | part of the development (G)   |            |                                     |  |
| 28          | Distance to nearest train station:  | R          | 368.25m                             |  |
|             | <ul><li>Less than 800m (G)</li></ul>  |            |                                     |  |
|             | • 800m-1200m (A)  |            |                                     |  |
|             | <ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>  |            |                                     |  |
| 29          | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | R          | Site accessed of Cobbitts road, but |  |
|             |   |            | current access is not wide enough   |  |
|             |   |            | and potential to widen may be       |  |

|      |   |             | restricted by private garden and   |
|------|---|-------------|--|
|      |   |             | restricted by private garden and garage either side.   |
| Scho | ol Capacity   |             |  |
| 30   | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A           | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.  |
| 31   | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | G           | Submission form says if applicable a contribution would be made  |
| Wate | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  | ture will   |  |
| 32   | Is there the capacity to provide all required   | R/A/G       | Water utilities companies have a   |
|      | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   |             | statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required. |
|      | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | est)        |  |
| 33   | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G)  Consider Further Assessment (A)  Further Assessment Required (R)  | G           | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required   |
|      | onmental Health   | T = / . / a |  |
| 34   | Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G       | Awaiting comments  |
| 35   | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G           | No immediate issues  |
|      | onmental Constraints  |             |  |
| 36   | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | G           | Scope for development – need to safeguard amenity of footpath – create a green corridor.   |
| 37   | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any   | Her:<br>G   | No Heritage comments. Site has multi-period  |

|                                       | heritage assets and their setting?                    | Arch: | archaeological potential but this   |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                       | Are there any opportunities for enhancement of        | Α     | would not prevent allocation        |  |  |
|                                       | these assets?   |       | providing appropriate mitigation is |  |  |
|                                       |   |       | undertaken                          |  |  |
| 38                                    | Ecological Assets                                     | R/A   | Rough grass / scrub, likely SPI     |  |  |
|                                       | What would the impacts of development be on any       |       | present, hard to demonstrate net    |  |  |
|                                       | biological, geological or ecological assets and are   |       | gain                                |  |  |
|                                       | there any opportunities for their enhancement?        |       |                                     |  |  |
| 39                                    | Open space/leisure and GI assets                      | Α     | Adjacent to Greensand Ridge Walk    |  |  |
|                                       | Are there any potential conflicts with open space,    |       | and within NIA. Development would   |  |  |
|                                       | leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there       |       | need to enhance habitats and        |  |  |
|                                       | capacity to provide the required levels of open space |       | Greensand Ridge Corridor            |  |  |
|                                       | and green infrastructure?                             |       | No Loss of Open Space               |  |  |
| Minerals and Waste                    |   |       |                                     |  |  |
| 40                                    | What would the impacts of development be on           | G     | No Issue                            |  |  |
|                                       | safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including       |       |                                     |  |  |
|                                       | mineral safeguarding sites?                           |       |                                     |  |  |
| Planning History                      |   |       |                                     |  |  |
| 41                                    | What is the sites planning history? (For example      |       | None                                |  |  |
|                                       | planning applications and submissions to previous     |       |                                     |  |  |
|                                       | Allocations Plans)                                    |       |                                     |  |  |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   |       | Yes                                 |  |  |

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

Concerns about educational capacity have been raised for this area. There have been some ecology concerns raised about the site, the site is currently rough grass/scrub with a potential Species of Principle Importance and it would be difficult to demonstrate net gain here. The site has multi-period archaeological potential, but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation was undertaken. As no significant constraints have been identified, this site will stay within the assessment process.

#### **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            | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?  • High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value  • Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value  • Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value | 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. |  |  |
| Achievability |   |   |  |  |  |
| 44            | Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?   |   | 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  |  |  |

| When can the scheme realistically commence delivery?  • 0 to 5 years (deliverable) • 6 to 10 years • 11 to 15 years | significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.  This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East-West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; 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.  O to 5 years |
|---|--|
| <ul><li>15 to 20 years</li><li>Outside Plan Period</li></ul>  |  |
| 46 What is the indicative build out time of the site?  Does the site pass this stage?                               | The Case Study Sites outlined within the Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that after the site has received detailed planning permission a single housebuilder would likely take one year to build out this site.  Yes   |
| Dood the site pass this stage:  | 103  |

#### 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>72</sup>

| Site details     | Site details                       |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Reference Number | NLP253                             |  |  |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land fronting Silsoe Road          |  |  |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land fronting Silsoe Road, Maulden |  |  |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden                            |  |  |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 4.45ha |  |  |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 4.45 ha |  |  |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 4.45ha          |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                        |  |  |  |  |
| Any other        |                                    |  |  |  |  |
| information      |                                    |  |  |  |  |

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

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

| STAG  | STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT  |            |  |  |  |
|-------|--|------------|--|--|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | Il or conf | ict with national policy designations.   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |  |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  150 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  80 dwellings |  |  |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ntial Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.   |  |  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)  |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.  |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an 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>72</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

72

| 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>73</sup> .   |   |  |  |  |
| Relati  | onship to Settlement  |   |  |  |  |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | Site borders the settlement envelope boundary. The eastern portion of the site is quite well related to existing development, and there is existing development on the opposite side of the road. The western portion of the site however extends into the open countryside and does not have a strong relationship. |  |  |
| 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   |  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |  |  |

| STAG   | GE 1C ASSESSMENT  |         |   |
|--------|---|---------|---|
| This s | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able | to meet | their critical infrastructure needs <sup>74</sup> . |
| Critic | al Infrastructure   |         |   |
| 8      | Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure</b>      | G       | Site is not dependent upon the                      |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>75</sup> ?    |         | delivery of off site infrastructure.                |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?                          |         | Yes   |

| STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT  This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site. |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Avail   | ability   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9   | What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?           | G | Agricultural use                         |  |  |  |
| 10  | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site? | G | Sole owner intent on developing the site |  |  |  |
| 11  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12  | Does the site already have planning permission for  | G | None.                                    |  |  |  |

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

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

The figure of 1,500 homes has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</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.

significant delays in the delivery of development.

This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

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

| Plan. | Plan.  |     |                           |  |  |
|-------|--|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| Greei | Greenbelt  |     |                           |  |  |
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt |  |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.76  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| 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**

Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R Agricultural

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

|       | with the NPPF definition?   |    |   |
|-------|---|----|---|
|       |   |    |   |
|       | • 76% - 100% (G)  |    |   |
|       | • 26 - 75% (A)  |    |   |
|       | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)   |    |   |
|       | nunity  | T  |   |
| 17    | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No | Designated but no draft plan                                      |
|       | designated areas)   |    |   |
|       | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |    |   |
|       | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |    |   |
| 18    | Community Consultation  | No |   |
|       | Has any community consultation taken place?   |    |   |
|       | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |    |   |
|       | consultation took and any overall community   |    |   |
|       | response.   |    |   |
| 19    | Sustainability of Settlement  | No | No impact on sustainability.                                      |
|       | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   |    |   |
|       | the settlement through the loss of services and   |    |   |
|       | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |    |   |
|       | house etc)  |    |   |
| Cumi  | lative Impact   |    |   |
| 20    | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | Α  | Number of houses in 2006: 1268                                    |
|       | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   |    | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                                    |
|       | the parish?   |    | Percentage growth: 5.68%  |
|       | Less than 5% growth (G)   |    | . orominge gromm encore   |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |    |   |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)  |    |   |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |    |   |
|       | completions over the last ten years as a percentage   |    |   |
|       | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using   |    |   |
|       | census and completions data).   |    |   |
| 21    | What level of housing growth would there be if all the  | G  | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                                    |
| 21    | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to  | U  | Number of nouses in 2010, 1340  Number of outstanding completions |
|       | be completed?   |    | in 2016: 24   |
|       | ·   |    | Percentage growth: 1.79%  |
|       | • Less than 5% growth (G)   |    | 1 ercentage growth. 1.7976  |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |    |   |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)  This is a dayloted by weathing and the total growth and fine total growth and g |    |   |
|       | 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  |    |   |
| DI    | data).  |    |   |
|       | cal Constraints   |    | Nie zanatuskat 11 cm 1  |
| 22    | Are there any physical constraints or permanent   | G  | No constraints identified.  |
| 1     | features that affect the site's developability?   |    |   |
|       | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |    |   |
|       | works, topography or wind turbines.   |    |   |
|       | ionship to Settlement   |    |   |
| 23    | Would development of the site be complementary to   | Α  | The site extends out in to the                                    |
|       | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   |    | countryside beyond the existing                                   |
|       | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |    | built form. Development of the                                    |
|       | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |    | entire site may therefore be                                      |
|       | form?   |    | inappropriate, and as such it is                                  |
|       |   |    | suggested that that only a portion                                |
|       |   |    | of the site is taken forward.                                     |
| Agric | ultural Land Quality  |    |   |
| 24    | Would the development impact on high quality  | R  | Site is in Grade 2  |
|       |   |    |   |

| agricultural land?   |  |
|--|--|
| <ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul> |  |
| <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>      |  |
| <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>      |  |

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.

|     | 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  |            |                                 |  |
| 25  | Facilities and services   |            |                                 |  |
|     | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability  | of the sit | te for housing. It links to the |  |
|     | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   |            |                                 |  |
|     |   |            |                                 |  |
|     | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |            |                                 |  |
| 25a | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  | G          | Yes                             |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                 |  |
|     | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  |            |                                 |  |
|     | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  |            |                                 |  |
|     | Not in the settlement or an adjoining   |            |                                 |  |
| 25h | settlement (R)  | ^          | In a disjoing a settlement      |  |
| 25b | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?   | Α          | In adjoining settlement         |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)  |            |                                 |  |
| 25c | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper   | Α          | In adjoining settlement         |  |
| 230 | school?   | / /        | in adjoining somement           |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)  |            |                                 |  |
| 25d | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical   | Α          | In adjoining settlement         |  |
|     | centre?   |            | ,                               |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>   |            |                                 |  |
|     | settlement (R)  |            |                                 |  |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α          | Convenience store               |  |
|     | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)  |            |                                 |  |
|     | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent   |            |                                 |  |
|     | (A)   |            |                                 |  |
| 07  | None (R)  Biology (a by constitution for a section (a))   | Δ.         | 400 47                          |  |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at   | Α          | 462.47m                         |  |
|     | least hourly at peak times):  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul><li>Less than 400m (G)</li><li>400m-800m (A)</li></ul>  |            |                                 |  |
|     | <ul><li>400ff-800ff (A)</li><li>Over 800m (R)</li></ul>   |            |                                 |  |
|     | OR submission form stated that improved   |            |                                 |  |
|     | public transport facilities could be provided as  |            |                                 |  |
|     | part of the development (G)   |            |                                 |  |
| 28  | Distance to nearest train station:  | R          |                                 |  |
| -5  | Distance to nearest train station.  | 1.1        |                                 |  |

