

# **Site Assessment Forms**



# Contents

ALP025	4
ALP062	7
ALP100	17
ALP166	
ALP167	
ALP275	
ALP276	
ALP277	
ALP351	72
ALP402	
ALP403	
ALP404	
NLP133	
NLP188	
NLP241	
NLP243	
NLP252	
NLP395	
NLP423	149
NLP524	151

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

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP025
Site Name	Land between 30&48 Hanscombe End Rd
Site Address	Land between 30&48 Hanscombe End Rd
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.6 Ha
	Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.6 Ha
	Measured GIS Area: 0.6 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	E 1A ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provisional Site Capacity					
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 15 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 18		
-	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the				
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	Νο	No part of the site falls within flood zones 2 or 3. However an ordinary watercourse is present within or neighbouring the site according to the EA's detailed River network mapping layer. JFlow modelling would be required to determine fluvial flood risk to the site and whether further assessment is required.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, whereby no more than 50% of the site is at risk of surface water flooding in the 100 year event (including 30 year).		
	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,	No	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.		

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

Page4

	Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not within an AONB.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

<ul> <li>STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT</li> <li>This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>Relationship to Settlement</li> </ul>					
6	•				
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 physical or visual coalescence between settlements would be caused by development at this site.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?	·	Yes		

#### **STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>3</sup>. Critical Infrastructure

8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>4</sup> ?	A	This question was not asked in 2014 Call for sites.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

<b>STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT</b> This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site.				
Avail	Availability			
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	A	The site currently forms Grassland. It is not considered that the existing use would limit the development potential of this site.	
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	This site has been submitted on behalf of a private landowner, who has expressed an intention to	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf ) <sup>3</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified usinf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

			develop 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 legal or ownership issues that could prevent or delay development are evident.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	R	Extant planning permission for 15 units CB/15/03329/OUT.
Does the site continue to next stage?		•	No

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

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP062
Site Name	
Site Address	Land at Apsley End Road
Settlement	Shillington (Apsley End)
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 1.2 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.7 Ha Measured GIS Area: 0.7 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.				
Provisional Site Capacity					
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10	No	Number of proposed dwellings as		
	dwellings?		per proforma:		
	Work out the number of new homes from site size				
	using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 %		15		
	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>				
	<ul> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> </ul>		28		
	<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.				
	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th				
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2	No	This site does not fall within flood		
	or 3?		zones 2 or 3.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface	No	Site is at limited risk of surface		
	water flooding?		water flooding, whereby no more		
			than 50% of the site is at risk of		
			surface water flooding in the 100		
			year event (including 30 year).		
	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S		•		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally	No	The site is not covered by a		
	significant designations? These are: Sites of Special		nationally significant designation.		
	Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves,				
	Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and				
5	Gardens. Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area	No	The site is not within an AONB.		
Э		No	The site is not within an AUNB.		
Deec	of Outstanding Natural Beauty?		Yes		
Dues	the site continue to next stage?		165		

## STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT

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

Page /

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>6</sup>.

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

#### **STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT**

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>7</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>8</sup>?
 A
 This question was not asked in 2014 Call for sites.

 Boes the site continue to next stage?
 Yes.

## STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT

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

Availa	Availability				
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	A	Existing use contains stables, open storage of building materials and grazing paddock on the west half.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	This site has been submitted on behalf of a private landowner, who has expressed an intention to develop 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 legal or ownership issues that could prevent or delay development are evident.		
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	Consented certificate for lawful use for agricultural storage and a consent for 2 storage buildings.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <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>7</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

Does the site continue to next stage?

Yes

<b>STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT</b> This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan.			
Green 13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	The site is not located within the
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	Green Belt.
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A	
15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>9</sup>	N/A	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

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

#### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

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

16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	А	It is considered that the land is	
	with the NPPF definition?		occupied by a permanent structure	

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

		1	
	• 76% - 100% (G)		whereby it is considered that
	• 26 - 75% (A)		portions of this site are considered
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		to form previously developed land,
			however it is considered that large
			portions of the site would not be
•			considered previously developed.
	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	The Council has not received an
	designated areas)		application for neighbourhood
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		planning powers for any area within
40	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?	N1/A	the Parish of Shillington.
18	Community Consultation	N/A	This question was not posed in the
	Has any community consultation taken place?		2014 call for sites form.
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	It is not considered that the
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		development of this site would
	the settlement through the loss of services and		impact on the sustainability of this
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		settlement.
•	house etc)		
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 823
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	<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: 879
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	<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).		
	ical Constraints	1	
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	There are no physical constraints
	features that affect the site's developability?		or permanent features that would
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		affect the developability of this site.
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
	ionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	А	The pattern of development in
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		Shillington (Apsley End) is linear
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		and rural in character, with
		1	dwallings fasturing aposisus plats
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		dwellings featuring spacious plots
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?		and separations. Development
			• • • •

Page 10

			the rear of the buildings fronting the highway, on plan appearing out of character with this part of the settlement. In addition the site is located within the Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings and scheduled monuments, whereby the site is considered to be historically sensitive. However when considering the separation between the proposal and heritage assets and the significance of those assets it is considered that substantial harm to such designated heritage assets would unlikely occur by developing this site, subject to acceptable details. Any public benefits would be required to be weighed against any identified harm. When considering that the site is relatively concealed from wider views by existing mature landscaping and frontage buildings, it is considered that the harm caused by built development into the open countryside on this site would be limited.
	ultural Land Quality		
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	Although the site is not currently used for arable farming the site forms Grade 2 of the agricultural land classification.

#### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

This stage further assesses the site's suitability using comments from technical specialists. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance. **Transport and Access to Services** 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 G In settlement Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school? 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) 25b Does the settlement have a Middle school (if А Adjoining settlement applicable)?

Page.

		1	1
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Adjoining settlement
	school?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		1 0
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	A	Convenience store and Post Office
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
	• None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop.
21	least hourly at peak times):		Development of this scale could not
	Less than 400m (G)		provide meaningful public transport
	• 400m-800m (A)		improvements.
	Over 800m (R)     OP submission form stated that improved		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided on</li> </ul>		Meppershall
	public transport facilities could be provided as		Mopperendi
	part of the development (G)		Service 89 – Henlow Camp -
			Shillington - Hitchin
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	Over 1200m to Arlesey station.
	Less than 800m (G)		,
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
	• Over 1200m (R)		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Apsley End Road.
	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not
			have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent Lower may be able to
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	Α	None identified.
	this?		
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	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
I		·	

 ${}^{\rm Page}12$ 

Drain	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	est)	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.
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	Ġ	The site does not fall within Flood Zone 2 or 3 and the site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, whereby no more than 50% of the site is at risk of surface water flooding in the 100 year event (including 30 year).
Envir	onmental Health		
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	A	Potential nose pollution from Public House. Potential disturbance relating to Equestrian uses.
Envir	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?	A	The Council's Landscape Officer has issued the following consultation response: "Site within Conservation Area and forms immediate landscape setting to Listed building. Distinctive settlement pattern and setting must be protected. Site within Conservation Area which encompasses linear settlement pattern, very small numbers of buildings in clusters and spatial settings. Site forms key part of landscape setting to Mulberry Cottage Grade II listed. Development would seriously compromise historic landscape setting".
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?	A	Site has archaeological potential and is within the setting of a Scheduled Monument, but this would not necessarily prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken. This site lies within the historic core of the settlement of Aspley End.

Page13

			The site also forms part of the
			The site also forms part of the setting of Pirton Grange medieval moated site Scheduled Monument. Therefore this site has archaeological potential. Archaeological potential does not necessarily prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate mitigation strategy in line with para 141 of the NPPF was implemented; this would include the mitigation of the impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument. Any planning submission would need to be accompanied by the results of an intrusive archaeological field evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF and a consideration of the impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument using the Historic England guidance on the setting of heritage assets and in the context of paragraphs 132-134 of the NPPF. Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability.
			Conservation Officer has raised no objection to development. The site is located within the Conservation Area and setting of Grade II listed building. Development will be required to be of an acceptable density, scale, design and detailing, in this historic context. Any harm caused shall be assessed in the context of paragraphs 132-134 of the Framework.
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Opportunity for enhancement, possible SPI present.
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	A	Would need to retain and enhance hedgerows.
Miner	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No safeguarded minerals and no existing or allocated minerals and waste sites would be affected by development of this site.

 $P_{age}14$ 

Planning History			
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		Consented certificate for lawful use for storage and a consent for two storage buildings
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The proposed development would be located within the conservation area as well as the setting of scheduled monument and listed buildings, whereby the site is architecturally and historically sensitive. When considering the location of the site to the rear of frontage properties, it is considered that a low density scheme that is sensitively designed and landscaped would not cause substantial harm to heritage assets.

Concern is raised in relation to the character and pattern of the settlement whereby the pattern of the settlement is linear and the development would form a cluster of development to the rear of frontage properties. However it is considered that the site is concealed from wider views by existing mature landscaping, whereby the impact upon the character of the settlement would be limited when viewed from public viewpoints. Additional landscaping to buffer views would be secured through policy.

#### The site is of archaeological potential; however this does not provide an overriding constraint.

## **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	<ul> <li>Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?</li> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value</li> <li>Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value</li> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value</li> </ul>	G	The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable.	
Achie 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	

age 1.

		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
	0 to 5 years (deliverable)	
	<ul> <li>6 to 10 years</li> <li>11 to 15 years</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>15 to 20 years</li> </ul>	
	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.
Doest	he 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>10</sup>

Site details	Site details				
Reference Number	ALP100				
Site Name	Land adj to 141 High Road				
Site Address	Land adj to 141 High Road				
Settlement	Shillington				
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.72 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.72 Ha Measured GIS Area: 0.72 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.				
	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 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 22		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	e Seque	ential Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	The site is not located within Flood Zone 2 or 3.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, whereby no more than 50% of the site is at risk of surface water flooding in the 100 year event (including 30 year).		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	This site is not covered by nationally significant designations.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	This site is not within the AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

Page L

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

STAG	STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT				
	tage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well	related to	a existing settlements but are of an		
	cient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites wh				
	or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a sel				
	le 1,500 homes or more <sup><math>11</math></sup> .	i ooman			
	ionship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	A	The site does is not adjacent to the settlement boundary, however it is considered that the development would be adjacent to a cluster of dwellings, whereby the site does not appear isolated. Shillington Road adjacent to the site does not benefit from a public footpath, however development of the site would provide an opportunity to connect the site to the existing footpath network upon Apsley End Road, Hanscombe End Road and High 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	Development within this site would not cause physical or visual coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

#### **STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>12</sup>. **Critical Infrastructure** 

8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>13</sup> ?	A	This question was not posed by the 2014 call for sites form.
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						
	Would the existing use limit the development		land associated with a residential			

<sup>11</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-<u>led garden villages towns and cities.pdf</u>)<sup>12</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development. <sup>13</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure

requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

	potential?		<ul><li>(bungalow) and agricultural (free range poultry small holding).</li><li>It is not considered that the existing use of the site would limit the development potential of the site.</li></ul>
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	This site has been submitted on behalf of a private landowner, who has expressed an intention to develop 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 legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development are evident.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	The site does not benefit from an extant planning permission for the proposed use.
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.