|         |   | ı     | Г   |
|---------|---|-------|---|
|         | <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>  |       |   |
|         | • 800m-1200m (A)  |       |   |
|         | <ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>  |       |   |
| 29      | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | G     | Access to Silsoe road   |
| Scho    | ol Capacity   |       |   |
| 30      | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | Α     | Small amount of capacity existing                                 |
|         | ' ,   |       | at Maulden lower, which is  |
|         |   |       | expected to be taken up by  |
|         |   |       | development already planned in                                    |
|         |   |       | the area, so a new site/ additional                               |
|         |   |       | land may be required. Middle and                                  |
|         |   |       | upper schools have already been                                   |
|         |   |       | expanded.   |
| 24      | If you had a committee out had a made to address  | 0     |   |
| 31      | If not, has a commitment been made to address   | G     | Submission form says 'where CIL                                   |
| 10/11/1 | this?   | 1 '11 | compliant   |
|         | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  |       |   |
| 32      | Is there the capacity to provide all required   | R/A/G | Water utilities companies have a                                  |
|         | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   |       | statutory duty to supply water and                                |
|         |   |       | waste water infrastructure to new                                 |
|         |   |       | development sites and a lack of                                   |
|         |   |       | available capacity does not prevent                               |
|         |   |       | future development. Any   |
|         |   |       | infrastructure upgrades required                                  |
|         |   |       | will depend on the quantum and                                    |
|         |   |       | location of growth falling within                                 |
|         |   |       | each catchment area. Whilst the                                   |
|         |   |       | Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April                                  |
|         |   |       | 2017) identifies the current capacity                             |
|         |   |       | of existing water infrastructure, a                               |
|         |   |       | Stage 2 study will be prepared to                                 |
|         |   |       | test the cumulative effect of sites                               |
|         |   |       | that have been shortlisted for                                    |
|         |   |       |   |
|         |   |       | allocation in the Local Plan and                                  |
|         |   |       | identify the nature and timing of                                 |
| Droin   | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Coguential To  | ot\   | any upgrades required.  |
| 33      | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to |       | Ordinary Watersourse present                                      |
| 33      |   | Α     | Ordinary Watercourse present, JFlow modelling required to confirm |
|         | site allocations, in regards to flood risk?   |       |   |
|         | No assessment required (G)  |       | flood risk  |
|         | Consider Further Assessment (A)   |       |   |
|         | Further Assessment Required (R)   |       |   |
|         | onmental Health   |       |   |
| 34      | Contamination   | R/A/G | Awaiting comments   |
|         | Are there any contamination constraints on site and   |       |   |
|         | will there be any remediation required?   |       |   |
| 35      | Adjoining uses  | Α     | Possible neighbouring uses  |
|         | Would any adjoining uses have the potential to  |       |   |
|         | cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;   |       |   |
|         | noise and smell)  |       |   |
| Envir   | onmental Constraints  |       |   |
| 36      | Landscape character   | Α     | Scope for development in scale                                    |
|         | What would the impacts of development be on the   |       | with existing depth of built form and                             |
|         | landscape character or setting of the area or any   |       | if set within landscape framework                                 |
|         | designated landscapes? Would there be any direct  |       | securing habitat gain   |
|         | or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural   |       | - cocarring riabilitat gain                                       |
|         |   |       |   |
|         | Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  |       |   |

| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology                                 | Her:  | No heritage comment.                |
|-------|---|-------|-------------------------------------|
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any       | G     | Site has multi-period               |
|       | heritage assets and their setting?                    | Arch: | archaeological potential but this   |
|       | Are there any opportunities for enhancement of        | Α     | would not prevent allocation        |
|       | these assets?   |       | providing appropriate mitigation is |
|       |   |       | undertaken                          |
| 38    | Ecological Assets                                     | Α     | NIA, Retain and buffer existing     |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any       |       | features, opportunities for         |
|       | biological, geological or ecological assets and are   |       | enhancement.                        |
|       | there any opportunities for their enhancement?        |       |                                     |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets                      | A/G   | Within Greensand NIA, would need    |
|       | Are there any potential conflicts with open space,    |       | to deliver habitat net gain, and    |
|       | leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there       |       | enhance ROW corridors on            |
|       | capacity to provide the required levels of open space |       | western edges                       |
|       | and green infrastructure?                             |       | No Loss of Open Space               |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |       |                                     |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on           | Α     | Within MSA                          |
|       | safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including       |       |                                     |
|       | mineral safeguarding sites?                           |       |                                     |
| Planr | ning History  |       |                                     |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example      |       | None                                |
|       | planning applications and submissions to previous     |       |                                     |
|       | Allocations Plans)                                    |       |                                     |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?                      |       | Yes                                 |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is within Grade 2 Agricultural land, and there have been educational constraints identified within this area. An Ordinary Watercourse is present so further modelling will be required to confirm flood risk.

There would however need to be some mitigation undertaken, in particular taking forward only the portion of the site which sits within the existing depth of the build form would help to ensure the site is well related to Maulden and does not significantly alter the existing historic settlement pattern. There would also be a need to retain and buffer the existing landscape and ecology features and deliver net habitat gain as the site is within the Greensand NIA. A portion of the site will retained within the Site Assessment process.

### **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.

| viabii | Viability   |   |  |  |  |
|--------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 43     | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?  High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value  Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value  Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value | G | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable. |  |  |
| Achie  | Achievability   |   |  |  |  |
| 44     | Are there any market factors which would affect   |   | The Council's Residential  |  |  |

| deliverability?   | Development Viability Report (Feb.   |
|---|--|
| deliverability?  45 When can the scheme realistically commence  | Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) is based upon residential property figures between 2013 and 2016. The housing market within Central Bedfordshire has seen significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.  This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East-West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; 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.  O to 5 years |
| delivery?  • 0 to 5 years (deliverable)  • 6 to 10 years  • 11 to 15 years  • 15 to 20 years  • Outside Plan Period |  |
| 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 first completion and would build out the site at a rate of 50 dwellings per   |
| Does the site pass this stage?  | annum there after. 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>77</sup>

| Site details     | Site details                        |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Reference Number | NLP270                              |  |  |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land North of Clophill Road (West)  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Address     | Clophill Road                       |  |  |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden                             |  |  |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area:2.2 ha   |  |  |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 16.69 ha |  |  |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 2.33ha           |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                         |  |  |  |  |
| Any other        | Part of ALP023                      |  |  |  |  |
| 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   |            |   |  |  |
|-------|---|------------|---|--|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma  | ll or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity  | ,          |   |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?  Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land.  Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  1 hectares or above 60%  Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  50 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  40 dwellings |  |  |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the  | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?  | No         | Not located 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.  |  |  |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.  | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?   | No         | Not located within an 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>77</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>78</sup> .   |   |  |  |  |
| Relati | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |  |  |
| 6      | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | Site borders the settlement envelope boundary. The site is quite well related to existing development as there is existing development on the opposite side of the road. |  |  |
| 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.  |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |  |  |

|        | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT  |   |  |   |  |
|--------|--|---|--|---|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>79</sup> . |   |  |   |  |
| Critic | al Infrastructure  |   |  |   |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>80</sup> ?                       | G | Form states the site good access to all r infrastructure | _ |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?   |   | Yes  |   |  |

| STAG    | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT   |           |                                 |  |  |
|---------|---|-----------|---------------------------------|--|--|
|         | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for |           |                                 |  |  |
|         | opment where there are no legal or ownership problems   | s and the | landowner has expressed an      |  |  |
| intenti | ion to develop the site.  |           |                                 |  |  |
| Availa  | ability   |           |                                 |  |  |
| 9       | What is the existing use of the site?   | G         | Field used for grazing horses   |  |  |
|         | Would the existing use limit the development  |           |                                 |  |  |
|         | potential?  |           |                                 |  |  |
| 10      | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner   | G         | Sole Owner intent on developing |  |  |
|         | who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   |           | the site                        |  |  |
| 11      | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could  | G         |                                 |  |  |
|         | delay or prevent development?   |           |                                 |  |  |
|         | If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically   |           |                                 |  |  |
|         | overcome?   |           |                                 |  |  |
| 12      | Does the site already have planning permission for  | G         | 17/00305/OUT application for 49 |  |  |
|         | the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red   |           | dwellings refused.              |  |  |
|         | because it's not eligible for allocation.   |           |                                 |  |  |
| Does    | the site continue to next stage?  |           | Yes                             |  |  |

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

To Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</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.

significant delays in the delivery of development.

80 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.

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

| Gree | Greenbelt  |     |                           |  |  |
|------|--|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| 13   | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt |  |  |
| 14   | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| 15a  | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| 15b  | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.81  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| 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 16 Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? • 76% - 100% (G) • 26 - 75% (A)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>81</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

|        | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)   |     |  |
|--------|---|-----|--|
| Comr   | nunity  |     |  |
| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No  | Designated but no draft plan                                     |
|        | designated areas)   | 110 | Boolghatoa bat no aran plan                                      |
|        | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |     |  |
|        | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |     |  |
| 18     | Community Consultation  | No  |  |
|        | Has any community consultation taken place?   |     |  |
|        | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |     |  |
|        | consultation took and any overall community   |     |  |
|        | response.   |     |  |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement  | No  | No impact on sustainability.                                     |
|        | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   |     |  |
|        | the settlement through the loss of services and   |     |  |
|        | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |     |  |
| Cum    | house etc) Ilative Impact   |     |  |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | A   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268                                   |
| 20     | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   |     | Number of houses in 2006, 1266<br>Number of houses in 2016; 1340 |
|        | the parish?   |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%   |
|        | Less than 5% growth (G)   |     | r croomago growini cico/o  |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |  |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)  |     |  |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |  |
|        | completions over the last ten years as a percentage   |     |  |
|        | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using   |     |  |
|        | census and completions data).   |     |  |
| 21     | What level of housing growth would there be if all the  | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                                   |
|        | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to  |     | Number of outstanding completions                                |
|        | be completed?   |     | in 2016: 24  |
|        | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>   |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%   |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |  |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)  |     |  |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |  |
|        | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as   |     |  |
|        | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions |     |  |
|        | data).  |     |  |
| Physi  | cal Constraints   |     |  |
| 22     | Are there any physical constraints or permanent   | G   | No constraints identified.                                       |
|        | features that affect the site's developability?   |     |  |
|        | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |     |  |
|        | works, topography or wind turbines.   |     |  |
| Relati | onship to Settlement  |     |  |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to   | Α   | Development of this site would                                   |
|        | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   |     | narrow a gap in Maulden that is                                  |
|        | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |     | distinctive and unique. However                                  |
|        | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |     | there is built development on the                                |
|        | form?   |     | opposite side of the road.                                       |
|        | ultural Land Quality  |     | Cita in in Conde   |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality  | R   | Site is in Grade 2   |
|        | agricultural land?  |     |  |
|        | • 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  |     |  |
|        | • 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)   |     |  |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>   |     |  |

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.