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

Page 1

	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>14</sup>	
Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes

STAC			
	E 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT) E 2 ASSESSMENT		
		d de alcter	accompant A red rating for any
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed		
	ion does not mean that the site will be automatically exc		this stage as the ratings across
	2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	<u>.</u>	
	ously Developed Land		
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	It is considered that less than 25%
	with the NPPF definition?		of the land would constitute
	• 76% - 100% (G)		previously developed land.
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Comr	nunity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	The Council has not received an
	designated areas)		application for neighbourhood
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		planning powers for any area within
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		the Parish of Shillington.
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		
19	response.	No	
19	Sustainability of Settlement	INO	
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		
	the settlement through the loss of services and		
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
•	house etc)		
	ulative Impact	•	
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	Number of houses in 2006: 823
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	<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: 879
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to	_	Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	• 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).		

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

 ${\rm Page}20$ 

22       Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability?       G         For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.       Relationship to Settlement         23       Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?       A         Agricultural Land Quality         24       Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?       A         24       Would the development innon-agricultural land (G)       50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)       A	
23       Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?       A         Agricultural Land Quality         24       Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?       A         24       Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?       A	This site is unobstructed.
Agricultural 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)	
24Would 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)A	The character of the area is rural, with agricultural uses and sporadic dwellings in large spacious plots, indicating an open countryside character. The proposed development would form a cluster of homes within the open countryside. Any development within the site should be low density and scale, with a design that reflects the rural character of the area, and this edge of countryside location. The site is located within the Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings and scheduled monuments, whereby the site is considered to be historically sensitive. However when considering the separation between the proposal and heritage assets it is considered unlikely that substantial harm to such designated heritage assets would occur by developing this site. Any public benefits would be required to be weighed against the harm. High density development would likely cause greater harm to the character of the area, including the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings.
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)	Development of the site would result in the loss of Grade 3 agricultural land. The split between grade 3a and 3b is not known.

## 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.

ITan	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.

	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In 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)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	А	Adjoining settlement
_0.0	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Adjoining settlement
200	school?		
	Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	A	Convenience store and Post Office
_	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		-
	• None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop.
	least hourly at peak times):		Development of this scale could not
	Less than 400m (G)		provide meaningful public transport
	• 400m-800m (A)		improvements.
	• Over 800m (R)		
	OR submission form stated that improved		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –
	public transport facilities could be provided as		Meppershall
	part of the development (G)		
			Service 89 – Henlow Camp -
00			Shillington - Hitchin
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	Over 1200m to Arlesey train
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>200m (A)</li> </ul>		station.
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
20	Over 1200m (R)		Lligh Dood
29 Scho	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	High Road.
30	ol Capacity Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not
50	[ $[$ $[$ $[$ $[$ $[$ $[$ $[$ $[$ $[$		have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent lower may be able to
			accommodate some expansion.
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area
L	1	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	А	No commitment identified.
Water	this? r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	turo will	he 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	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>	Ġ	The site is at limited risk of flooding, further assessments unlikely to be required.
	Further Assessment Required (R)		
	onmental Health		
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	A	Noise pollution from neighbouring land uses.
	onmental Constraints	I	
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	The Council's landscaping officer has issued the following consultation response: "The site lies within the Conservation Area, and forms landscape buffer to village settlement edge / parkland setting of Pirton Grange Gentle, informal transition from built development to small scale agriculture / chicken coups in field and strong rural ambience. Site character and use reinforces landscape character at edge of settlement, landscape gateway and spatial buffer to parkland setting of Pirton Grange Grade II* listed building".

 ${}^{\rm Page}23$ 

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?	A	The Councils Archaeologist has issued the following consultation response: "Unsuitable for allocation, the site lies in close proximity to nationally protected Scheduled Monument. The site is unsuitable for allocation due to proximity to Pirton Grange medieval moated site Scheduled Monument. Development would cause substantial harm to the setting of Pirton Grange moat and therefore be contrary to para 132 of the NPPF. Please also note para 126 of the NPPF with reference to the duties of Local Planning Authorities towards the historic environment when creating Local Plans. Allocation of this site would be inappropriate". When considering the location of the development within the Conservation Area, as well as the setting of Listed Buildings and a Scheduled monument, it is judged that development within this site would cause a degree of harm to designated heritage assets. Any harm would need to be weighed against the public benefits in accordance with Paragraph 132- 134 of the NPPF.
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	G	Hedgerows and trees should be retained as part of any development at the site. Development would be required to provide a net gain for biodiversity.
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	A	Development would need to retain and enhance hedgerows / trees. No loss of LS open space. Potential cumulative impact from developments. Existing formal sport facilities are under pressure from current demand. Requirements for formal and informal open space from the developments should deliver a

 ${}_{\rm Page}24$ 

			combined site/facilities to benefit the village, not individual.	
Mine	rals and Waste			
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G		
Plan	Planning History			
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None relevant.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

## **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of a Scheduled Monument and Grade II\* Listed Building as well as being located within the open countryside, detached from defined settlement envelopes. It is considered that a development of more than 10 dwellings within the site would be inappropriate and would likely cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, which includes that intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and the setting of heritage assets. It is considered that such harm would not be outweighed by the benefits. As such it is considered that the site is not worthy of further consideration.

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

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP166
Site Name	Land to the north of New Walk, Shillington
Site Address	Land to the north of New Walk, Shillington
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 4.6 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 4.6 Ha Measured GIS Area: 4.6 Ha
Proposed Use	residential
Any other information	See ALP402 and NLP243

# STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

STAG	E 1A ASSESSMENT				
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provis	Provisional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 115 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 87		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ential Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	Site is not within Flood Zone 2 or 3.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, whereby no more than 50% of the site is at risk of surface water flooding in the 100 year event (including 30 year).		
	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	stage 2 b			
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	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not located within an AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?	•	Yes		

Page 26

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

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>16</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Shillington and there are no barriers to development. The proposed site would however, join up two separate settlement ends.		
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 does impact the existing village pattern by coalescing Hillfoot End and Shillington.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		
Does	individual context of the site.		Yes		

 STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>17</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>18</sup>?
 G
 None identified.

 Boes the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

**STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site. Availability What is the existing use of the site? 9 G The sites existing use is Would the existing use limit the development agricultural. It is not considered that potential? the existing use would limit the potential of development within the site. 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner The site is submitted by a А who has expressed an intention to develop the site? developer. Are there any legal or ownership problems that could Submission states no legal or 11 А delay or prevent development? ownership issues. If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? 12 Does the site already have planning permission for G The site does not have planning

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

STAG	STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT				
This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary					
	screening of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable of demonstrating Exceptional				
	nstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined				
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circ				
Plan.		uniotaniot			
	Greenbelt				
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	The site is not located within the		
		110	Green Belt.		
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A			
	within one of the parcels which have been identified	,			
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt				
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no				
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage				
	2.				
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A			
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which	,			
	may contribute to identification of exceptional				
	circumstances?				
	Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the				
	following key local services - convenience				
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper				
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,				
	library (use settlement audit)				
	• •				
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>				
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA				
	<ul> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement</li> </ul>				
	that has a mainline rail station or direct				
	assess (junction) to the strategic road				
	network (A road or motorway)				
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14				
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not				
	progress any further in this assessment of				
	suitability.*				
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	N/A			
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted				
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject				
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the				
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress				
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage				
	2. <sup>19</sup>				
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		
2 3 3 3 3					

# **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** 

 ${}^{\rm Page}28$ 

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

16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	It is considered that less than 25%
	with the NPPF definition?		of the site forms previously
	• 76% - 100% (G)		developed land.
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
Com	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	The Council has not received an
••	designated areas)		application for neighbourhood
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		planning powers for any area within
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		the Parish of Shillington.
18	Community Consultation	No	the ransh of orninington.
10	Has any community consultation taken place?	INU	
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
10	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)		
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 823
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	<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: 879
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to	U	Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
			r creentage Growin. 0.3478
	• 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).		
	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No physical or permanent features
	features that affect the site's developability?		that would affect the developability
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		of the site are evident.
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
	ionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	А	Although the site doesn't
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		necessarily cause complete
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		coalescence between two
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		settlements it does infill a large
	form?		paddock which separates the main
			village of Shillington from Hillfoot
			End and this would have an
			adverse impact on the settlement
	1	1	

 ${}^{\rm Page}29$ 

			pattern of Shillington.		
Agric	Agricultural Land Quality				
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site lies in Grade 3 Agricultural Land.		

STAC	GE 2 ASSESSMENT				
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme				
any q	any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across				
Stage	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).			
Trans	sport and Access to Services				
25	Facilities and services				
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the		
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.				
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately				
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>				
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)				
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>				
	settlement (R)				
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	А	Adjoining settlement		
	applicable)?				
	Yes, in the settlement (G)				
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)				
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>				
	Other catchment school available (A)				
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Adjoining settlement		
	school?				
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)				
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)				
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>				
	Other catchment school available (A)				
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	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 settlement or an adjoining				
	settlement (R)				
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	А	Convenience store and Post Office		
	<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	R	Over 800m to bus stop.		
	least hourly at peak times):		Development of this scale could not		
	Less than 400m (G)		provide meaningful public transport		
	• 400m-800m (A)		improvements.		
	• Over 800m (R)				
	OR submission form stated that improved		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –		
			l v		

 ${}_{\rm Page}30$ 

29   School 30   31	public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G) Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G) • 800m-1200m (A) • Over 1200m (R) Is the site accessible from the existing road network? I Capacity Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers? If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	R G A A	Meppershall Service 89 – Henlow Camp - Shillington - Hitchin Over 1200m to Arlesey Train Station. Yes Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern. Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and upper school places may be
29   School 30   31	Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G) • 800m-1200m (A) • Over 1200m (R) Is the site accessible from the existing road network? I Capacity Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers? If not, has a commitment been made to address	G A	Shillington - Hitchin Over 1200m to Arlesey Train Station. Yes Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern. Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and
29   School 30   31	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul> Is the site accessible from the existing road network? I Capacity Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers? If not, has a commitment been made to address	G A	Station. Yes Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern. Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and
School 30 31	Over 1200m (R) Is the site accessible from the existing road network? I Capacity Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers? If not, has a commitment been made to address	A	Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern. Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and
School 30 31	Is the site accessible from the existing road network? I Capacity Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers? If not, has a commitment been made to address	A	Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern. Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and
School 30 31	I Capacity Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers? If not, has a commitment been made to address		developments could be a concern. Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address		developments could be a concern. Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and
1	•	A	this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and
Water			upper school places may be
Water			provided within the proposed Pix Brook Free School, if the application for that is approved by
Water			the EFA.
	Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
	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.
		-	Site is at limited rick of ourface
2	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required
-	nmental Health		
	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	will there be any remediation required? <b>Adjoining uses</b> Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;	A	Pavilion forms a potential source of noise pollution.
	noise and smell) nmental Constraints		

 ${}^{\rm Page}31$ 

36 Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any	R	The Council's Landscape Officer has issued the following consultation response:
designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		This site forms part of spatial landscape buffer typical to Shillington settlement pattern of 'ends'. Setting to Conservation Area.
		'Enclosure' of landscape 'gap' by development along New Walk would result in detrimental change in village landscape character, reducing connectivity of landscape/ rural gaps physically and visually. Concern potential impact of change on character of New Walk 'quiet lane' and landscape setting to Conservation Area.
<b>37 Heritage/ Archaeology</b> What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?	A	This site lies within a landscape that is known to contain multi- period archaeological remains and is adjacent to the historic core of settlement of Shillington; therefore it has archaeological potential.
		Archaeological potential does not prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate mitigation strategy in line with para 141 of the NPPF was implemented. Any planning submission would need to be accompanied by the results of an intrusive archaeological field evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF. Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability.
<b>38 Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Development within this site should retain, buffer and enhance Important hedgerows/ trees. Valuable for SPI.
		Development would be required to provide a net gain for biodiversity.
<b>39 Open space/leisure and Gl assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	A	Parish Green Infrastructure plan aspiration for this area to create new open access sites to maintain the green centre of the village. No loss of Leisure Strategy open
-		

 ${\rm Page}32$ 

40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	Development within this site would not impact upon minerals and waste sites or safeguarded areas.
Planr	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None relevant.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

## **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site if fully developed would on plan appear to join High Road and Hillfoot Road, whereby the Landscaping Officer has objected to the development of the entire site on grounds relating to the character of the settlement. However, it is considered that subject to an appropriate scale of development, that development within the site will not be visually prominent within the landscape or the streetscene of either Hillfoot Road or High Road due to mature landscaping which would be sought to be retained and enhanced. Thereby it is considered that such harm would not be significant. It is considered that the proposal for development of this site is worthy of further assessment, including consideration of infrastructure capacity as well as access. Additional detail relating to the access to the site will be required.

## **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	<ul> <li>Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?</li> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value</li> <li>Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value</li> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value</li> </ul>	G	The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable.				
Achie	evability						
44	Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?		It is not clear whether the land owners are intent on developing the site. 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				

Page 33

		20	16 Dunstable has benefited from
		a <sup>2</sup> wi inc	17.9% housing price increase th an average annual house price crease in 2016 for housing within entral Bedfordshire of 10.74%.
		be tre tra su sig wi W up Ex Gu an is inf or Au ind de va	his increase in property value has been a result of not only national ands in house prices and existing ansport links to economically accessful areas but also gnificant infrastructure projects thin the pipeline including: East- est Rail; M1-A5 link road; A421 grades; Oxford to Cambridge press Way; Luton and Dunstable uided Busway; M1 improvements; ad potential A1 improvements. It considered that as such trastructure projects progress that operty prices within the Local uthority will likely continue to crease which has and will crease viability/deliverability of evelopment not only in the higher lue areas but also the lower lue areas of the Authority.
45	When can the scheme realistically commence		to 5 years
	delivery?		·
	<ul> <li>0 to 5 years (deliverable)</li> <li>6 to 10 years</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>6 to 10 years</li> <li>11 to 15 years</li> </ul>		
	<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?		an be provided over a four year riod.
Doost	the site pass this stage?	wi De 20 ha pe vo co sit	the Case Study Sites outlined thin the Council's Residential evelopment Viability Report (Feb 17) indicates that after the site is received detailed planning ermission a single housebuilder ould likely take one year to first impletion and would build out the e at a rate of 50 dwellings per inum 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:

 $_{\text{Page}}34$ 

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

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

Site details					
Reference Number	ALP167				
Site Name	Land to the south and east of High Road, Shillington				
Site Address	Land to the south and east of High Road, Shillington				
Settlement	Shillington				
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 2.2 Ha				
	Submitted Whole Site Area: 2.2 Ha				
	Measured GIS Area: 2.2 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						
This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.							
Provisional Site Capacity							
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 55 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 40				
	this is smaller.						
Flood Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the Sequential Test)							
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	This site is not located within Flood Zone 2 or 3.				
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No					
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)				
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	This site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.				
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	This site is not located within an AONB.				
Does	Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes				
Does the site continue to next stage?			162				

Page 36

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

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>21</sup>.

Relati	ionship to Settlement			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	This site is well related to Shillington and there are no major physical barriers evident.	
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	Development of this site would not cause coalescence between existing settlements or ends of settlements.	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

# STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>22</sup>. Critical Infrastructure 8 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure A This question was not posed in the 2014 Call for Sites form. 8 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>23</sup>? A This question was not posed in the 2014 Call for Sites form. Does the site continue to next stage? Yes

**STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** 

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

**Availability** What is the existing use of the site? 9 G The site is currently used for Would the existing use limit the development agricultural use. potential? 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G This site has been submitted on who has expressed an intention to develop the site? behalf of a developer. 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G There are no evident legal or delay or prevent development? ownership issues that would If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically prevent development. overcome? 12 Does the site already have planning permission for G No extant planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red the proposed use. because it's not eligible for allocation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages\_towns\_and\_cities.pdf</u>)
<sup>22</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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			
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circu	umstance	es to considered for allocation in the
Plan. Green	halt		
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	This site is not located within the
_			Green Belt.
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A	
	within one of the parcels which have been identified		
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no		
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage		
	2.		
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A	
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which		
	may contribute to identification of exceptional		
	circumstances?		
	<ul> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key least services</li> </ul>		
	following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper		
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,		
	library (use settlement audit)		
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>		
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA		
	Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement		
	that has a mainline rail station or direct		
	assess (junction) to the strategic road		
	network (A road or motorway)		
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14		
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not		
	progress any further in this assessment of		
15b	suitability.* Sites which have support from the local community	N/A	
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted		
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject		
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the		
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress		
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>24</sup>		
Does t	he site continue to next stage?		Yes
2063 [	the site continue to next stage:		100

# 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.

16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	The site is not considered to form		
	with the NPPF definition?		previously developed land.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

 ${}^{\rm Page}38$ 

	700/ 4000/ (0)		
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
•	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
Commun		NI-	No. No jeda konstanta di Diana in
	ighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	No Neighbourhood Plan in
	signated areas)		Shillington.
	he site identified as a housing allocation in an		
	erging Neighbourhood Plan?	NI-	
	mmunity Consultation	No	No community consultation is
	s any community consultation taken place?		evident. This question was not
	es, provide brief details on the form this		posed in the 2014 Call for Sites
	nsultation took and any overall community		form.
	ponse.	NI	
	stainability of Settlement	No	
	ould this proposal impact on the sustainability of		
	settlement through the loss of services and		
	ilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	use etc)		
	ve Impact	•	
	nsidering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 823
•	ars, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879
the	parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	• More than 20% growth (R)		
	is is calculated by working out the total number of		
	mpletions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	nsus and completions data).		
	nat level of housing growth would there be if all the	G	Number of houses in 2016: 879
	standing permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
be	completed?		2016: 3
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
<i></i>	More than 20% growth (R)		
	is is calculated by working out the total number of		
	tstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	rcentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	16 (as calculated using census and completions		
	Constraints		
	there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No issues identified on site.
	tures that affect the site's developability?		
	r example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
	rks, topography or wind turbines.		
	hip to Settlement		
	build development of the site be complementary to	G	No impact.
	existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		
	verse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		
	aracteristics of the settlement's built or natural		
for			
	ral Land Quality	•	
24 Wo	ould the development impact on high quality ricultural land?	А	The site lies in Grade 3 Agricultural
		1	Land. The most recent data from
agi			
agi	<ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>		Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b.

 $_{\rm Page}39$ 

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

OTAC			
			to share a sinitate. A westware for
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme		
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		a at this stage as the ratings across
	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance port and Access to Services	;.	
25	Facilities and services		
25	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the cit	to for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		le for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Therarchy Addit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement
200	• Yes, in the settlement (G)	Ŭ	
	<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	А	Adjoining settlement
	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Adjoining settlement
200	school?		, ajoining cothornorn
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		, 3
	• 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)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	А	Convenience store and Post Office
	<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	R	Over 800m to bus stop.
	least hourly at peak times):		Development of this scale could not
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>		provide meaningful public transport
	• 400m-800m (A)		improvements.
	• Over 800m (R)		Convice 70 Luter Obility star
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –
	public transport facilities could be provided as		Meppershall.
	part of the development (G)		Service 89 – Henlow Camp -
			Shillington – Hitchin.
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	5.7km to Arlesey Station.
20	טוסומווטה וט ווהמובסו וומווז סומווטוז.		J. MIT IN ATTESEY STATION.

 $_{\rm Page}40$ 

			I
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	High Road.
	ol Capacity	-	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	А	Shillington Lower School does not
•••		/ ``	have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent lower may be able to
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	A	None Identified.
	this?		
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	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
	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
54	Are there any contamination constraints on site and	1770	
25	will there be any remediation required?	C	Limited pollution from reside bourses
35	Adjoining uses	G	Limited pollution from neighbouring
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		uses.
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
	noise and smell)		
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Development of site not
	What would the impacts of development be on the		acceptable; exposed, rural edge
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		site beyond settlement envelope /
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		Conservation Area. Potential wide
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		ranging views to south. Forms part
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		of landscape setting to



			Conservation Area, rural 'gaps' within settlement / intervening
			typical to village settlement pattern and defining characteristic 'end's.
			Site on gently rising ground – key
			concern is exposure of development on wider rural south /
			wide ranging views, especially in
			deciduous landscape setting and during winter months.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	А	The Council's Conservation Officer
	What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?		has raised no objection to the development of this site; however
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of		the site is within the setting of listed
	these assets?		buildings and the borders the Conservation Area. Subject to
			acceptable design that would
			preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the
			conservation area, and would be
			acceptable in the context of
			paragraphs 132-135 of the NPPF, it is considered that development
			would be acceptable in this context.
			The Council's Archaeologist has
			issued the following consultation
			response:
			Site has archaeological
			potential but this would not prevent allocation providing
			appropriate mitigation is
			undertaken. This site lies adjacent to the historic core of the
			settlement of Shillington and
			another area of historic settlement at Clawders Hill Farm to the north
			east. Archaeological potential does
			not prevent allocation or development providing that
			an appropriate archaeological
			mitigation strategy in line with the
			requirements of para 141 of the NPPF is
			implemented.
			As this site has archaeological potential it is likely that an
	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$		archaeological evaluation
			to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF would be required prior to a
			planning submission.
			Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological
			works must be included in any
			proposal to prevent issues with
			viability.