|            | question does not mean that the site will be automatically<br>e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance |            | ed at this stage as the ratings across  |
|------------|--|------------|---|
|            | sport and Access to Services   |            |   |
| <u> 25</u> | Facilities and services  |            |   |
| 23         | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the                      |            |   |
|            | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.  | 01 1110 01 | to for flodding. It links to the        |
|            | Obdition o Cottlement Therarenty Fladit.   |            |   |
|            | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  |            |   |
| 25a        | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?   | G          | Yes                                     |
|            | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            | 100                                     |
|            | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |   |
|            | Not in the settlement or an adjoining  |            |   |
|            | settlement (R)   |            |   |
| 25b        | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if   | Α          | In adjoining settlement                 |
|            | applicable)?   |            | a a join i g                            |
|            | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |   |
|            | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)   |            |   |
|            | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)   |            |   |
|            | Other catchment school available (A)   |            |   |
| 25c        | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper  | Α          | In adjoining settlement                 |
| -          | school?  |            | , |
|            | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |   |
|            | Other catchment school available (A)   |            |   |
| 25d        | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical  | Α          | In adjoining settlement                 |
|            | centre?  |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>   |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>  |            |   |
|            | settlement (R)   |            |   |
| 26         | What retail provision does the settlement offer?   | Α          | Convenience store                       |
|            | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)   |            |   |
|            | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent  |            |   |
|            | (A)  |            |   |
|            | None (R)   |            |   |
| 27         | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at  | G          | 75.13                                   |
|            | least hourly at peak times):   |            |   |
|            | Less than 400m (G)   |            |   |
|            | • 400m-800m (A)  |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>  |            |   |
|            | OR submission form stated that improved  |            |   |
|            | public transport facilities could be provided as   |            |   |
|            | part of the development (G)  |            |   |
| 28         | Distance to nearest train station:   | R          |   |
|            | • Less than 800m (G)   |            |   |
|            | • 800m-1200m (A)   |            |   |
|            | <ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>   |            |   |
| 29         | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | G          | Fronts on to Clophill Road              |

| 20    | Do the level cabacle have considered all tiere?   | Ι Λ                     | Consultance of consolity evictions   |
|-------|---|-------------------------|--|
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A                       | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.  |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | А                       | Nothing on submission form   |
| Water | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  | ture will               | be assessed at a later stage)  |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   | R/A/G                   | Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and |
| Dunin |   | <b>-4</b> \             | identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.   |
|       | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  |                         |  |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  • No assessment required (G)  • Consider Further Assessment (A)  • Further Assessment Required (R)  | G                       | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required   |
|       | onmental Health   | - / - / -               |  |
| 34    | Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G                   | Awaiting comments  |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | А                       | Possibly Neighbouring Business Impact  |
|       | onmental Constraints  |                         |  |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | R                       | Unsuitable for development in landscape terms— land forms important farmed open space within linear development. Important to maintain hedged enclosure and sequence of farmed spaces within village.  |
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?   | Her:<br>G<br>Arch:<br>R | No heritage comment. Unsuitable for allocation. Site contains archaeological earthworks.   |

| 38    | Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | A   | Semi-improved acid grassland with hedges– NIA, must demonstrate net gain  |
|-------|---|-----|---|
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/G | No Loss of Open Space<br>Within Greensand NIA, would need<br>to deliver habitat net gain and<br>retain / enhance existing habitats. |
|       | rals and Waste  |     |   |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on   | G   | No Issue  |
|       | safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   |     |   |
| Planr | ning History  |     |   |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |     | 17/00305/OUT application for 49 dwellings refused   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |     | No  |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is not appropriate for development. This site is mostly Grade 2 agricultural land. Concerns have been raised about educational capacity in this area. In addition to this the site is unsuitable in Archaeological terms because it contains archaeological earthworks. The landscape of the site forms an important farmed open space within linear development, the landscape officer considers it important to maintain the hedged enclosure and sequence of farmed spaces within the village.

Development here would fill in a gap in the settlement pattern which is distinctive and unique to the historical pattern of Maulden. It is recognised that there is some low density development on the opposite side of the road, and there is some existing housing and employment to the west of the site but development could still have an unacceptable impact on the character of the settlement and when combined with the other constraints it is considered that the site is not appropriate for further consideration as part of this process.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING82

| Site details     |   |
|------------------|---|
| Reference Number | NLP276  |
| Site Name        | Land north of Clophill Road (East)            |
| Site Address     | M Land north of Clophill Road (East), Maulden |
| Settlement       | Maulden                                       |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 1.85 ha           |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 16.6 ha            |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 1.71 ha                    |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                                   |
| Any other        | Part of ALP023                                |
| 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.

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  42 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  41 dwellings |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ntial Test)   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an AONB.   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |            | Yes   |

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>82</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>83</sup> .   |   |  |  |
| Relati  | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |  |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | Site borders the settlement envelope boundary. The site is quite well related to existing development as there is existing development on the opposite side of the road. |  |
| 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   |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |  |

|   | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT  |   |                  |               |  |
|---|--|---|------------------|---------------|--|
| This s  | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>84</sup> . |   |                  |               |  |
| Critic  | cal Infrastructure   |   |                  |               |  |
| 8   | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure  | G | Good access to a | all necessary |  |
| requirements that will enable delivery <sup>85</sup> ? infrastructure |  |   |                  | -             |  |
| 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? Field used for sileage production Α Would the existing use limit the development which would need to be relocated. potential? 10 G Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner Sole owner intent on developing who has expressed an intention to develop the site? the site 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? 12 Does the site already have planning permission for 17/00305/OUT application for 49 G the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red dwellings refused because it's not eligible for allocation. Does the site continue to next stage? Yes

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

<sup>85</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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>84</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.

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

| Green | Greenbelt  |     |                           |  |
|-------|--|-----|---------------------------|--|
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.86  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 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.

| Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance. |   |   |              |  |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| Previously Developed Land                                     |   |   |              |  |
| 16  | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R | Agricultural |  |
|   | with the NPPF definition?                           |   |              |  |
|   | • 76% - 100% (G)                                    |   |              |  |
|   | • 26 - 75% (A)                                      |   |              |  |
|   | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)                         |   |              |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| Comr   | nunity   |    |  |
|--------|--|----|--|
| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in                   | No | Designated but no draft plan           |
|        | designated areas)  |    |  |
|        | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an         |    |  |
|        | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?                                 |    |  |
| 18     | Community Consultation                                       | No |  |
|        | Has any community consultation taken place?                  |    |  |
|        | If yes, provide brief details on the form this               |    |  |
|        | consultation took and any overall community                  |    |  |
|        | response.  |    |  |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement                                 | No | No impact on sustainability.           |
|        | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of          |    |  |
|        | the settlement through the loss of services and              |    |  |
|        | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public          |    |  |
|        | house etc)   |    |  |
| Cumu   | lative Impact  |    |  |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10             | Α  | Number of houses in 2006: 1268         |
|        | years, what has been the level of housing growth in          |    | Number of houses in 2016: 1340         |
|        | the parish?  |    | Percentage growth: 5.68%               |
|        | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>                  |    |  |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)                                       |    |  |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)                                     |    |  |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of        |    |  |
|        | completions over the last ten years as a percentage          |    |  |
|        | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using          |    |  |
|        | census and completions data).                                |    |  |
| 21     | What level of housing growth would there be if all the       | G  | Number of houses in 2016: 1340         |
|        | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to           |    | Number of outstanding completions      |
|        | be completed?  |    | in 2016: 24                            |
|        | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>                  |    | Percentage growth: 1.79%               |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)                                       |    |  |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)                                     |    |  |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of        |    |  |
|        | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as              |    |  |
|        | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April         |    |  |
|        | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions             |    |  |
|        | data).   |    |  |
| Physi  | cal Constraints  |    |  |
| 22     | Are there any physical constraints or permanent              | G  | No constraints identified.             |
|        | features that affect the site's developability?              |    |  |
|        | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment              |    |  |
|        | works, topography or wind turbines.                          |    |  |
| Relati | ionship to Settlement  |    |  |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to            | Α  | Development of this site would         |
|        | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an        |    | narrow a gap in Maulden that is        |
|        | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive        |    | distinctive and unique. Whilst there   |
|        | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural         |    | is some built development on the       |
|        | form?  |    | opposite side of the road, this is set |
|        |  |    | back from the road and unique in       |
|        |  |    | nature.                                |
|        | ultural Land Quality   |    |  |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality                 | R  | Site is in Grade 2                     |
|        | agricultural land?   |    |  |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul> |    |  |
|        | <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>      |    |  |
|        | <ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>      |    |  |
|        |  | ı  | <u> </u>                               |

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.

| Stage | Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.   |           |                                 |  |  |
|-------|---|-----------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Trans | Transport and Access to Services  |           |                                 |  |  |
| 25    | Facilities and services  Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.  Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  | of the si | te for housing. It links to the |  |  |
| 25a   | <ul> <li>Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li> <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</li> </ul> | G         | Yes                             |  |  |
| 25b   | settlement (R)  Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Other catchment school available (A)                     | A         | In adjoining settlement         |  |  |
| 25c   | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Other catchment school available (A)   | A         | In adjoining settlement         |  |  |
| 25d   | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?  • Yes, in the settlement (G)  • Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  • No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  • Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)                     | A         | In adjoining settlement         |  |  |
| 26    | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | A         | Convenience store               |  |  |
| 27    | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):  • Less than 400m (G)  • 400m-800m (A)  • Over 800m (R)  • OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)  | G         | 132.88m                         |  |  |
| 28    | Distance to nearest train station:  • Less than 800m (G)  • 800m-1200m (A)  • Over 1200m (R)  | R         |                                 |  |  |
| 29    | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | G         | Access from Clophill Road       |  |  |
|       | <u> </u>  |           |                                 |  |  |

| Scho  | ol Capacity  |           |                                       |
|-------|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?     | Α         | Small amount of capacity existing     |
|       | 20 me recar company at an area.                      | ' '       | at Maulden lower, which is            |
|       |  |           | expected to be taken up by            |
|       |  |           | development already planned in        |
|       |  |           | the area, so a new site/ additional   |
|       |  |           | land may be required. Middle and      |
|       |  |           | upper schools have already been       |
|       |  |           | expanded.                             |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address        | Α         | Nothing on submission form            |
|       | this?  | ' '       | Treat in 1g on Cashinesien reini      |
| Water | Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc | ture will | be assessed at a later stage)         |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required        | R/A/G     | Water utilities companies have a      |
|       | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?    |           | statutory duty to supply water and    |
|       | •  |           | waste water infrastructure to new     |
|       |  |           | development sites and a lack of       |
|       |  |           | available capacity does not prevent   |
|       |  |           | future development. Any               |
|       |  |           | infrastructure upgrades required      |
|       |  |           | will depend on the quantum and        |
|       |  |           | location of growth falling within     |
|       |  |           | each catchment area. Whilst the       |
|       |  |           | Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April      |
|       |  |           | 2017) identifies the current capacity |
|       |  |           | of existing water infrastructure, a   |
|       |  |           | Stage 2 study will be prepared to     |
|       |  | · ·       | test the cumulative effect of sites   |
|       |  |           | that have been shortlisted for        |
|       |  |           | allocation in the Local Plan and      |
|       |  |           | identify the nature and timing of     |
|       |  |           | any upgrades required.                |
| Drain | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te | est)      |                                       |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to | G         | Site is at limited risk of surface    |
|       | site allocations, in regards to flood risk?          |           | water flooding, assessment is         |
|       | <ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>       |           | unlikely to be required.              |
|       | <ul> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>  |           |                                       |
|       | <ul> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>  |           |                                       |
| Envir | onmental Health                                      | •         |                                       |
| 34    | Contamination  | R/A/G     | Awaiting comments                     |
|       | Are there any contamination constraints on site and  |           |                                       |
|       | will there be any remediation required?              |           |                                       |
| 35    | Adjoining uses                                       | Α         | Possibly neighbouring Business        |
|       | Would any adjoining uses have the potential to       |           | impact                                |
|       | cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;  |           |                                       |
|       | noise and smell)                                     | <u></u>   |                                       |
|       | onmental Constraints                                 |           |                                       |
| 36    | Landscape character                                  | R         | Unsuitable for development in         |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on the      |           | landscape terms– land forms           |
|       | landscape character or setting of the area or any    |           | important farmed open space           |
|       | designated landscapes? Would there be any direct     |           | within linear development.            |
|       | or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural  |           |                                       |
|       | Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?               |           |                                       |
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology                                | Her:      | No Heritage comment.                  |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any      | G         | Site has multi-period                 |
|       | heritage assets and their setting?                   | Arch:     | archaeological potential but this     |
|       | Are there any opportunities for enhancement of       | Α         | would not prevent allocation          |
|       |  |           |                                       |

|       | these assets?  |     | providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken |
|-------|--|-----|--|
| 38    | Ecological Assets  | Α   | Semi-improved acid grassland with              |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any  |     | hedges– NIA, must demonstrate                  |
|       | biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement? |     | net gain                                       |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets   | A/G | No Loss of Open Space                          |
| 33    | Are there any potential conflicts with open space,   | 7.0 | Within Greensand NIA, would need               |
|       | leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there  |     | to deliver habitat net gain and                |
|       | capacity to provide the required levels of open space  |     | retain / enhance existing habitats.            |
|       | and green infrastructure?  |     |  |
| Mine  | rals and Waste   |     |  |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on  | G   | No Issue                                       |
|       | safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including  |     |  |
|       | mineral safeguarding sites?  |     |  |
| Planr | ning History   |     |  |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example   |     | 17/00305/OUT application for 49                |
|       | planning applications and submissions to previous  |     | dwellings refused                              |
|       | Allocations Plans)   |     |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |     | No   |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is not suitable for development. The site is Grade 2 Agricultural Land. Issues with education capacity have been raised in this area. The landscape of the site forms an important farmed open space within linear development, and therefore in landscape terms the site is not considered suitable for development. The site has multi-period archaeological potential, but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation was undertaken. Ecologically the site is semi-improved acid grassland with hedges and within the Nature Improvement Area so net gain must be demonstrated.