38	Ecological Assets	G	Potential for enhancement, retain
	What would the impacts of development be on any		existing hedgerow & buffer.
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	А	Would need to retain hedgerows.
	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?		
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	Development of this site would not
	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including		affect a minerals and waste site,
	mineral safeguarding sites?		including mineral safeguarding
			sites.
Plan	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		None relevant.
	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?

It is considered, subject to appropriate design within this historic context and edge of settlement location, in addition to an acceptable soft landscaping scheme to mitigate the visual impact of development upon the wider landscape, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.

Any development will require archaeological investigations and would be required to provide a net gain for biodiversity.

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

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 • Outside Plan Period	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
46 Does t	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 annum there after.Yes

# SUMMARY

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

 $_{\rm Page}44$ 

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

Page'

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

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

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP275
Site Name	Land off New Walk, Shillington
Site Address	Land off New Walk, Shillington
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 4.4 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 4.4 Ha Measured GIS Area: 4.4 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.
Prov	isional 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: 80-100 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 80
	this is smaller.		
	d Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	Site not in flood zone 2 or 3.
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	
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	This site is not covered by nationally significant designations.
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	Yes/ No	This site is not located within an AONB.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

Page40

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>26</sup>.

Relationship to Settlement			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Shillington and there are no barriers.
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 does impact the existing village pattern by conjoining Hillfoot End and Shillington
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>27</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 G
 None identified.

 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

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

Availa	Availability			
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	A mix of farm land and vacant scrub land.	
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	Site has been submitted on behalf of the sole landowner, intention to develop is stated.	
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	No legal or ownership issues that would prevent or delay development of this site are evident.	
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red	G	No extant planning permission for the proposed use.	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>27</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</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>28</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

### **STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT** This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan. Greenbelt 13 Is the site located within the Green Belt? No This site is not located within the Green Belt. 14 N/A 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. 15a Does the site have all of the following merits that N/A may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances? Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit) Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway) Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.\* 15b Sites which have support from the local community N/A as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.29 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** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

4.0		<b>_</b>	
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	Less than 25% previously
	with the NPPF definition?		developed land.
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Com	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Shillington has not been
	designated areas)		designated for a Neighbourhood
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Plan and subsequently no draft
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		allocations are yet available.
18	Community Consultation	No	None evident.
	Has any community consultation taken place?		
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
10	response.	No	Detaile
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	Details
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		
	the settlement through the loss of services and		
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 823
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	<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: 879
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to	_	Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	• 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		
Dhue	data).		
	ical Constraints		No issues identified on site.
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	
	features that affect the site's developability?		
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
Delit	works, topography or wind turbines.		
	ionship to Settlement	•	
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	A	Although the site doesn't
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		necessarily cause complete
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		coalescence between two
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		settlements it does infill a large
	form?		paddock which separates the main
			village of Shillington from Hillfoot
			End.
Agric	cultural Land Quality		

 $_{\rm Page}49$ 

24	Would the development impact on high quality	А	The site lies 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.
	• 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)		

STAG	E 2 ASSESSMENT			
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents 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			
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		5 5	
	sport and Access to Services			
25	Facilities and services			
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the	
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately			
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement	
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>			
	settlement (R)			
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	А	Adjoining settlement	
	applicable)?			
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	Other catchment school available (A)			
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Adjoining settlement	
	school?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)			
	Other catchment school available (A)			
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	A	Adjoining settlement	
	centre?			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)			
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)			
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (P)</li> </ul>			
26	settlement (R) What retail provision does the settlement offer?	A	Convenience store and Post Office	
20	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)			
	<ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>			
	(A)			
	• None (R)			
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop.	
	least hourly at peak times):		Development of this scale could not	
	Less than 400m (G)		provide meaningful public transport	
	<ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> </ul>		improvements.	
	<ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>			
	public transport facilities could be provided as		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –	
	part of the development (G)		Meppershall	

 ${\rm Page} 50$ 

		I	
			Service 89 – Henlow Camp - Shillington – Hitchin.
28	Distance to nearest train station: <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> </ul>	R	Over 1200m Arlesey Train Station
	<ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	New Walk.
	ool Capacity	-	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not have existing capacity to accommodate new growth. Derwent lower may be able to accommodate some expansion. Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	A	None identified.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	A	Water utilities companies have a
Drain 33	infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	est) G	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. Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required.
	Consider Further Assessment (A)		
Envi	Further Assessment Required (R) ronmental Health		
34	Contamination	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
01	Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	10/00	
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	A	Noise from neighbouring pavilion.
	ronmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Development of site not
	What would the impacts of development be on the		acceptable; site forms part of

 ${}_{Page}51$ 

	landscape character or setting of the area or any		spatial landscape buffer typical to
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		Shillington settlement pattern of 'ends'. Setting to Conservation Area.
			'Enclosure' of landscape 'gap' by development along New Walk would result in detrimental change in village landscape character, reducing connectivity of landscape/ rural gaps physically and visually. Concern potential impact of change on character of New Walk 'quiet lane' and landscape setting to Conservation Area.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	A	Site has multi-period
57	What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	A	archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing
	these assets?		appropriate mitigation is undertaken. This site lies within a landscape
			that is known to contain multi- period archaeological remains and
			is adjacent to the historic core of settlement of Shillington; therefore it has archaeological potential.
			Archaeological potential does not prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate
			mitigation strategy in line with para 141 of the NPPF was implemented. Any planning submission would
			need to be accompanied by the results of an intrusive archaeological field evaluation to
			satisfy para 128 of the NPPF. Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological
			works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability.
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Important hedgerows/ trees to be retained, buffered and enhanced. Valuable for SPI
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space	A	Extensive network of ROW around and across site. Established hedgerows and trees. Access would need to be enhanced
	and green infrastructure?		(including visual amenity) and hedgerows retained and enhanced. No loss of open space but direct
			impact on adj Memorial Playing Fields & Tennis Courts. Near to Woodmer End Playing Field, Shillington Recreation
L		1	,

 ${\rm Page}52$ 

			Ground Play Area, Shillington Lower School, Hillside Road Allotments and All Saints Church Cemetery.
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	Development of this site would not existing or allocated minerals and waste sites or mineral safeguarding sites.
Planr	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None relevant.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

# **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site if fully developed would on plan appear to join High Road and Hillfoot Road, whereby the Landscaping Officer has objected to the development of the entire site on grounds relating to the character of the settlement. However, it is considered that subject to an appropriate scale of development, that development within the site will not be visually prominent within the landscape or the streetscene of either Hillfoot Road or High Road due to mature landscaping which would be sought to be retained and enhanced. Thereby it is considered that such harm would not be significant. It is considered that the development of this site is worthy of further consideration subject to appropriate details and infrastructure capacity. More detail relating to the access to the site will be required.

# **STAGE 3 : ACHIEVABILITY**

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

Viabil	Viability				
43	<ul> <li>Referring to the Viability Assessment undertaken by consultants, is the probability of the site being viable high, medium or low?</li> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value</li> <li>Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value</li> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value</li> </ul>	G	The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area and at this scale would exceed both the upper and lower benchmark land values and as such the report indicates that such development would likely be viable.		
Achie	vability				
44	Are there any market factors which would affect deliverability?		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
<ul><li>0 to 5 years (deliverable)</li><li>6 to 10 years</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>11 to 15 years</li> <li>15 to 20 years</li> </ul>	
Outside Plan Period	The Orea Ofende Office outline d
<b>46</b> 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 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:

 $P_{age}54$ 

- 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>30</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP276
Site Name	Land at Hillside Rd (West of the Church)
Site Address	Land at Hillside Rd (West of the Church)
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: Submitted Whole Site Area: Measured GIS Area:
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	ll 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: 17 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 59
Flood	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	The site is not within flood zone 2 or 3.
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	
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	The site is not covered by nationally significant designations.
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not in an AONB.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>31</sup>.

Relati	ionship to Settlement		
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Shillington and there are no barriers.
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 does impact the existing village pattern by conjoining Hillfoot End and Shillington
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>32</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>32</sup>.

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>32</sup>.

 9
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>32</sup>.

 9
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>32</sup>.

 9
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>32</sup>.
 G
 None identified.

 9
 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

**STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not available. A site is considered available for

development where there are no legal or ownership problems and the landowner has expressed an intention to develop the site.

**Availability** What is the existing use of the site? 9 А Field, allotments and vacant land. Would the existing use limit the development potential? 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G Site has been submitted on behalf who has expressed an intention to develop the site? of a developer. 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G None, other than full consideration delay or prevent development? given to existing allotment tenants, If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically and adjoining landowners where overcome? necessary. 12 Does the site already have planning permission for G The site does not benefit from an the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red extant planning permission for the because it's not eligible for allocation. proposed use.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>32</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</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>33</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

Does the site continue to next stage?

Yes

Circui asses Plan.	ning of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable mstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined soment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circu	as suita	able based on the high level SHLAA
Gree			
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	The site is 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	
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A	
15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>34</sup>	N/A	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

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

### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT

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

11011			
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	It is considered that the site does
	with the NPPF definition?		not form previously developed land.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

 ${}^{\rm Page}58$ 

	completions over the last ten years as a percentage of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
04	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	G	Number of houses in 2016: 879
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3 Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>E% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	• 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).		
	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No issues identified on site.
	features that affect the site's developability?	-	
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
Relat	ionship to Settlement		
		D	Dovelopment of the site would
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	R	Development of the site would
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		cause harm to the character and
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		appearance of the conservation
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		area, the setting of a Grade I Listed
	form?		
			Building and the setting of the
		1	settlement.
			Settlement.
Agric	cultural Land Quality		
	cultural Land Quality Would the development impact on high quality	Δ	
Agric 24	Would the development impact on high quality	A	Loss of Grade 3 Agricultural Land.
		A	

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

STAG	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme		
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		ed at this stage as the ratings across
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).	
	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the s	ite 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	In settlement
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)	L	
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	A	Adjoining settlement
	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Adjoining settlement
	school?		, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining		
00	settlement (R)	•	Operations of the set Dest Office
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	A	Convenience store and Post Office
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
27	None (R)     Distance to hus store with a frequent convice (at	R	Over 800m to bus step
21	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):	ĸ	Over 800m to bus stop. Development of this scale could not
	Less than 400m (G)		provide meaningful public transport
			improvements.
	• 400m-800m (A)		
	Over 800m (R)     OP submission form stated that improved		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as</li> </ul>		Meppershall
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
	part of the development (G)		Service 89 – Henlow Camp -
			Shillington - Hitchin

		r	<b>-</b>
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	Over 1200m to Arlesey Train
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>		Station.
	<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	А	Hillside Road , however access is
	Ŭ		tight with a pinch point. Hillside
			does not benefit from a footpath to
			connect to. More details required.
Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	Α	Shillington Lower School does not
00			have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent lower may be able to
			-
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	A	None identified
	this?		
	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	let)	any upgrades required.
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
			drinkery to be required
	Consider Further Assessment (A)		
<b>-</b> •	Further Assessment Required (R)		
	conmental Health		
34	Contamination	R/A/G	Awaiting comments.
	Are there any contamination constraints on site and		
05	will there be any remediation required?		
35	Adjoining uses	G	No evident sources of pollution
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		from neighbouring land uses.
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
	noise and smell)		
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Development not acceptable;
	What would the impacts of development be on the		Impact on simple, historic

<ul> <li>designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?</li> <li>Conservation Area / wider rural landscape. Wide ranging views. Simplicity of setting of church, historic ambience and physical / visual relationship with immediate and wider landscape surrounds must be conserved. Existing residential edge beyond north site boundary behind treed buffer and integrated. Key concern development to northern site boundary would result in exposed views. Including rooftops, from church surrounds. Development at Church View Ave exposed but mitigation could be achieved without development.</li> <li>What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?</li> <li>R Site has archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation. Archaeological potential the requirements of para 141 of the NPPF is implemented.</li> <li>As this site has archaeological potential is likely that an archaeological potential is likely that an archaeological potential is likely that an archaeological potential to the NPPF is implemented.</li> </ul>		Τ	[	
What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?		or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		landscape. Wide ranging views. Simplicity of setting of church, historic ambience and physical / visual relationship with immediate and wider landscape surrounds must be conserved. Existing residential edge beyond north site boundary behind treed buffer and integrated. Key concern development to northern site boundary would result in exposed views, including rooftops, from church surrounds. Development at Church View Ave exposed but mitigation could be achieved without development.
potential it is likely that an archaeological evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF would be required prior to a planning submission. Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any	37	What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of	R	potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken. This site lies adjacent to the historic core of the settlement of Shillington. Archaeological potential does not prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy in line with the requirements of para 141 of the NPPF is
proposal to prevent issues with viability.				potential it is likely that an archaeological evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF would be required prior to a planning submission. Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with
site due to the harm to designated heritage assets not outweighing the benefits.				has objected to development of this site due to the harm to designated heritage assets not outweighing the benefits.
38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?ASmall area of housing proposed with potential GI enhancement. Retain & buffer existing hedgerow corridors	38	What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are	A	with potential GI enhancement. Retain & buffer existing hedgerow
<b>39 Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> R Currently allotments, established	39		R	
Are there any potential conflicts with open space,hedgerows / tree lines around site.	1	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		hedgerows / tree lines around site.

	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?		ROW across site, would need to be enhanced.
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	Developing this site would not impact on existing or allocated minerals and waste sites, or mineral safeguarding areas.
Planr	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None relevant.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

### **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is located within the Shillington Conservation Area, on land identified as Significant Landscape Area within the Conservation Area Appraisal which forms part of the distinctive character of the conservation area and the settlement, emphasising the landmark statues and importance of All Saints Church which is a Grade I Listed Building that is sited prominently above the site upon a hill top. It is considered that the site forms part of the immediate setting of this listed building.

In addition to the above, the site contains allotments which are considered to form important open space for recreation in the context of the NPPF. These allotments are not considered to be surplus to requirements and no justification has been provided.

As only a proportion of the site forms important open space the reduced northern parcel of the site has also been considered.

The sites access is restricted in width with a 6 metre wide access road, whereby an acceptable carriageway width could be provided, however no footpath could be provided to connect to the existing footpath network via this access.

Notwithstanding the above access constraints, this edge of settlement site is within the conservation area and is within the open countryside. The development of this site, by virtue of its open countryside location and its relationship with the existing settlement, result in the loss of an area of valued landscape and the introduction of built form would have a harmful impact on character of the area and local amenity and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade I listed Church at this edge of settlement location. It is considered that the benefits of developing the site would not outweigh the harm to designated heritage assets which includes their setting. The adverse impacts of the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal would not amount to sustainable development.

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

Site details	
Reference Number	ALP277
Site Name	Land off High Road
Site Address	Land off High Road
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.77 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.77 Ha Measured GIS Area: 0.77 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					
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.					
	Provisional Site Capacity					
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 19 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 19			
Flood	<b>I Risk</b> (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the	ne Seque	ontial Test)			
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	No part of the site falls within flood zones 2 or 3. However an ordinary watercourse is present within or neighbouring the site according to the EA's detailed River network mapping layer. JFlow modelling would be required to determine fluvial flood risk to the site and whether further assessment is required.			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, whereby no more than 50% of the site is at risk of surface water flooding in the 100 year event (including 30 year).			
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	No	This site is not covered by nationally significant designations.			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

	Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	This site is 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 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>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is considered to be well related to Shillington and there appears to be no major physical barriers.		
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	Development of the site would not cause physical or visual coalescence between neighbouring settlements.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

STACE 1C ASSESSMENT

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs <sup>37</sup> .					
Critical Infrastructure					
8 Can the site meet the <b>critical infrastructure</b>	A	This .question was not posed in the			
requirements that will enable delivery <sup>38</sup> ?		2014 Call for Sites form			
Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes			

This s devel intent	<b>STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT</b> 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?	A	The site is currently used for a village hall as well as equestrian uses.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted on behalf of a private landowner and the intention to develop the site has		

<sup>36</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-<u>led garden villages towns and cities.pdf</u>) <sup>37</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>38</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.

<ul> <li>Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?</li> <li>Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.</li> <li>A No extant planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.</li> <li>CB/15/02102/FULL – awaiting decision. This application was linked to application CB/15/02104/FULL which includes the delivery of a community facility. The application for the community facility, has yet to be determined however, the decisions both have a motion for the grant of planning permission from the DM committee subject to S106 agreements which have yet to be agreed and sealed.</li> </ul>				been expressed.
the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	11	delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically	A	Approval to develop will need to be secured from the Charities
Does the site continue to payt stage?	12	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red	A	the proposed use however, plan app submitted under ref: CB/15/02102/FULL – awaiting decision. This application was linked to application CB/15/02104/FULL which includes the delivery of a community facility. The application for the community facility, has yet to be determined however, the decisions both have a motion for the grant of planning permission from the DM committee subject to S106 agreements which
	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.

Gree	nbelt		
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	This site is 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	
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A	

15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage $2.^{39}$	N/A	
Does the site continue to next stage?			Yes

### **STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT) STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT** This stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed desktop assessment. A red rating for any question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance. **Previously Developed Land** 16 Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance 26-75% of the site is considered to A form previously developed land. with the NPPF definition? 76% - 100% (G) 26 - 75% (A) 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R) Community 17 Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in No Shillington has not been designated areas) designated for a Neighbourhood Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an Plan and subsequently no draft emerging Neighbourhood Plan? allocations are yet available. 18 **Community Consultation** No This question was not posed by the 2014 Call for Sites form, None Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this evident. consultation took and any overall community response. Sustainability of Settlement 19 Yes Unless an equal or better Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of community centre in an appropriate location would be provided off site the settlement through the loss of services and facilities (for example, employment, retail, public through a linked planning house etc) permission and legal agreements. **Cumulative Impact** 20 Considering housing completions over the past 10 Number of houses in 2006: 823 А years, what has been the level of housing growth in Number of houses in 2016: 879 the parish? Percentage Growth: 6.8% • Less than 5% growth (G) 5% to 20% growth (A) More than 20% growth (R) This is calculated by working out the total number of completions over the last ten years as a percentage of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using census and completions data). Number of houses in 2016: 879 21 What level of housing growth would there be if all the G outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to Number of outstanding completions be completed? 2016: 3 Percentage Growth: 0.34% Less than 5% growth (G) •

More than 20% growth (R)
 This is calculated by working out the total number of

5% to 20% growth (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.

Phys	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions data). sical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. tionship to Settlement	G	No physical constraints or permanent features that would affect the site's developability are evident.
23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	A	It is considered that appropriate development within the site would not cause harm to the existing settlement pattern and would not have a unacceptable harmful impact upon the historic, unique or distinctive characteristic of the settlement's built or natural form.
Agric	cultural Land Quality		
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	50% of the site falls within Grade 3 of the agricultural land classification. The split between Grade 3a and 3b is unknown.

STAC	GE 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						
			ed at this stage as the fathlys across				
	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance appart and Appage to Services	;.					
	sport and Access to Services						
25	Facilities and services	- 6 4 6	ite fan hausinen. It linke ta tha				
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	or the s	alle for housing. It links to the				
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.						
05-	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately						
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement				
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)						
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)						
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)						
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>						
	settlement (R)	_					
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	A	Adjoining settlement				
	applicable)?						
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)						
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)						
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>						
	Other catchment school available (A)						
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Adjoining settlement				
	school?						
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>						
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)						
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>						
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement				
	centre?						

	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	А	Convenience store and Post Office
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	•		
	(A)		
	None (R)	<u> </u>	
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop.
	least hourly at peak times):		Development of this scale could not
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>		provide meaningful public transport
	<ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> </ul>		improvements.
	<ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>		
	OR submission form stated that improved		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –
	public transport facilities could be provided as		Meppershall
	part of the development (G)		
			Service 89 – Henlow Camp -
			Shillington - Hitchin
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	More than 1200 metres from
	Less than 800m (G)		Arlesey Train Station.
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
29		G	The site can be accessed from
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	
Caba	al Caraceitu		High Street.
	ol Capacity	•	Chilliantan Lawar Cabaal daga nat
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not
			have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent lower may be able to
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	А	None evident.
	this?		
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	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
		1	identify the network and timing of
			identify the nature and timing of

			any upgrades required.
Drain	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	st)	
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	A	No part of the site falls within flood zones 2 or 3. However an ordinary watercourse is present within or neighbouring the site according to the EA's detailed River network mapping layer. JFlow modelling would be required to determine fluvial flood risk to the site and whether further assessment is required.
24	Contamination	R/A/G	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	It does not appear that adjoining uses would result in pollution that would preclude development of this site.
Envir	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?	A	Development of site may be acceptable; Forms rural edge / setting to Conservation Area. Concern on access and capacity of site. Appropriate landscape mitigation required. Any development must compliment and enhance Conservation Area landscape setting and interface with rural landscape; need to ensure effective and appropriate landscape mitigation based on and strengthening existing landscape boundaries to east and south especially, including locally native hedgerow trees. Landscape / rural interfaces must be retained within the public realm and not form garden boundaries. Concern access from High Road is constrained; widening of access could have detrimental effect on street scene.
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?	A	The frontage of the site is located within the Shillington Conservation Area, whereby regard should be had to the need to preserve and enhance the architectural and historic interest of this designated heritage asset. Any harm to heritage assets will be determined in accordance with paragraphs 132-135 of the NPPF. Site has archaeological potential but this would not

			provent ellegation providing			
			prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken. This site lies within the historic core of the settlement of Shillington and has been subject to archaeological evaluation in response to planning application CB/15/02102/FULL which identified surviving earthworks and deposits dated to the medieval period. Archaeological potential does not			
			prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy in line with the requirements of para 141 of the NPPF is implemented.			
			As this site has archaeological potential it is likely that an archaeological Heritage Statement to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF would be required as part of any			
			planning application. Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability.			
38	Ecological Assets	G	Development should provide a net			
	What would the impacts of development be on any		gain for biodiversity and existing			
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		mature hedgerows would be			
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		required to be retained.			
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	G	Development should retain			
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		hedgerow and enhance right of			
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		way on western edge of the site.			
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space					
Minor	and green infrastructure?	l				
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	Development of the site would not			
40	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including	9	impact upon any existing or			
	mineral safeguarding sites?		allocated minerals or waste site, or			
			impact upon a mineral			
			safeguarding area.			
Plann	ing History					
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		Planning application			
	planning applications and submissions to previous		CB/15/02102/FULL, awaiting			
	Allocations Plans)		decision.			
Gypsy and Traveller Provision						
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No			

# **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The development of the site would result in the loss of community facility that cannot be reprovided within the confines of the site and therefore this impact cannot be mitigated through a site specific policy. Furthermore; the site cannot be developed without the removal of the community facility. For the latter reason it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.