Development here would fill in a gap in the settlement pattern which is distinctive and unique to the historical pattern of Maulden. Green End forms a gateway to Maulden Wood and thus developing either side of this would change the character of this rural area for the users of Maulden Wood. Whilst it is recognised that there is some low density development on the opposite side of the road, it is not considered to be an appropriate location for an allocation of 10 or more dwellings which would considerably change the nature of the settlement in this place. In landscape terms the site forms an important farmed open space within linear development.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING87

| Site details     | Site details                                 |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| Reference Number | NLP287                                       |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land to the North and South of Clophill Road |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land to the North and South of Clophill Road |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden                                      |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 3.56ha           |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.56ha            |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 3.64ha                    |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                                  |  |  |
| Any other        | Includes ALP151, ALP 153,                    |  |  |
| 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.

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |  |
|-------|--|------------|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  75-90 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  64 dwellings |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.   |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an 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>87</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

27

| towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| provid  | provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>88</sup> .   |   |  |  |
| Relat   | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |  |
| 6   | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site borders the settlement envelope and is well related to Maulden.   |  |
| 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 | The site is placed such that development of it would bridge the gap between distinctly separate settlement envelopes of Maulden in this location. Development of this site would cause coalescence between what are currently two distinct parts of Maulden. |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |  |

|        | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT  |   |  |  |  |
|--------|--|---|--|--|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>89</sup> . |   |  |  |  |
| Critic | Critical Infrastructure  |   |  |  |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>90</sup> ?                       | G | Forms identifies that site need highway improvements but access is off main road |  |  |
| 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? G Agricultural use Would the existing use limit the development potential? 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G Sole owner intent on developing who has expressed an intention to develop the site? the site 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G No known legal or ownership delay or prevent development? issues. If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? 12 Does the site already have planning permission for G None. the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation. Does the site continue to next stage? Yes

This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

<sup>89</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.

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

| Green | Greenbelt  |     |                           |  |  |
|-------|--|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt |  |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.91  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |     | Yes                       |  |  |

### STAGE 2: SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

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

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

| Comr   | nunity  |      |                                    |
|--------|---|------|------------------------------------|
| 17     | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No   | Designated but no draft plan       |
|        | designated areas)   |      | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·    |
|        | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |      |                                    |
|        | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |      |                                    |
| 18     | Community Consultation  | Yes  | No details given.                  |
| . •    | Has any community consultation taken place?   | . 00 | The detaile give in                |
|        | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |      |                                    |
|        | consultation took and any overall community   |      |                                    |
|        | response.   |      |                                    |
| 19     | Sustainability of Settlement  | No   | No impact on sustainability.       |
| 13     | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   | NO   | No impact on sustainability.       |
|        | the settlement through the loss of services and   |      |                                    |
|        | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |      |                                    |
|        | house etc)  |      |                                    |
| Cumi   | Ilative Impact  |      |                                    |
| 20     | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | Α    | Number of houses in 2006: 1268     |
| 20     | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   | ^    | Number of houses in 2006: 1208     |
|        | the parish?   |      | Percentage growth: 5.68%           |
|        | •   |      | Fercentage growth. 5.06 %          |
|        | • Less than 5% growth (G)   |      |                                    |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |      |                                    |
|        | More than 20% growth (R)  This is a start of the fact of the start of the star |      |                                    |
|        | 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   |      |                                    |
| 0.4    | census and completions data).   | 0    | 1                                  |
| 21     | What level of housing growth would there be if all the  | G    | Number of houses in 2016: 1340     |
|        | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to  |      | Number of outstanding completions  |
|        | be completed?   |      | in 2016: 24                        |
|        | • Less than 5% growth (G)   |      | Percentage growth: 1.79%           |
|        | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |      |                                    |
|        | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>  |      |                                    |
|        | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |      |                                    |
|        | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as   |      |                                    |
|        | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April  |      |                                    |
|        | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions  |      |                                    |
| Di :   | data).  |      |                                    |
|        | cal Constraints   |      |                                    |
| 22     | Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability?   | G    | No constraints identified.         |
|        |   |      |                                    |
|        | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |      |                                    |
| Rolati | works, topography or wind turbines.   |      |                                    |
| 23     | Would development of the site be complementary to   | R    | This would further exaggerate the  |
| 23     | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   | 1    | linear nature of Maulden and close |
|        | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |      | the gap between what are currently |
|        | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |      | two very distinct parts of Maulden |
|        | form?   |      | with separate settlement           |
|        | TOTH:   |      | envelopes.                         |
| Agric  | ultural Land Quality  |      | CHIVOIOPOS.                        |
| 24     | Would the development impact on high quality  | R    | Site is in Grade 2                 |
|        | agricultural land?  |      | 5.0 15 III 51446 Z                 |
|        | 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  |      |                                    |
|        | <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>   |      |                                    |
|        | <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 35, 4 of 3 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>  |      |                                    |
|        | JU/0 UI IIIUIE III GIAUE I, Z UI JA (K)   |      |                                    |

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.

|      | question does not mean that the site will be automatically<br>e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance   |           | d at this stage as the ratings across |
|------|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|
|      | sport and Access to Services   | · .       |                                       |
| 25   | Facilities and services  |           |                                       |
| 23   | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability   | of the si | te for housing. It links to the       |
|      | te for flouding. It lifted to the  |           |                                       |
|      | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.  |           |                                       |
|      | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  |           |                                       |
| 25a  | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?   | G         | Yes                                   |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |           | 163                                   |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      | Not in the settlement or an adjoining  |           |                                       |
|      | settlement (R)   |           |                                       |
| 25b  | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if   | A         | In adjoining settlement               |
| _0.5 | applicable)?   | ,         | in adjoining comorner                 |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)   |           |                                       |
|      | Other catchment school available (A)   |           |                                       |
| 25c  | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper  | Α         | In adjoining settlement               |
|      | school?  |           | daysg comec                           |
|      | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)   |           |                                       |
|      | Other catchment school available (A)   |           |                                       |
| 25d  | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical  | Α         | In adjoining settlement               |
|      | centre?  |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      | Not in the settlement or an adjoining  |           |                                       |
|      | settlement (R)   |           |                                       |
| 26   | What retail provision does the settlement offer?   | Α         | Convenience store                     |
|      | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)   |           |                                       |
|      | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent  |           |                                       |
|      | (A)  |           |                                       |
|      | None (R)   |           |                                       |
| 27   | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at  | G         | 247.26m                               |
|      | least hourly at peak times):   |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      |  |           |                                       |
|      | • 400m-800m (A)  |           |                                       |
|      | <ul><li>400m-800m (A)</li><li>Over 800m (R)</li></ul>  |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>  |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
|      | <ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |           |                                       |
| 28   | <ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> <li>Distance to nearest train station:</li> </ul>   | R         |                                       |
| 28   | <ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> <li>Distance to nearest train station:         <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>                         | R         |                                       |
| 28   | <ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> <li>Distance to nearest train station:         <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | R         |                                       |
| 28   | <ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> <li>Distance to nearest train station:         <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>                         | R         | Access from Clophill Road             |

| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A                       | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.  |
|-------|---|-------------------------|--|
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | G                       | Submission form says other education contribution  |
| Water | Tutilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc   | ture will               | be assessed at a later stage)  |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   | R/A/G                   | Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of |
| Drain | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | et)                     | any upgrades required.   |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G)  Consider Further Assessment (A)  Further Assessment Required (R)  onmental Health   | G                       | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required   |
| 34    | Contamination   | R/A/G                   | Awaiting comments  |
|       | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | 1070                    | 7. Walting comments  |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G                       | No immediate issues  |
|       | onmental Constraints  |                         |  |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | R/A                     | Very little scope for development to<br>the north of Clophill Road, if set<br>within strong screening integration<br>to protect views from north. Land to<br>south – important to retain open<br>views to greensand dipslope and<br>Flit Valley  |
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?   | Her:<br>G<br>Arch:<br>A | No heritage comment Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is   |

|       |   |     | undertaken                       |
|-------|---|-----|----------------------------------|
| 38    | Ecological Assets                                     | Α   | NIA, Retain and buffer existing  |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any       |     | features, opportunities for      |
|       | biological, geological or ecological assets and are   |     | enhancement.                     |
|       | there any opportunities for their enhancement?        |     |                                  |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets                      | A/G | No Loss of Open Space            |
|       | Are there any potential conflicts with open space,    |     | Within Greensand NIA, would need |
|       | leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there       |     | to deliver habitat net gain.     |
|       | capacity to provide the required levels of open space |     |                                  |
|       | and green infrastructure?                             |     |                                  |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |     |                                  |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on           | Α   | Within MSA                       |
|       | safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including       |     |                                  |
|       | mineral safeguarding sites?                           |     |                                  |
| Planr | ning History  |     |                                  |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example      |     | 15/03296 1 dwelling allowed on   |
|       | planning applications and submissions to previous     |     | appeal                           |
|       | Allocations Plans)                                    |     |                                  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?                      |     | No                               |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

This site is mostly Grade 2 agricultural land and educational capacity issues have been identified. The site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation was undertaken. The site is also within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. In landscape terms, the land to the south of Maulden road in particular provides open views to Greensand Dipslope and Flit Valley which should be retained. Ecologically there are opportunities for enhancement, and existing features should be retained and buffered.

This site is not appropriate for development. The site lies between two distinctly separate settlement envelopes. Development here would fill in a gap in the settlement pattern which is distinctive and unique to the historical pattern of Maulden, development could have an unacceptable impact on the character of the settlement. The site will not be considered further as part of this process.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING92

| Site details  | Site details   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Reference Number                                      | NLP289   |  |  |  |  |
| Site Name   | Land to the rear of Clophill Road                                      |  |  |  |  |
| Site Address  | Clophill Road, Maulden   |  |  |  |  |
| Settlement  | Maulden  |  |  |  |  |
| Size Submitted Developable Area: 7.8ha                |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Submitted Whole Site Area: 8.5ha                                       |  |  |  |  |
|   | Measured GIS Area: 7.08ha  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use  | Mixed Use- including early years provision, residential and employment |  |  |  |  |
| Any other Site is currently allocated for employment. |  |  |  |  |  |
| information   | Adjacent to parcels NLP270, ALP203 and ALP151                          |  |  |  |  |

### 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.

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  50-90 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  213 dwellings |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ntial Test)   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an AONB.   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |            | Yes   |

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

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

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

|      | towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more 93.   |   |   |  |
|------|---|---|---|--|
|      | ionship to Settlement   |   |   |  |
| 6    | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site is partially within the settlement envelope, and partially bordering it. The site is well related to Maulden.  |  |
| 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 | The site is placed such that development of it would bridge the gap between distinctly separate settlement envelopes of Maulden in this location. Development of this site would therefore cause coalescence between two distinct parts of Maulden. |  |
| Does | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes   |  |

| _      | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT  |   |   |  |  |
|--------|--|---|---|--|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>94</sup> . |   |   |  |  |
| Critic | Critical Infrastructure  |   |   |  |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery 95?                                   | G | Submission states that there are no critical infrastructure requirements required to enable delivery of the site. |  |  |
| 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   |   |  |  |  |
| intenti             | ion to develop the site.  |   |  |  |  |
| Availa              | ability   |   |  |  |  |
| 9                   | What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?   | A | Site is allocated for employment use. Relocation or demolition may be required for parts of site which accommodate employment. |  |  |
| 10                  | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   | G | Site submitted on behalf of sole land owner, intent to develop site is recorded.   |  |  |
| 11                  | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?  If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? | G | No legal or ownership problems identified.   |  |  |
| 12                  | Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red  | G | No planning permission for proposed use.   |  |  |

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 )

94 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.