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

Site details							
Reference Number	ALP351						
Site Name	Land off Brookside, Shillington.						
Site Address	Land off Brookside, Shillington.						
Settlement	Shillington.						
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.25 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.44 Ha Measured GIS Area: 0.23 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 stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.						
Provisional Site Capacity							
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	Yes	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 15 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology 7				
Flood	Flood Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the Sequential Test)						
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	The site is not located within Flood Zone 2 or 3.				
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	No more than 50% of the site is 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	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.				
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not located within the AONB.				
Does the site continue to next stage?			No				
Does the site continue to next stage?							

Page / ∠

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

# Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>41</sup>

Site details		
Reference Number	ALP402	
Site Name	Land at New Walk	
Site Address	New Walk, Shillington. SG5 3NP	
Settlement	Shillington	
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 4.8ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 5ha Measured GIS Area: 5.81ha	
Proposed Use	Residential development	
Any other information	NLP243 and ALP166	

# 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.

TAGE 1A ASSESSMENT his stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations
This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small of connict with hational policy designations
rovisional Site Capacity
Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if
this is smaller.
lood Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the Sequential Test)
Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 No Site not in floodzone 2 or 3 or 3?
Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface No Site not at risk from surface water flooding?
ationally significant designations (All sites which reach Stage 2 be subject to detailed assessment)
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.
Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area No Not in AONB of Outstanding Natural Beauty?
oes the site continue to next stage? Yes

Page / J

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>42</sup>.

Relati	ionship to Settlement		
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Shillington and there are no barriers to development. The proposed site would however, join up two ends in Shillington.
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	It would joins two ends of Shillington but not cause coalescence between two different villages.
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>43</sup>. Critical Infrastructure 8 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>44</sup>? A Further information provided 9 Does the site continue to next stage? Yes

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

Availa	Availability				
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	Agricultural		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The land is controlled by land owners intending to develop 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	There are no known legal or ownership problems that could prevent or delay development.		
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red	G	There are no planning applications on the site.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</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>44</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

STAC	E 1E ASSESSMENT			
		Poviow a	ad also provides a preliminary	
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				
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circl			
Plan.	sment would still have to demonstrate exceptional Circl	unistance		
-	abalt			
Greer		NL-	Natile sate die One as Dalt	
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	Not located in Green Belt	
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	Yes or	N/A	
	within one of the parcels which have been identified	No		
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt			
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no			
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage			
	2.			
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	Yes or	N/A	
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which	No		
	may contribute to identification of exceptional			
	circumstances?			
	Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the			
	following key local services - convenience			
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper			
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,			
	library (use settlement audit)			
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>			
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA			
	<ul> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement</li> </ul>			
	that has a mainline rail station or direct			
	assess (junction) to the strategic road			
	network (A road or motorway)			
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14			
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not			
	progress any further in this assessment of			
	suitability.*			
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	No	Site is not supported by a	
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted		Neighbourhood Plan	
	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			
	2.45			
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.

16       Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance       R       Greenfield         with the NPPF definition?       Image: state st	Freviously Developed Land			1	
with the NPPF definition?	16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	Greenfield	
		with the NPPF definition?			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</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)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
	nunity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	N/A
	designated areas)		
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		
18	Community Consultation	No	No consultation
	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		
	house etc)		
	Ilative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	There has been a 6.8% growth in
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		housing in Shillington.
	the parish?		
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	• More than 20% growth (R)		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
04	census and completions data).	0	<b>7</b>
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	G	There would be an additional
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed?		0.34% housing growth.
	·		
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	• 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	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No physical constraints
	features that affect the site's developability?	Ŭ	
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
Relat	ionship to Settlement	I	
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	A	Although the site doesn't
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		necessarily cause complete
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		coalescence between two
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		settlements it does infill a large
	form?		paddock which separates the main
			village of Shillington from Hillfoot
			End and this would have an
			adverse impact on the settlement
			pattern of Shillington.
Agric	ultural Land Quality	L	

Page76

	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	Grade 3
This any q	<b>GE 2 ASSESSMENT</b> stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme question does not mean that the site will be automatically e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	/ exclude	
	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.	of the si	te for housing. It links to the
~ -	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> </ul>		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	A	Adjoining settlement
2015	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	Α	Adjoining settlement
	school?		
	Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	• Not in the settlement of an adjoining settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	А	Convenience store and Post Office
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)		
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
	None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop.
	least hourly at peak times):		Development of this scale could not
	• Less than 400m (G)		provide meaningful public transport
	• 400m-800m (A)		improvements.
	• Over 800m (R)		Sonvice 70 Luten Chillington
	OR submission form stated that improved		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –
	public transport facilities could be provided as		Meppershall
	part of the development (G)		Service 89 – Henlow Camp -

			Shillington - Hitchin
28	Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G) • 800m-1200m (A) • Over 1200m (R)	R	Over 1200m
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	yes
	ol Capacity	r	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	A	Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and upper school places may be provided within the proposed Pix Brook Free School, if the application for that is approved by the EFA.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
Drain	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	st)	
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required
		D/A/C	Awaiting Comments
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting Comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	G	No issues
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	А	Limited potential for low density

 ${}^{\rm Page}78$ 

	What would the impacts of development be on the		development. Significant
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		landscape corridor would be
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		required connecting village green
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		with sports fields and wider
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		countryside.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	G	Site is considered to have low
	What would the impacts of development be on any		archaeological potential. No
	heritage assets and their setting?		objection to allocation
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of		
	these assets?		
38	Ecological Assets	A/R	Important hedgerows/ trees to be
	What would the impacts of development be on any		retained, buffered and enhanced.
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		Valuable for SPI
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	R	Parish GI plan aspiration for this
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		area to create new open access
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		sites to maintain the green centre
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space		of the village.
	and green infrastructure?		No loss of LS open space.
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on	G	No issues
	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including		
	mineral safeguarding sites?		
Plan	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example		No planning history
	planning applications and submissions to previous		
	Allocations Plans)		
Gyps	sy and Traveller Provision		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

# **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site if fully developed would on plan appear to join High Road and Hillfoot Road, whereby the Landscaping Officer has objected to the development of the entire site on grounds relating to the character of the settlement. However, it is considered that subject to an appropriate scale of development, that development within the site will not be visually prominent within the landscape or the streetscene of either Hillfoot Road or High Road due to mature landscaping which would be sought to be retained and enhanced. Thereby it is considered that such harm would not be significant. It is considered that the development of this site is suitable subject to appropriate details and infrastructure capacity. More detail relating to the access to the site will be required.

## **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? <ul> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably</li> </ul>	G	The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that residual value of development in this value area	

	, , ,	
	exceeded by likely residual value	and at this scale would exceed
	Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual	both the upper and lower
	land value close to benchmark land value	benchmark land values and as
	<ul> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below</li> </ul>	such the report indicates that such
	benchmark land value	development would likely be viable.
	vability	
44	Are there any market factors which would affect	The Council's Residential
	deliverability?	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)	
	<ul> <li>6 to 10 years</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>11 to 15 years</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <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?	Over a two year period
		The Case Study Sites outlined
		within the Council's Residential
		Development Viability Report (Feb

 ${}^{\rm Page}80$ 

	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.	e
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.

Page

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>46</sup>

Site details		
Reference Number	ALP403	
Site Name	Land at Marquis Hill	
Site Address	Land at Marquis Hill	
Settlement	Shillington.	
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.40 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 0.39 Ha	
	Measured GIS Area: 0.39 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.

	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: 8 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 12		
Flood	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	The site is not located within Flood Zone 2 or 3.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	Less than 50% of the site is at risk from surface water flooding.		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not located within an AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

Page 82

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>47</sup>.

Relati	ionship to Settlement		
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Shillington and there are no major physical barriers.
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	Development within this site would not cause physical or visual coalescence of settlements.
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>48</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>49</sup>.
 A
 This question was not posed by the 2014 Call for Sites forms.

 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

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

Availability What is the existing use of the site? 9 G The existing use of the site is Would the existing use limit the development agricultural. It is not considered that potential? the existing use would limit development potential. 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G The site has been submitted on who has expressed an intention to develop the site? behalf of a private landowner. The intention to develop has been expressed. 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G No legal or ownership problems delay or prevent development? that could delay or prevent If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically development of the site are overcome? evident.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</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>49</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	No extant planning permission for
	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red		the proposed use.
	because it's not eligible for allocation.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes
	GE 1E ASSESSMENT		
	section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt F		
	ning of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable		• •
	mstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined		
	ssment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circl	umstance	es to considered for allocation in the
Plan.			
Gree		NL	The site is well be set advitting the
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	The site is not located within the Green Belt.
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	N/A	
	within one of the parcels which have been identified		
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt		
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no		
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage		
45-	2.		
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	N/A	
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional		
	circumstances?		
	Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the		
	following key local services - convenience		
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper		
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,		
	library (use settlement audit)		
	Site makes a strong contribution to housing		
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA		
	Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement		
	that has a mainline rail station or direct		
	assess (junction) to the strategic road		
	network (A road or motorway)		
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14		
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not		
	progress any further in this assessment of		
	suitability.*		
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	N/A	
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted		
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject		
	to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the		
	criteria in question 15a will automatically progress		
	through this stage to be considered further at Stage		
_	2.50		
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.

 $P_{age}84$ 

<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.

16	iously Developed Land		
-	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	It is considered that this site does
	with the NPPF definition?		not form previously developed land.
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Com	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Shillington has not been
17	designated areas)		designated for a Neighbourhood
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Plan and subsequently no draft
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		allocations are yet available.
18	Community Consultation	No	This question was not posed in the
10		INO	2014 Call for Sites form.
	Has any community consultation taken place?		2014 Gail for Siles form.
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
40	response.	Ala	
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)		
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 823
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	More than 20% growth (R)		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	G	Number of houses in 2016: 879
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	<ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> </ul>		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	<ul> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	<b>U U U</b>		
	This is calculated 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		
	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		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
Phys	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		
Phys 22	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	G	There are no physical constraints
	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 Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	There are no physical constraints or permanent features that would
	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 ConstraintsAre there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability?	G	or permanent features that would
	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).itical ConstraintsAre there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability?For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment	G	
22	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 ConstraintsAre 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	or permanent features that would
22 Relat	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 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. tionship to Settlement		or permanent features that would affect the developability of the site.
22	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 ConstraintsAre 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.tionship to Settlement Would development of the site be complementary to	G	or permanent features that would affect the developability of the site. There would be no adverse
22 Relat	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).cical ConstraintsAre 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.tionship to Settlement Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		or permanent features that would affect the developability of the site. There would be no adverse impacts as a result of the
22 Relat	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). <b>ical Constraints</b> Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines. <b>tionship to Settlement</b> Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		or permanent features that would affect the developability of the site. There would be no adverse impacts as a result of the development regarding settlement
22 Relat	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 ConstraintsAre 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.tionship to SettlementWould development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		or permanent features that would affect the developability of the site. There would be no adverse impacts as a result of the
22 Relat 23	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 ConstraintsAre 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.tionship to SettlementWould development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?		or permanent features that would affect the developability of the site. There would be no adverse impacts as a result of the development regarding settlement
22 Relat 23	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 ConstraintsAre 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.tionship to SettlementWould development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		or permanent features that would affect the developability of the site There would be no adverse impacts as a result of the development regarding settlement

 ${}^{\rm Page}85$ 

	<ul> <li>agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>		Agricultural Land Classification. The split between Grade 3a and 3b is unknown.
This s any q Stage	SE 2 ASSESSMENT stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically 2 B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance sport and Access to Services	/ exclude	
	Facilities and services		
25	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.	of the sit	te for housing. It links to the
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
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	In settlement
25b	<ul> <li>Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?</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>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>	A	Adjoining settlement
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Adjoining settlement
	<ul> <li>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>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25d	<ul> <li>Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?</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>	A	Adjoining settlement
26	<ul> <li>What retail provision does the settlement offer?</li> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)</li> <li>None (R)</li> </ul>	A	Convenience store and Post Office
27	<ul> <li>Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times):</li> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>	R	Over 800m to bus stop with frequent service. Development of this scale could not provide meaningful public transport improvements.
28	Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G)	R	Over 1200m to Arlesey Train Station.

Page 86

	a = 800m (1200m (A))		
	<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Marquis Hill
	ol Capacity	0	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not have existing capacity to accommodate new growth. Derwent lower may be able to accommodate some expansion. Middle and upper school places are very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	A	Not identified.
Wate	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	est)	
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required.
	conmental Health		Amoiting comments
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	G	No identified sources of pollution on neighbouring land uses that would conflict with the proposed use.
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	R	Development of site not acceptable; open rural site, elevated ground, revealing views to south /AONB horizon. Concern development cannot be integrated within elevated rural edge / appropriately mitigated.

 ${}^{\rm Page}87$ 

37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?	A	Site has archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?		mitigation is undertaken. This site lies adjacent to an area of historic settlement at Clawders Hill Farm to the north east. Archaeological potential does not prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy in line with the requirements of para 141 of the NPPF is implemented.
			As this site has archaeological potential it is likely that an archaeological evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF would be required prior to a planning submission.
			Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability.
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	O	Development should retain existing hedgerow, and provide a net gain for biodiversity.
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	A	Development would need to enhance right of way on western edge of the site.
	als and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	Development of this site would not impact upon any existing or allocated minerals and waste sites or mineral safeguarding areas.
	ing History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None relevant.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

# STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, which includes the openness of the countryside and the character of the settlement which includes its setting, due to the topography of the site and the openness of the landscape it is not considered that the impact of the development upon the landscape could be mitigated to an acceptable degree through soft landscaping, it is considered that the benefit of 12 homes would not outweigh the identified environmental harm and as such it is considered that this site is not worthy of further consideration for development.

Concern in relation to Highway Safety, due to the crest of hill obscuring views to the west of the site, needs further investigation.

Page 89

# Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>51</sup>

Site details		
Reference Number	ALP404	
Site Name	Land at Hillside	
Site Address	Land at Hillside	
Settlement	Shillington	
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 2.3 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 2.3 Ha Measured GIS Area: 2.3 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	E 1A ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
	Provisional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma:         15         Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology:         18		
Flood	I Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Sequent	ial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	The site is not located within flood zone 2 or 3.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	Less than 50% of the site is at risk from surface water flooding.		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be s	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	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not within an AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

Page 90

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

## **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>52</sup>.

Relationship to Settlement			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Shillington and there are no major physical barriers between the site and the 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	Development of this site would not cause visual or physical 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>53</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>54</sup>?

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>54</sup>?

 9
 A
 This question was not posed in the 2014 Call for Sites.

 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

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

Availability What is the existing use of the site? 9 А Fields, allotments and vacant land. Would the existing use limit the development potential? 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G This site has been submitted on who has expressed an intention to develop the site? behalf of a private landowner. The intention to develop this site is expressed. 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G No legal or ownership issues are delay or prevent development? evident. If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome? 12 Does the site already have planning permission for G This site does not benefit from an

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</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>54</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT         This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan.         Greenbelt         13       Is the site located within the Green Belt?       No       This site is not located within the			
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	Green Belt.
15a 15b	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A N/A	
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.55		
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** 

Page 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

4.0			
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	It is considered that this site does
	with the NPPF definition?		not form previously developed land.
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Comn	nunity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	Shillington has not been
	designated areas)		designated for a Neighbourhood
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		Plan and subsequently no draft
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		allocations are yet available.
18	Community Consultation	No	No community consultation is
	Has any community consultation taken place?		evident. This question was not
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		posed in the 2014 Call for Sites
	consultation took and any overall community		Form.
	response.		
19	Sustainability of Settlement	No	
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		
	the settlement through the loss of services and		
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
Cum	Ilative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 823
20	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2006: 829
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
			Fercentage Growth. 0.0%
	• Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	More than 20% growth (R)		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).	<u> </u>	
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	G	Number of houses in 2016: 879
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	• 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).		
	cal Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No physical or permanent features
	features that affect the site's developability?		that would affect the site's
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		developability are evident.
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
	ionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	R	Development of the site would
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		cause harm to the character and
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		appearance of the conservation
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		area, the setting of a Grade I Listed
	form?		Building and the historic setting of
			the settlement.
Agric	ultural Land Quality		
		A	Loss of land within Grade 3 of the
24	Would the development impact on high quality	A	

agricultural land?	agricultural land classification. The
50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)	split between grade 3a and 3b is
• 50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)	unknown.
• 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)	

STAG	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
This s	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents from	technical specialists. A red rating for
any q	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically	/ exclude	d at this stage as the ratings across
Stage	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).	
Trans	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the 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	In settlement
	Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	А	Adjoining settlement
	applicable)?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Adjoining settlement
	school?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	A	Convenience store and Post Office
	<ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>		
	(A)		
	None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop with a
	least hourly at peak times):		frequent service. Development of
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>		this scale could not provide
	• 400m-800m (A)		meaningful public transport
	<ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>		improvements.
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved</li> </ul>		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –
	part of the development (G)		Meppershall

			Service 89 – Henlow Camp - Shillington - Hitchin
28	Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G) • 800m-1200m (A) • Over 1200m (R)	R	Over 1200m to Arlesey Train Station.
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	A	Hillside Road , however access is tight with a pinch point. Hillside does not benefit from a footpath to connect to. More details required.
Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not have existing capacity to accommodate new growth. Derwent lower may be able to accommodate some expansion. Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	A	None identified.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
	hage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te		
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required.
	onmental Health		
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;	G	No identified adjoining uses have the potential to conflict with the proposed use.

36	Landscape character	R	Development not acceptable;
	What would the impacts of development be on the		Impact on simple, historic
	landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		landscape setting of All Saints / Conservation Area / wider rural
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		landscape. Wide ranging views.
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		Simplicity of setting of church,
	bound of the Nature improvement from		historic ambience and physical /
			visual relationship with immediate
			and wider landscape surrounds
			must be conserved.
			Existing residential edge beyond
			north site boundary behind treed
			buffer and integrated. Key concern
			development to northern site
			boundary would result in exposed
			views, including rooftops, from
			church surrounds.
		ĺ	Development at Church View Ave
			exposed but mitigation could be
			achieved without development.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	R	The Council's Archaeologist has
	What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?		issued the following consultation response:
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of		Tesponse.
	these assets?		Site has archaeological
			potential but this would not
			prevent allocation providing
			appropriate mitigation is
			undertaken. This site lies adjacent
			to the historic core of the
			settlement of Shillington.
			Archaeological potential does not
			prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate
			archaeological mitigation
			strategy in line with the
			requirements of para 141 of the
			NPPF is implemented.
			As this site has archaeological
			potential it is likely that an
			archaeological evaluation
			to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF would be required prior to a
			planning submission.
			Should the site be allocated, a
			contingency for archaeological
	V		works must be included in any
			proposal to prevent issues with
			viability.
			The Site is located within the
			Shillington Conservation Area and
			consists of land identified as a
			significant landscape space within
			the Conservation Area Appraisal.