95 This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure

requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

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

| Plan. |  |     |                           |  |
|-------|--|-----|---------------------------|--|
| Greei | nbelt  |     |                           |  |
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.96  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 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**

| 16 | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R | The site is mainly undeveloped |
|----|---|---|--------------------------------|
|    | with the NPPF definition?                           |   | land. Though part of the site  |

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

|          | • 76% - 100% (G)  |     | appears to be developed for   |
|----------|---|-----|---|
|          | • 26 - 75% (A)  |     | employment uses, this is likely to                                  |
|          | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)   |     | be less than 25%.   |
|          | nunity  | NI- | Mandan is designated for a  |
| 17       | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas)  | No  | Maulden is designated for a<br>Neighbourhood Plan; however          |
|          | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |     | there are not any draft allocations                                 |
|          | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |     | at this stage.  |
| 18       | Community Consultation  | No  | No consultation has taken place.                                    |
|          | Has any community consultation taken place?   |     |   |
|          | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |     |   |
|          | consultation took and any overall community   |     |   |
|          | response.   |     |   |
| 19       | Sustainability of Settlement  | Yes | Part of the site is covered by                                      |
|          | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   |     | employment allocations (EA7 and                                     |
|          | the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |     | EMP4). Part of the site is also a safeguarded employment site (E1). |
|          | house etc)  |     | saleguarded employment site (£1).                                   |
| Cumi     | lative Impact   |     |   |
| 20       | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | Α   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268                                      |
|          | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   |     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                                      |
|          | the parish?   |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%  |
|          | Less than 5% growth (G)   |     |   |
|          | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |   |
|          | More than 20% growth (R)  This is a daylated by weathing and the task are for the second and the second are for the second |     |   |
|          | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |     |   |
|          | completions over the last ten years as a percentage of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using   |     |   |
|          | census and completions data).   |     |   |
| 21       | What level of housing growth would there be if all the  | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                                      |
|          | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to  |     | Number of outstanding completions                                   |
|          | be completed?   |     | in 2016: 24   |
|          | Less than 5% growth (G)   |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%  |
|          | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |   |
|          | More than 20% growth (R)  This is colorated by weating out the total number of  |     |   |
|          | This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as   |     |   |
|          | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April  |     |   |
|          | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions  |     |   |
|          | data).  |     |   |
|          | cal Constraints   |     |   |
| 22       | Are there any physical constraints or permanent   | Α   | No major constraints identified,                                    |
|          | features that affect the site's developability?   |     | though it is noted that the   |
|          | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |     | topography appears to be uneven                                     |
| Relati   | works, topography or wind turbines.  ionship to Settlement  |     | in places.  |
| 23       | Would development of the site be complementary to   | R   | Development of this site would                                      |
|          | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   |     | further exaggerate the linear nature                                |
|          | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive   |     | of Maulden and close the gap  |
|          | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |     | between what are currently two                                      |
|          | form?   |     | very distinct parts of Maulden with                                 |
| A        |   |     | separate settlement envelopes.                                      |
| Agric 24 | ultural Land Quality  Would the development impact on high quality  | R   | Over 50% of the site is within                                      |
| 24       | Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?   | T.  | Grade 2 Agricultural Land.  |
|          | 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  |     | Orado 2 Agricultural Lariu.   |
|          | 5 30 /0 or more in non-agricultural land (G)  | l . |   |

| • | 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A) |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| • | 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R) |

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                     |   |                         |  |  |
| 25  | Facilities and services   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability of the site for housing. It links to the                   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   |   |                         |  |  |
|   |   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |   |                         |  |  |
| 25a   | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  | G | Yes                     |  |  |
|   | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  No. has been additionable and deep (A).                               |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul><li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li><li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li></ul>            |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining<br/>settlement (R)</li> </ul>  |   |                         |  |  |
| 25b   | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if  | Α | In adjoining settlement |  |  |
| 200   | applicable)?  |   | in adjoining contonion  |  |  |
|   | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>  |   |                         |  |  |
| 25c   | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper   | Α | In adjoining settlement |  |  |
|   | school?   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  Other catcher and selections (A)  |   |                         |  |  |
| 25d   | <ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> <li>Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical</li> </ul> | Α | In adjoining settlement |  |  |
| ZJu   | centre?   | ^ | in adjoining settlement |  |  |
|   | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | Not in the settlement or an adjoining   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | settlement (R)  |   |                         |  |  |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α | Convenience store       |  |  |
|   | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | (A)<br>• None (R)   |   |                         |  |  |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at   | Α | 425.97m                 |  |  |
|   | least hourly at peak times):  |   | 420.37111               |  |  |
|   | • Less than 400m (G)  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | • 400m-800m (A)   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | <ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>   |   |                         |  |  |
|   | public transport facilities could be provided as  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | part of the development (G)   |   |                         |  |  |
| 28  | Distance to nearest train station:  | R |                         |  |  |
|   | • Less than 800m (G)  |   |                         |  |  |
|   | • 800m-1200m (A)  |   |                         |  |  |

|       | <ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>  |                      |   |
|-------|---|----------------------|---|
| 29    | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | G                    | Site fronts on to Ampthill Road.  |
|       | ol Capacity   |                      | One frome office / unpulm read.   |
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | А                    | Smaller developments could be accommodated within existing schools, may be a requirement for financial contributions.   |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | А                    | No commitment made to address this.   |
| Water | Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  | ture will            | be assessed at a later stage)   |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   | R/A/G                | Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required. |
|       | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  |                      |   |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  • No assessment required (G)  • Consider Further Assessment (A)  • Further Assessment Required (R)  | G                    | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  |
|       | onmental Health   |                      |   |
| 34    | Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | G                    | None identified   |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G                    | None identified   |
|       | onmental Constraints  |                      |   |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | R                    | Unsuitable for development in landscape terms— land rises steeply from road — development would intrude in views to Maulden Church landmark.  |
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?   | Her: R<br>Arch:<br>A | Site contains above ground archaeological remains, but this may not prevent allocation provided appropriate mitigation is undertaken.  Heritage concerned about impact  |

|       |   |     | on the setting of LBs and CA         |
|-------|---|-----|--------------------------------------|
| 38    | Ecological Assets                                     | A/R | In NIA & GCN terrestrial corridor so |
|       | What would the impacts of development be on any       |     | opportunity for enhancement.         |
|       | biological, geological or ecological assets and are   |     | Buffer and extend hedgerow           |
|       | there any opportunities for their enhancement?        |     | corridors and tree lines.            |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets                      | Α   | Within NIA, very close to Maulden    |
|       | Are there any potential conflicts with open space,    |     | Meadows SSSI. No parish GI plan      |
|       | leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there       |     | for Maulden. Partial loss of Rectory |
|       | capacity to provide the required levels of open space |     | Lane & High Street Rec Gd.           |
|       | and green infrastructure?                             |     |                                      |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |     |                                      |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on           | G   | No issues                            |
|       | safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including       |     |                                      |
|       | mineral safeguarding sites?                           |     |                                      |
| Planr | ning History  |     |                                      |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example      |     | None                                 |
|       | planning applications and submissions to previous     |     |                                      |
|       | Allocations Plans)                                    |     |                                      |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?                      |     | Yes                                  |

#### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is Grade 2 Agricultural Land. Concerns about educational capacity have been raised in this area. The site also contains above ground archaeological remains, but this may not prevent allocation providing that appropriate mitigation takes place.

The site is located in a gap between two distinctly separate parts of Maulden, development of this site would change the historic and unique settlement pattern of Maulden dramatically. Further to this, the land rises steeply from the road and the landscape is important in terms of the setting of Maulden Church landmark; and therefore development here would significantly negatively effect the landscape. There have also been concerns about the site raised by the heritage team, particularly in relation to the impact on the setting of Listed Buildings and the wider Conservation Area. The site is within both the Nature Improvement Area and the GCN terrestrial corridor so there is an opportunity for enhancement but existing hedgerows and tree lines would need to be buffered and extended. Development of this site would also see a partial loss of Rectory Lane and High Street Recreation Ground. In addition to this the portion of the site which connects to the road is designated as an employment site.

This site is not appropriate for development; it forms an important gap between what are currently two distinct parts of Maulden. Maulden has a distinctive and historical settlement pattern which consists of a number of separate parts with important landscape gaps defining distinct parts and maintaining a rural character. Development of this site would close one of these important gaps and thus change the distinctive character of Maulden, instead making it a linear settlement. These negative impacts would be further exaggerated by the heritage impact. The site will not be considered further as part of this process.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>97</sup>

| Site details     |  |
|------------------|--|
| Reference Number | NLP320   |
| Site Name        | Land West of Silsoe Road   |
| Site Address     | Land West of Silsoe Road, Maulden                                      |
| Settlement       | Maulden  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 0.45 ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.45 ha |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 0.44 ha   |
| Proposed Use     | Residential  |
| Any other        |  |
| information      |  |

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

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

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  10 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  11 dwellings |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an 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

 $^{97}$  Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

| provi                                 | provide 1,500 homes or more 98.   |   |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Relat                                 | tionship to Settlement  |   |  |  |
| 6                                     | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | R | The site lies outside the settlement envelope and separated from the main village of Maulden. The site is poorly related to the existing settlement. |  |
| 7                                     | Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would be able to provide appropriate buffers or green wedges to mitigate this, or Red if it would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site. | G | No coalescence.  |  |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   |   | No   |  |



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

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING99

| Site details     |   |  |  |
|------------------|---|--|--|
| Reference Number | Pr NLP342   |  |  |
| Site Name        | Land between Silsoe Road and Clophill Road                    |  |  |
| Site Address     | Land between Silsoe Road and Clophill Road                    |  |  |
| Settlement       | Maulden   |  |  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: Option A 1.74 ha Option B 2.87 ha |  |  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.15ha                             |  |  |
|                  | Measured GIS Area:3.05 ha                                     |  |  |
| Proposed Use     | Elderly persons care facility                                 |  |  |
| Any other        | Includes ALP415   |  |  |
| 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.

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |  |
|-------|--|------------|--|
|       | stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | II or conf | lict with national policy designations.  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |            |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  82 residential units  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  Option B = 52 units Option A = 42 units |
| Floor | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)   |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.   |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S  | Stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an AONB.  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?   |            | Yes  |

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>99</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>100</sup> .  |   |  |  |
| Relati | onship to Settlement  |   |  |  |
| 6      | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | A | The site lies in close proximity to the settlement envelope boundary, though it is separated by a field. Site does not have a very strong relationship with the centre of Maulden. Development of this site would constitute poorly-related back-land development. |  |
| 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 |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |  |

| STAG                                  | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT   |     |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----|---|--|
| This s                                | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>101</sup> . |     |   |  |
| Critical Infrastructure               |   |     |   |  |
| 8                                     | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>102</sup> ?                       | G   | Need further negotiations with other land owners but there are options available. |  |
| Does the site continue to next stage? |   | Yes |   |  |

#### **STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site. **Availability** What is the existing use of the site? Agricultural field G Would the existing use limit the development 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G Part owners all intent on who has expressed an intention to develop the site? developing the site 11 Potential issues for access Are there any legal or ownership problems that could Α delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? 12 Does the site already have planning permission for Α Roadside portion of site approved the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red for 4 dwellings.

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

Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>101</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.

This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

### STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT

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

| гіан. | Plan.  |     |                           |  |
|-------|--|-----|---------------------------|--|
| Greei | nbelt  |     |                           |  |
| 13    | Is the site located within the Green Belt?   | No  | Not within the Green Belt |  |
| 14    | If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 15a   | 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?  • Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)  • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA  • Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)  Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.* | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 15b   | Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. 103  | N/A | Not applicable            |  |
| 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**

16 Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance R with the NPPF definition?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>103</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

|       |  | 1  | T   |
|-------|--|----|---|
|       | • 76% - 100% (G)                                       |    |   |
|       | • 26 - 75% (A)   |    |   |
|       | <ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>          |    |   |
|       | nunity   |    |   |
| 17    | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in             | No | Designated but no draft plan  |
|       | designated areas)                                      |    |   |
|       | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an   |    |   |
|       | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?                           |    |   |
| 18    | Community Consultation                                 | No |   |
|       | Has any community consultation taken place?            |    |   |
|       | If yes, provide brief details on the form this         |    |   |
|       | consultation took and any overall community            |    |   |
|       | response.  |    |   |
| 19    | Sustainability of Settlement                           | No | No impact on sustainability.  |
|       | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of    |    |   |
|       | the settlement through the loss of services and        |    |   |
|       | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public    |    |   |
|       | house etc)   |    |   |
| Cumu  | ılative Impact   |    |   |
| 20    | Considering housing completions over the past 10       | Α  | Number of houses in 2006: 1268                                      |
|       | years, what has been the level of housing growth in    |    | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                                      |
|       | the parish?  |    | Percentage growth: 5.68%  |
|       | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>            |    |   |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)                                 |    |   |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)                               |    |   |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of  |    |   |
|       | completions over the last ten years as a percentage    |    |   |
|       | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using    |    |   |
|       | census and completions data).                          |    |   |
| 21    | What level of housing growth would there be if all the | G  | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                                      |
|       | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to     |    | Number of outstanding completions                                   |
|       | be completed?  |    | in 2016: 24   |
|       | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>            |    | Percentage growth: 1.79%  |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)                                 |    |   |
|       | <ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>           |    |   |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of  |    |   |
|       | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as        |    |   |
|       | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April   |    |   |
|       | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions       |    |   |
|       | data).   |    |   |
| Physi | cal Constraints  |    |   |
| 22    | Are there any physical constraints or permanent        | G  | No constraints identified.  |
|       | features that affect the site's developability?        |    |   |
|       | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment        |    |   |
|       | works, topography or wind turbines.                    |    |   |
|       | onship to Settlement                                   |    |   |
| 23    | Would development of the site be complementary to      | R  | Development of this site would                                      |
|       | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an  |    | constitute poorly-related back-land                                 |
|       | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive  |    | development. It could also visually                                 |
|       | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural   |    | close the gap between what are                                      |
| 1     | form?  |    | currently two very distinct parts of                                |
| 1     | 1  | 1  | Mouldon with congrete cottlement                                    |
|       |  |    | Maulden with separate settlement                                    |
|       |  |    | envelopes, setting the precedence                                   |
|       |  |    | envelopes, setting the precedence for coalescence between these two |
|       | ultural Land Quality                                   |    | envelopes, setting the precedence                                   |

| 24 | Would the development impact on high quality                 | R | Site is in Grade 2 |
|----|--|---|--------------------|
|    | agricultural land?   |   |                    |
|    | <ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul> |   |                    |
|    | <ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>      |   |                    |
|    | <ul> <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.

| Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance. |   |            |                                   |  |
|---|---|------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Trans   | sport and Access to Services  |            |                                   |  |
| 25  | Facilities and services   |            |                                   |  |
|   | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability  | of the s   | site for housing. It links to the |  |
|   | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   |            |                                   |  |
|   | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |            |                                   |  |
| 25a   | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  | G          | Yes                               |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | Not in the settlement or an adjoining   | <b>N</b> 4 |                                   |  |
| 0Fh   | settlement (R)  |            | La caliciais a cattle se cat      |  |
| 25b   | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?   | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |  |
|   | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | Other catchment school available (A)  |            |                                   |  |
| 25c   | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper   | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |  |
|   | school?   |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | Other catchment school available (A)  |            |                                   |  |
| 25d   | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical   | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |  |
|   | <ul><li>centre?</li><li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li></ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | Not in the settlement or an adjoining   |            |                                   |  |
|   | settlement (R)  |            |                                   |  |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α          | Convenience store                 |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |  |
|   | (A)   |            |                                   |  |
| 07  | None (R)  Distance to be a second to the formula of the second to t |            | 000 04                            |  |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at   | G          | 380.61m                           |  |
|   | least hourly at peak times):  • Less than 400m (G)  |            |                                   |  |
|   | • 400m-800m (A)   |            |                                   |  |
|   | • Over 800m (R)   |            |                                   |  |
|   | OR submission form stated that improved   |            |                                   |  |
|   | public transport facilities could be provided as  |            |                                   |  |
|   | part of the development (G)   |            |                                   |  |

| 00     | Distance to accept the first of                        | <u> </u>  |                                       |
|--------|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| 28     | Distance to nearest train station:                     | R         |                                       |
|        | <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>                 |           |                                       |
|        | • 800m-1200m (A)                                       |           |                                       |
|        | <ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>                     |           |                                       |
| 29     | Is the site accessible from the existing road network? | G         | Access from Silsoe Road               |
| School | ol Capacity  |           |                                       |
| 30     | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?       | Α         | Small amount of capacity existing     |
|        |  |           | at Maulden lower, which is            |
|        |  |           | expected to be taken up by            |
|        |  |           | development already planned in        |
|        |  |           | the area, so a new site/ additional   |
|        |  |           | land may be required. Middle and      |
|        |  |           | upper schools have already been       |
|        |  |           | expanded.                             |
| 31     | If not, has a commitment been made to address          | Α         | Nothing on submission form            |
|        | this?  |           |                                       |
|        | Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc   | ture will |                                       |
| 32     | Is there the capacity to provide all required          | R/A/G     | Water utilities companies have a      |
|        | infrastructure for waste water and potable water?      |           | statutory duty to supply water and    |
|        |  |           | waste water infrastructure to new     |
|        |  |           | development sites and a lack of       |
|        |  |           | available capacity does not prevent   |
|        |  |           | future development. Any               |
|        |  |           | infrastructure upgrades required      |
|        |  |           | will depend on the quantum and        |
|        |  |           | location of growth falling within     |
|        |  |           | each catchment area. Whilst the       |
|        |  |           | Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April      |
|        |  |           | 2017) identifies the current capacity |
|        |  |           | of existing water infrastructure, a   |
|        |  |           | Stage 2 study will be prepared to     |
|        |  |           | test the cumulative effect of sites   |
|        |  |           | that have been shortlisted for        |
|        |  |           | allocation in the Local Plan and      |
|        |  |           | identify the nature and timing of     |
|        |  |           | any upgrades required.                |
|        | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te   |           |                                       |
| 33     | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to   | G         | Site is at limited risk of surface    |
|        | site allocations, in regards to flood risk?            |           | water flooding, assessment is         |
|        | No assessment required (G)                             |           | unlikely to be required               |
|        | Consider Further Assessment (A)                        |           |                                       |
|        | Further Assessment Required (R)                        |           |                                       |
|        | onmental Health  | D/4 /2    | Α                                     |
| 34     | Contamination  | R/A/G     | Awaiting comments                     |
|        | Are there any contamination constraints on site and    |           |                                       |
|        | will there be any remediation required?                |           |                                       |
| 35     | Adjoining uses   | G         | No immediate issues                   |
|        | Would any adjoining uses have the potential to         |           |                                       |
|        | cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;    |           |                                       |
|        | noise and smell)                                       |           |                                       |
|        | onmental Constraints                                   | _         |                                       |
| 36     | Landscape character                                    | Α         | Very limited scope for development    |
|        | What would the impacts of development be on the        |           | in landscape terms - land rises       |
|        | landscape character or setting of the area or any      |           | steeply – development would           |
|        | designated landscapes? Would there be any direct       |           | intrude in views from elevated land   |
|        | or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural    |           | to north and east.                    |
|        |  |           |                                       |

|       | Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?  |                         |  |
|-------|---|-------------------------|--|
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?   | Her:<br>G<br>Arch:<br>A | No Heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is  |
| 38    | Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | R/G                     | undertaken p/p 16/527, western part, prefer option B which allows net gain. R if option B which disturbs woodland.   |
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A                       | No Loss of Open Space Within Greensand NIA, would need to deliver habitat net gain and retain / enhance existing habitats, buffering and extending the woodland to the eastern edge. |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |                         |  |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | A                       | Within MSA   |
| Planr | ning History  |                         |  |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |                         | None   |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |                         | No   |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is within Grade 2 Agricultural Land. Concerns about educational capacity have also been raised for this area. The landscape of the site rises steeply and development would intrude on views from the elevated land to the north and east. The site also has multi-period archaeological potential, but this would not prevent allocation providing it was mitigated. Depending on the final design, development may have a negative ecological effect on the woodland. The site is also within a Minerals and Waste safeguarding area.

This site is not appropriate for development because it lies in an important gap between what are currently two distinct parts of Maulden. Maulden has a distinctive and historical settlement pattern which consists of a number of separate parts with important landscape gaps defining distinct parts and maintaining a rural character. Development of this site would adjoin what are currently two distinctive separate parts of Maulden, instead making it a linear settlement. Though the site lies a small distance south of the parts of the settlement at danger of coalescence, development here could set a precedent. Development of only the eastern portion would not be well related to the existing settlement and would have a negative ecological impact. There is already planning permission for development of the western portion so there is no need to re-consider this portion under the Call for Sites process. Therefore this site will not be considered any further at this stage.

## Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>104</sup>

| Site details          |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Reference Number      | NLP367   |
| Site Name             | Land off Abbey Lane  |
| Site Address          | Abbey Lane, Maulden  |
| Settlement            | Maulden  |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area:3.6 ha  |
|                       | Submitted Whole Site Area:3.6 ha   |
|                       | Measured GIS Area: 3.6ha   |
| Proposed Use          | Tennis Facility  |
| Any other information | This site has not been assessed because it has not been proposed for housing, rather it has been proposed for a replacement leisure facility in combination with another submission which proposes that an existing leisure facility be redeveloped for housing. The site has not been submitted by the landowner. |



Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>105</sup>

| Site details          | Site details  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Reference Number      | NLP377  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Name             | Land South of Clophill Road   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Address          | Land South of Clophill Road, Hall End                                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Settlement            | Maulden   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Size                  | Submitted Developable Area:1.99 ha<br>Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.44ha |  |  |  |  |  |
|                       | Measured GIS Area:1.39 ha   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Use          | Residential   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any other information |   |  |  |  |  |  |

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

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

|       | STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |  |  |
|-------|---|------------|---|--|--|
|       | tage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma   | ll or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity  | T          |   |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?  Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land.  Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60%  Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  10 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  33 dwellings |  |  |
| Flood | I Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the  | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?  | No         | About 40% is in Flood Zone 2 and 3.   |  |  |
| 3     | Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?   | No         | Not at risk from surface water flooding.  |  |  |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | stage 2 b  | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.  | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?   | No         | Not located within an 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>105</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 106. |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| Relat  | ionship to Settlement   |   |   |
| 6  | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site adjoins the settlement envelope boundary. It is partly within the settlement envelope boundary and well related to Clophill. |
| 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.   |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes   |

| STAG   | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT   |   |                                 |  |  |
|--------|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs 107. |   |                                 |  |  |
| Critic | cal Infrastructure  |   |                                 |  |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure   | G | None but is near to A507/A6 and |  |  |
|        | requirements that will enable delivery <sup>108</sup> ?   |   | access of a main road           |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes                             |  |  |

|        | STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT This starts of the assessment rules out sites that are not qualished. A site is considered qualished for  |   |  |  |  |
|--------|---|---|--|--|--|
|        | 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 |   |  |  |  |
| intent | tion to develop the site.   |   |  |  |  |
| Avail  | ability   |   |  |  |  |
| 9      | What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?  A Demolition of existing commercial premises would be required.  |   |  |  |  |
| 10     | Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?   | G | Sole owner intent on developing the site |  |  |
| 11     | Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?  If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?   | G | No known legal or ownership issues.      |  |  |
| 12     | Does the site already have planning permission for<br>the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red<br>because it's not eligible for allocation.  | G | None.                                    |  |  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes                                      |  |  |

### **STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT**

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 )

107 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.

108 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.

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

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

| 110 | 1 Teviously Beveloped Edita                         |   |         |  |  |  |
|-----|---|---|---------|--|--|--|
| 16  | Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance | R | 20% PDL |  |  |  |
|     | with the NPPF definition?                           |   |         |  |  |  |
|     | • 76% - 100% (G)                                    |   |         |  |  |  |
|     | • 26 - 75% (A)                                      |   |         |  |  |  |
|     | • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)                         |   |         |  |  |  |
|     |   |   |         |  |  |  |

### Community

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>109</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| 17    | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in designated areas)                      | No  | Designated but no draft plan         |
|-------|---|-----|--------------------------------------|
|       | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan? |     |                                      |
| 18    | Community Consultation  | No  |                                      |
| .0    | Has any community consultation taken place?                                       | 110 |                                      |
|       |   |     |                                      |
|       | If yes, provide brief details on the form this                                    |     |                                      |
|       | consultation took and any overall community                                       |     |                                      |
|       | response.   |     |                                      |
| 19    | Sustainability of Settlement  | No  | No impact on sustainability.         |
|       | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of                               |     |                                      |
|       | the settlement through the loss of services and                                   |     |                                      |
|       | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public                               |     |                                      |
|       | house etc)  |     |                                      |
| Cumi  | ,   |     |                                      |
|       | llative Impact  | Λ . | Number of houses in 2000, 4000       |
| 20    | Considering housing completions over the past 10                                  | Α   | Number of houses in 2006: 1268       |
|       | years, what has been the level of housing growth in                               |     | Number of houses in 2016: 1340       |
|       | the parish?   |     | Percentage growth: 5.68%             |
|       | <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>                                       |     |                                      |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     |                                      |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)  |     |                                      |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of                             |     | · ·                                  |
|       | , o   |     |                                      |
|       | completions over the last ten years as a percentage                               |     |                                      |
|       | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using                               |     |                                      |
|       | census and completions data).   |     |                                      |
| 21    | What level of housing growth would there be if all the                            | G   | Number of houses in 2016: 1340       |
|       | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to                                |     | Number of outstanding completions    |
|       | be completed?   |     | in 2016: 24                          |
|       | Less than 5% growth (G)   |     | Percentage growth: 1.79%             |
|       | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |     | Teresmage greman in eye              |
|       |   |     |                                      |
|       | More than 20% growth (R)  |     |                                      |
|       | This is calculated by working out the total number of                             |     |                                      |
|       | outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as                                   |     |                                      |
|       | percentage of the total number of dwellings in April                              |     |                                      |
|       | 2016 (as calculated using census and completions                                  |     |                                      |
|       | data).  |     |                                      |
| Physi | cal Constraints   |     |                                      |
| 22    | Are there any physical constraints or permanent                                   | R   | Approximately 40% of the site is in  |
|       | features that affect the site's developability?                                   | 1 \ | Flood Zone 2/3, and this would       |
|       |   |     |                                      |
|       | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment                                   |     | severely restrict development        |
| · ·   | works, topography or wind turbines.   |     | potential. In addition, two sides of |
|       |   |     | the site are bordered by major       |
|       |   |     | roads intersecting at a roundabout   |
|       |   |     | and there are a number of mature     |
|       |   |     | trees on site.                       |
| Relat | ionship to Settlement   |     |                                      |
| 23    | Would development of the site be complementary to                                 | R   | This would further exaggerate the    |
|       | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an                             |     | linear nature of Maulden and         |
|       |   |     |                                      |
|       | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive                             |     | increase the proportion of Maulden   |
|       | characteristics of the settlement's built or natural                              |     | that sprawls from Clophill.          |
|       | form?   |     |                                      |
|       |   |     |                                      |
| Agric | ultural Land Quality  |     |                                      |
| 24    | Would the development impact on high quality                                      | G   | Site in non agricultural land        |
|       | agricultural land?  |     | ]                                    |
| •     |   |     | 1                                    |
|       | 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)  |     |                                      |

| • | 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A) |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| • | 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R) |  |

## STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using comments from technical specialists. A red rating for

|     | 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                     |            |                                 |  |  |
| 25  | Facilities and services   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability  | of the sit | te for housing. It links to the |  |  |
|     | Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     |   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately   |            |                                 |  |  |
| 25a | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?  | G          | Yes                             |  |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)  No. has been additionable as the search does (A).                     |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul><li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li><li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li></ul>            |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining<br/>settlement (R)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |  |
| 25b | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if  | Α          | In adjoining settlement         |  |  |
| 200 | applicable)?  |            | in adjoining contonion          |  |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |  |
| 25c | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper   | Α          | In adjoining settlement         |  |  |
|     | school?   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)  Other catcher and selections (A)  |            |                                 |  |  |
| 25d | <ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> <li>Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical</li> </ul> | Α          | In adjoining settlement         |  |  |
| ZJu | centre?   | ^          | in adjoining settlement         |  |  |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | Not in the settlement or an adjoining   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | settlement (R)  |            |                                 |  |  |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?  | Α          | Convenience store               |  |  |
|     | Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | (A)<br>• None (R)   |            |                                 |  |  |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at   | G          | 198.95m                         |  |  |
|     | least hourly at peak times):  |            | 100.00111                       |  |  |
|     | • Less than 400m (G)  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | • 400m-800m (A)   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | • Over 800m (R)   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | <ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>   |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | public transport facilities could be provided as  |            |                                 |  |  |
| 00  | part of the development (G)   | <u> </u>   |                                 |  |  |
| 28  | Distance to nearest train station:  | R          |                                 |  |  |
|     | • Less than 800m (G)  |            |                                 |  |  |
|     | • 800m-1200m (A)  |            |                                 |  |  |

|       | <ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>  |           |   |
|-------|---|-----------|---|
| 29    | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?  | A         | Yes once the commercial building is demolished. Can be accessed from Clophill Road  |
|       | ol Capacity   |           |   |
| 30    | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?  | A         | Small amount of capacity existing at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.   |
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address this?   | A         | Nothing on submission form  |
|       | r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc  | ture will |   |
| 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. |
| Drain | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | st)       |   |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R) onmental Health  | Ŕ         | Level 2 assessment required   |
| 34    | Contamination   | R/A/G     | Awaiting comments   |
| 34    | Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G     | Awaiting comments   |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | А         | Noise from Road Traffic   |
|       | onmental Constraints  | I A       | Manufication and a second second  |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | A         | Very limited scope for development<br>-site contains a range of mature<br>trees forming a gateway feature<br>characteristic of Flit Valley  |

| 37   | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?  Ecological Assets                            | Her:<br>G<br>Arch:<br>A | No heritage comment. Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken NIA, existing mature trees, possible  |
|------|---|-------------------------|--|
|      | What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  |                         | SPI on site, low density 10 units<br>OK  |
| 39   | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/R                     | No Loss of Open Space Well established wooded area with flood area identified. Any development would need to demonstrate net flood risk improvement, and retain and enhance existing habitats, as part of the Greensand NIA. Site appears to have informal access – if so, development would need to enhance public access / footpath connectivity |
|      | rals and Waste  |                         |  |
| 40   | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G                       | No Issue   |
|      | ning History  |                         |  |
| 41   | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |                         | None   |
| Does | the site continue to next stage?  |                         | No   |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is not appropriate for development. The capacity of the site would be severely restricted by it being 40% within Flood Zones 2/3 and in addition further constraints would be presented by the two major roads which run alongside two of the site's borders and that intersect at a large roundabout adjacent to the site.

Development would also alter the historical and unique settlement pattern here, reducing the separation between this part of Maulden and Clophill. There are also a number of mature trees on the site and potentially a Species of Principle Importance.

Due to the size of the site and the constraints presented, it is considered unlikely that it would be suitable for a development or 10 or more dwellings that is in-keeping with the density and character of the adjoining settlements of Maulden and Clophill and has a positive impact in terms of ecology and green infrastructure. Therefore this site will not be considered further as part of the process.

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>110</sup>

| Site details     |  |
|------------------|--|
| Reference Number | NLP390   |
| Site Name        | Land East of Ampthill  |
| Site Address     | Land East of Ampthill  |
| Settlement       | Maulden parish (adjoins Ampthill)  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 17.02ha  |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 33.73ha   |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 33.70ha   |
| Proposed Use     | Residential Development  |
| Any other        | ALP053 and NLP390 are very similar submissions but with slightly different |
| information      | boundaries and different land owner/ promoter details.                     |

### 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.

|       | SE 1A ASSESSMENT  |           |   |  |  |
|-------|---|-----------|---|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.  |           |   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity  | T         |   |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings?  Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land.  Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  2 hectares or above 60%  Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No        | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 600-650 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 306 dwellings |  |  |
| Flood | I Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the  | ne Seque  | ntial Test)   |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?  | No        | Not located 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.  |  |  |
| Natio | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | stage 2 b | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.  | No        | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?   | No        | Not located within an 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>110</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

|       | de 1,500 homes or more <sup>111</sup> .   |   |  |
|-------|---|---|--|
| Relat | tionship to Settlement  |   |  |
| 6     | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site lies adjacent to the existing settlement of Ampthill and there are not any barriers between the site and Ampthill.  |
| 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. | R | The site lies between Ampthill and Maulden in an important gap which is designated Green Belt.  Development of this site would cause coalescence between Maulden and Ampthill across the Green Belt and therefore would not be acceptable. |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |   | No   |



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

### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>112</sup>

| Site details     |  |
|------------------|--|
| Reference Number | NLP416   |
| Site Name        | Land at Duck End Farm                          |
| Site Address     | Land at Duck End Farm, Flitwick Road, Maulden, |
| Settlement       | Maulden  |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 2.648ha            |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 2.648ha             |
|                  | Measured GIS Area:2.647 ha                     |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                                    |
| Any other        |  |
| information      |  |

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

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

|       | GE 1A ASSESSMENT   |           |   |  |  |
|-------|--|-----------|---|--|--|
|       | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.   |           |   |  |  |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   |           |   |  |  |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No        | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  48 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  48 dwellings |  |  |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque  | ential Test)  |  |  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No        | Not located 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.  |  |  |
| Natio | onally significant designations (All sites which reach S   | Stage 2 b | e subject to detailed assessment)   |  |  |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No        | No nationally significant designations.   |  |  |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No        | Not located within an AONB.   |  |  |
| Does  | Does the site continue to next stage?  |           |   |  |  |

### **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>112</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 113. |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| Relati   | ionship to Settlement   |   |  |
| 6  | For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-<br>contained, is the site a logical extension to the<br>settlement or are there any major physical<br>constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)<br>that separate it from the main settlement?   | G | The site lies on the boundary of the settlement envelope. It is well related to the existing settlement of Maulden and has some road frontage. |
| 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.  |
| Does   | the site continue to next stage?  |   | Yes  |

|        | STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT   |   |   |  |  |
|--------|---|---|---|--|--|
| This s | This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>114</sup> . |   |   |  |  |
| Critic | Critical Infrastructure   |   |   |  |  |
| 8      | Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>115</sup> ?                       | G | No known critical infrastructure requirements which will affect the delivery of the site. |  |  |
| 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? G Agricultural use Would the existing use limit the development potential? 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G Sole owner intent on developing who has expressed an intention to develop the site? the site 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G No known legal or ownership delay or prevent development? issues. If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? 12 Does the site already have planning permission for G None. the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation. Does the site continue to next stage? Yes

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

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.

led garden villages towns and cities.pdf )

114 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.

### **STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT**

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

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

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>116</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

| Comn        | nunity  |          |   |
|-------------|---|----------|---|
| 17          | Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in  | No       | Designated but no draft plan                        |
| • •         | designated areas)   |          | 2 colgrated but no drait plan                       |
|             | Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an  |          |   |
|             | emerging Neighbourhood Plan?  |          |   |
| 18          | Community Consultation  | Yes      | The proposals were presented to                     |
| .           | Has any community consultation taken place?   | 1.00     | Maulden Parish Council at a public                  |
|             | If yes, provide brief details on the form this  |          | meeting in November 2015                            |
|             | consultation took and any overall community   |          | moding in November 2010                             |
|             | response.   |          |   |
| 19          | Sustainability of Settlement  | No       | No impact on sustainability.                        |
|             | Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of   | 110      | Tto impact on odetainability.                       |
|             | the settlement through the loss of services and   |          |   |
|             | facilities (for example, employment, retail, public   |          |   |
|             | house etc)  |          |   |
| Cumu        | Ilative Impact  |          |   |
| 20          | Considering housing completions over the past 10  | Α        | Number of houses in 2006: 1268                      |
| -5          | years, what has been the level of housing growth in   |          | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                      |
|             | the parish?   |          | Percentage growth: 5.68%                            |
|             | Less than 5% growth (G)   | 1        | . s. ssinage growni o.oo/o                          |
|             | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |          |   |
|             | More than 20% growth (R)  |          | Ť   |
|             | This is calculated by working out the total number of   |          |   |
|             | completions over the last ten years as a percentage   |          |   |
|             | of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using   |          |   |
|             | census and completions data).   |          |   |
| 21          | What level of housing growth would there be if all the  | G        | Number of houses in 2016: 1340                      |
| 2           | outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to  |          | Number of outstanding completions                   |
|             | be completed?   |          | in 2016: 24   |
|             | Less than 5% growth (G)   |          | Percentage growth: 1.79%                            |
|             |   |          | Crocinage growth. 1.7370                            |
|             | • 5% to 20% growth (A)  |          |   |
|             | More than 20% growth (R)  This is a level and the way white a count the total number of                     |          |   |
|             | 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  |          |   |
| Dhyoi       | data). cal Constraints  |          |   |
| 22          |   | G        | No constraints identified.                          |
| 44          | Are there any physical constraints or permanent   | G        | ino constraints identified.                         |
|             | features that affect the site's developability?   |          |   |
|             | For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment   |          |   |
| Dolot:      | works, topography or wind turbines.   |          |   |
|             | Mould development of the cite he complementary to   | <u> </u> | No advarsa impact                                   |
| 23          | Would development of the site be complementary to   | G        | No adverse impact.                                  |
|             | the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an   |          |   |
|             | adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural  |          |   |
|             |   |          |   |
| i I         | form?   |          |   |
| A curio     | ultural Land Quality  |          |   |
|             | ultural Land Quality  | Ъ        | Months in Overland Other was at                     |
| Agric<br>24 | Would the development impact on high quality  | R        | Mostly in Grade 2. Other part of                    |
|             | Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?   | R        | Mostly in Grade 2. Other part of site is in Grade 3 |
|             | Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?  • 50% or more in non-agricultural land (G) | R        |   |
|             | Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?   | R        |   |

### 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.

|     | e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance   | ) <u>.</u> |                                   |
|-----|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
|     | sport and Access to Services   |            |                                   |
| 25  | Facilities and services Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit. | of the sit | e for housing. It links to the    |
|     | Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately  | 1          |                                   |
| 25a | Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?   | G          | Yes                               |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)  Yes, prepared as part of the development (C)   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul><li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li><li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li></ul>        |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |
|     | settlement (R)   |            |                                   |
| 25b | Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?  | A          | In adjoining settlement           |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)   |            |                                   |
| 25c | Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper school?  | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | Other catchment school available (A)   |            |                                   |
| 25d | Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical  | Α          | In adjoining settlement           |
|     | centre?  |            |                                   |
|     | Yes, in the settlement (G)   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | <ul><li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li><li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li></ul>               |            |                                   |
|     | settlement (R)   |            |                                   |
| 26  | What retail provision does the settlement offer?   | Α          | Convenience store                 |
|     | <ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>   |            |                                   |
|     | Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent  |            |                                   |
|     | (A)  |            |                                   |
| 07  | None (R)  Picture of the burn of the property continue (ct.)   | ^          | F00 20                            |
| 27  | Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):   | Α          | 598.32m                           |
|     | Less than 400m (G)   |            |                                   |
|     | • 400m-800m (A)  |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |
|     | <ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>  |            |                                   |
|     | public transport facilities could be provided as   |            |                                   |
| 20  | part of the development (G)  | D          |                                   |
| 28  | Distance to nearest train station:   | R          |                                   |
|     | <ul><li>Less than 800m (G)</li><li>800m-1200m (A)</li></ul>  |            |                                   |
|     | • Over 1200m (R)   |            |                                   |
| 29  | Is the site accessible from the existing road network?   | G          | Fronts onto Flitwick Road         |
|     | ol Capacity  |            |                                   |
| 30  | Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?   | А          | Small amount of capacity existing |

|       |   |                         | at Maulden lower, which is expected to be taken up by development already planned in the area, so a new site/ additional land may be required. Middle and upper schools have already been expanded.   |
|-------|---|-------------------------|---|
| 31    | If not, has a commitment been made to address   | Α                       | Submission form says they will  |
|       | this?   | ' '                     | make a financial contribution   |
| Wate  | Tutilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc   | ture will               | be assessed at a later stage)   |
| 32    | Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?   | R/A/G                   | Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required. |
| Drain | age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te  | est)                    | , , , 3   |
| 33    | What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?  No assessment required (G) Consider Further Assessment (A) Further Assessment Required (R)  | Ğ                       | Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required  |
|       | onmental Health   | D / 1 / 0               | A tot   |
| 34    | Contamination Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?   | R/A/G                   | Awaiting comments   |
| 35    | Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)  | G                       | No immediate issues   |
|       | onmental Constraints  |                         |   |
| 36    | Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area? | R                       | Unsuitable for development in landscape terms— land forms part of greensand dipslope extending down to Flitt Valley- highly visible position in broader landscape.  |
| 37    | Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?   | Her:<br>G<br>Arch:<br>A | No heritage comment Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken   |

| 38    | Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?  | R   | NIA, SPI present, too dense, valuable foraging area for bats and barn owls, cannot demonstrate net gain at this density.            |
|-------|---|-----|---|
| 39    | Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure? | A/G | No Loss of Open Space<br>Within Greensand NIA, would need<br>to deliver habitat net gain and<br>retain / enhance existing habitats. |
| Mine  | rals and Waste  |     |   |
| 40    | What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?   | G   | No Issue  |
| Planr | ning History  |     |   |
| 41    | What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)   |     | None  |
| Does  | the site continue to next stage?  |     | Yes   |

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is partially within Grade 2 Agricultural Land and concerns about educational capacity have been raised. The site lies within a highly visible position in the broader landscape, it forms part of the greensand dipslope extending to Flit Valley. The site has multi-period archaeological potential, but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken. The site includes a Species of Potential Importance, and provides a valuable foraging area for bats and barn owls. Considering the landscape and ecology constraints on site, it is a considered that a smaller roadside portion of the site may be more appropriate. Taking forward only a portion of the site could reduce the landscape impact and mitigate against ecological concerns. A portion of this site will be considered further to understand the potential for mitigation in terms of the raised issues.

### **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.

| Viabi | lity  |   |  |
|-------|---|---|--|
| 43    | Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?  • High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value  • Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value  • Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value | G | The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable. |
| Achie | evability   |   |  |
| 44    | Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?   |   | 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  |

| When can the scheme realistically commence delivery?  • 0 to 5 years (deliverable)  • 6 to 10 years  • 11 to 15 years  • 15 to 20 years | significant increases in residential property values in a relatively short period of time, whereby it is considered that the viability of developments within this report has been cautious. For example in 2016 Dunstable has benefited from a 17.9% housing price increase with an average annual house price increase in 2016 for housing within Central Bedfordshire of 10.74%.  This increase in property value has been a result of not only national trends in house prices and existing transport links to economically successful areas but also significant infrastructure projects within the pipeline including: East-West Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 upgrades; Oxford to Cambridge Express Way; Luton and Dunstable Guided Busway; M1 improvements; 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 of the Authority.  O to 5 years |
|---|---|
| Outside Plan Period  What is the indicative build out time of the site?  Does the site pass this stage?                                 | The Case Study Sites outlined within the Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that after the site has received detailed planning permission a single housebuilder would likely take one year to first completion and would build out the site at a rate of 50 dwellings per annum there after.   |

## 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>117</sup>

| Site details     |   |
|------------------|---|
| Reference Number | NLP445                                      |
| Site Name        | Land to the north of Ampthill Road, Maulden |
| Site Address     | Land to the north of Ampthill Road, Maulden |
| Settlement       | Maulden                                     |
| Size             | Submitted Developable Area: 9ha             |
|                  | Submitted Whole Site Area: 16.60ha          |
|                  | Measured GIS Area: 8.44ha                   |
| Proposed Use     | Residential                                 |
| Any other        | ALP326 similar submission                   |
| 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.

|       | SE 1A ASSESSMENT   |            |   |
|-------|--|------------|---|
|       | tage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma  | ll or conf | lict with national policy designations.   |
| Provi | sional Site Capacity   | T          |   |
| 1     | Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards  • Up to 0.4 hectare 100%  • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80%  • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller. | No         | Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:  123 dwellings  Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:  152 dwellings |
| Flood | Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the   | ne Seque   | ential Test)  |
| 2     | Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?   | No         | Not located 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.  |
|       | nally significant designations (All sites which reach S  |            |   |
| 4     | Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.   | No         | No nationally significant designations.   |
| 5     | Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?  | No         | Not located within an 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>117</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

| For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?  | G | The site lies adjacent to the existing settlement of Maulden and there are not any barriers between  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | the site and Maulden.  |
| 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. | R | The site lies between Ampthill and Maulden in an important gap which is designated Green Belt. Development of this site would cause coalescence between Maulden and Ampthill across the Green Belt and therefore would no be acceptable. |



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



A great place to live and work