 $P_{age}96$ 

			The Conservation Area Appraisal
			indicates that significant landscape space should be sought to be
			retained where necessary and that
			development proposal should be
			resisted on significant landscape
			space.
			The significant landscaping space
			for which the site consists forms
			part of the immediate setting to the All Saints Church which is a Grade
			I Listed Building. The Church is
			sited upon a hill top whereby the
			church towers over the village of
			Shillington and is a valued feature
			from the immediate and wider views within the landscape.
			Development within the setting of
			this Listed Building and on land
			indicated to be important in
			landscaping terms as a definitive
			character of the conservation area
			and the village, would cause harm to both these heritage assets. This
			harm will need to be judged in
			accordance with Paragraph 132-
			135 of the NPPF.
			A reduced scheme to the portion of
			the site would cause a reduced
		-	degree of harm.
38	Ecological Assets	А	Small area of housing proposed
	What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are		with potential GI enhancement. Retain & buffer existing hedgerow
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		corridors
39	Open space/leisure and GI assets	R	Currently allotments, established
	Are there any potential conflicts with open space,		hedgerows / tree lines around site.
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space		ROW across site, would need to be enhanced.
	and green infrastructure?		chinanceu.
			Direct impact on adj Hillside Road
			Allotments. Potential extension and
Minor	vala and Wasta		appropriate separation required.
40	rals and Waste What would the impacts of development be on	G	Development of this site would not
	safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including		impact upon any existing or
	mineral safeguarding sites?		allocated minerals or waste sites or
			mineral safeguarding areas.
Planr 41	hing History		None relevant.
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous		
	Allocations Plans)		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

 $P_{age}97$ 

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is located within the Shillington Conservation Area, on land identified as Significant Landscape Area within the Conservation Area Appraisal which forms part of the distinctive character of the conservation area and the settlement, emphasising the landmark statues and importance of All Saints Church which is a Grade I Listed Building that is sited prominently above the site upon a hill top. It is considered that the site forms part of the immediate setting of this listed building.

In addition to the above, the site contains allotments which are considered to form important open space for recreation in the context of the NPPF. These allotments are not considered to be surplus to requirements and no justification has been provided.

As only a proportion of the site forms important open space the reduced northern parcel of the site has also been considered.

The sites access is restricted in width with a 6 metre wide access road, whereby an acceptable carriageway width could be provided, however no footpath could be provided to connect to the existing footpath network via this access.

Notwithstanding the above access constraints, this edge of settlement site is within the conservation area and is within the open countryside. The development of this site, by virtue of its open countryside location and its relationship with the existing settlement, result in the loss of an area of valued landscape and the introduction of built form would have a harmful impact on character of the area and local amenity and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade I listed Church at this edge of settlement location. It is considered that the benefits of developing the site would not outweigh the harm to designated heritage assets which includes their setting. The adverse impacts of the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal would not amount to sustainable development.

# Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>56</sup>

Site details	Site details				
Reference Number	NLP133				
Site Name	Land off Bury Road				
Site Address	Land off Bury Road				
Settlement	Shillington				
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 1.67 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 2.67 Ha Measured GIS Area: 2.67 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	E 1A ASSESSMENT				
This s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provi	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 55 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 30		
Flood	I Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ential Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	>0% <50% of site within Flood Zone 2.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	Surface water flood risk in the 100yr event (including 30yr) is >0%<50%.		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not located within an AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

 $P_{age}99$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT         This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>57</sup> .         Relationship to Settlement         6       For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?       A       The site is well related to Shillington and there are major no physical barriers between the site and the settlement. Development of the entire site would not form a logical extension to the settlement. Development into the open countryside in a form out of character to the existing settlement pattern.         7       Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town and another existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.       A       Development of this site would cause coalescence between Shillington and one of its ends.         A coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town and anothere site would not cause physical or visual co	0740				
<ul> <li>insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>57</sup>.</li> <li>Relationship to Settlement</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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 not be possible for 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.</li> </ul>					
<ul> <li>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>57</sup>.</li> <li>Relationship to Settlement</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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 not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.</li> </ul>					
<ul> <li>Provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>57</sup>.</li> <li>Relationship to Settlement</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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 not exust propriate 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.</li> </ul>					
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would not cause physical or visual coalescence between the site would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.</li> <li>A The site is well related to Shillington and there are major no physical barriers between the site and the settlement. Development of the site would not form a logical extension to the settlement, projecting built development into the open countryside in a form out of character to the existing settlement pattern.</li> <li>A Development of the site would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.</li> </ul>			f-contain	ed site is defined as a site which will	
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>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 not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.</li> <li>For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self-contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement of the site would not the settlement. Development of the site would not form a logical extension to the settlement, projecting built development into the open countryside in a form out of character to the existing settlement pattern.</li> </ul>					
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>boes the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would not 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.</li> <li>Contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement. Development of the site would not form a logical extension to the settlement, projecting built development into the open countryside in a form out of character to the existing settlement pattern.</li> <li>Does the site cause coalescence between an existing village or town and another existing village or town and another existing village or town and another existing village or town? If yes, then grade as Amber if the site would not be possible for appropriate buffers to be provided leaving a reasonable developable area based on the individual context of the site.</li> </ul>	Relati	onship to 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.	6	contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways)	A	Shillington and there are major no physical barriers between the site and the settlement. Development of the entire site would not form a logical extension to the settlement, projecting built development into the open countryside in a form out of character to the existing	
Deep the site continue to payt store?	7	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	A	cause physical or visual coalescence between Shillington and neighbouring settlements. However development of this site would cause coalescence between	
Does the site continue to next stage?	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>58</sup>. **Critical Infrastructure** 

	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery <sup>59</sup> ?	G	None identified.		
Does the site continue to next stage?		Yes			

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

Avail	valiability			
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	A	Agricultural land still in production.	
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	This site has been submitted on behalf of a private landowner. The intention to develop the site is expressed.	

<sup>57</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locallyled garden villages towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</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>59</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.

11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	No legal or ownership issues are evident.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	No extant permission for the proposed use.
Does the site continue to next stage?			Yes

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

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

Greer	nbelt		
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	This site is 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	
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A	
15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage $2.^{60}$	N/A	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

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

Page **L** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		a accomment. A red rating for any			
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed					
question does not mean that the site will be automatically excluded at this stage as the ratings across						
	e 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance					
Previously Developed Land						
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	It is not considered that the site			
	with the NPPF definition?		forms previously developed land.			
	• 76% - 100% (G)					
	• 26 - 75% (A)					
	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)					
Com	munity					
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No				
	designated areas)					
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an					
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?					
18	Community Consultation	No	No community consultation evident.			
	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	Development of this site would not			
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		impact on the sustainability of the			
	the settlement through the loss of services and		settlement through the loss of			
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		services and facilities.			
	house etc)					
Cum	ulative Impact					
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	G	Number of houses in 2006: 823			
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879			
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%			
	<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: 879			
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions			
	be completed?		2016: 3			
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%			
	• 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).					
Phys	sical Constraints		l			
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No physical constraints or			
LĹ	features that affect the site's developability?	0	permanent features that would			
			•			
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		affect the developability of the site			
Dele	works, topography or wind turbines.		are evident.			
	tionship to Settlement					
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	R	Development of this site would not			
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		form a logical extension to the			
		1	settlement, causing coalescence			

	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?		between the Shillington and one of its ends.
Agric	cultural Land Quality		
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	The site lies in Grade 3 Agricultural Land. The most recent data from Natural England does not sub- classify Grades 3a and 3b.

STAG	GE 2 ASSESSMENT					
This s	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	nts from	technical specialists. A red rating for			
any q	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically	/ exclude	d at this stage as the ratings across			
	Stage 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.					
	sport and Access to Services					
25	Facilities and services					
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the Council's			
	Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		J			
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately					
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)					
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)					
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>					
	settlement (R)					
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	А	Adjoining settlement			
	applicable)?		<b>V</b>			
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)					
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)					
	• No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)					
	<ul> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>					
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Adjoining settlement			
	school?					
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)					
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)					
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>					
	Other catchment school available (A)					
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement			
	centre?					
	Yes, in the settlement (G)					
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)					
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>					
	settlement (R)					
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	А	Convenience store and Post Office			
_	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)					
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent					
	(A)					
	• None (R)					
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop with a			
	least hourly at peak times):		frequent service. Development of			
	• Less than 400m (G)		this scale could not provide			
	• 400m-800m (A)		meaningful public transport			
	<ul> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>		improvements.			
		1	1			

	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington – Meppershall
			Service 89 – Henlow Camp - Shillington - Hitchin
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R/A/G	Over 1200m to Arlesey Station
	<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	Bury Road
Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	А	Shillington Lower School does not
			have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent lower may be able to
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	А	None evident.
	this?		
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	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	Ŕ	Further assessment required.
	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?		
	No assessment required (G)		
	Consider Further Assessment (A)		
	Further Assessment Required (R)		
Envir	onmental Health	J	
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 identified adjoining uses that
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		would have the potential to cause
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		conflict with the proposed use.
	noise and smell)		
L			

Envir	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	R	Development of site not acceptable; impact on character of landscape setting to village envelope, development will be poorly related to settlement / rural setting. Shillington settlement pattern typically linked 'ends' separated by rural spatial 'gaps', development of site would impact on spatial setting
			on Woodmer End, result in built form extending beyond village envelope, poorly related to settlement and rural setting, impacting on landscape character within and beyond settlement envelope.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	A	Way and landscape amenity. The Council's Archaeologist has
	What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting? Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?		issued the following consultation response: "The site lies within an area of archaeological potential, it site also forms part of the setting of Church Panel moated site Scheduled Monument. Therefore this site has archaeological potential. Archaeological potential does not necessarily prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate mitigation strategy in line with para 141 of the NPPF was implemented; this would include the mitigation of the impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument. Any planning submission would need to be accompanied by the results of an intrusive archaeological field evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF and a consideration of the impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument using the Historic England guidance on the setting of heritage assets and in the context of paragraphs 132-134 of the NPPF. Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability".

 ${}^{\rm Page}105$ 

39Open space/leisure and GI assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space,RExtensive network of right of wa across site, open ditch to three
<ul> <li>leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?</li> <li>sides. Established hedgerows a trees. Access would need to be enhanced (including visual amenity) and hedgerows and waterbodies retained and enhanced.</li> <li>Parish GI plan identifies aspirat for new open access land in thi area. Site is already open acce land with recreational value tha would be lost as a result of development.</li> </ul>
Minerals and Waste
40What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?GDevelopment of this site would impact on safeguarded mineral and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?
Planning History
41What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)None relevant.
Does the site continue to next stage? No

# **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The golden thread running through plan making and decision taking is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF outlines that there are three dimensions to sustainable development which are the environmental, social and economic. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF outlines the Core Planning principles which includes: take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it; and take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

Development of entire site would cause a negative impact on the character of the landscape setting of the settlement, whereby the projection of built development would not visually appear as a logical extension to the settlement and would poorly relate to the surrounding built environment. Furthermore; due to Shillington's settlement pattern which features linked 'ends' that are separated by rural spatial 'gaps', the development of this site would result in the coalescence of and negative impact upon spatial setting of Woodmer End and Shillington, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. The latter is considered to form environmental harm which weighs heavily against development of this site.

The landscape here is clearly valued by local people, featuring an extensive and well used right of way network through the site which connects to a network of public right of ways through the

landscape and is a landscape in which people spend their leisure time, which is experienced close up and at a distance.

There is no doubt that any development on this site would lead to a change in character and appearance and that development would be immediately apparent to those using the associated footpath network. Even given a potential for provision of landscape buffers development of the site would fail to provide the isolation necessary either in landscape terms or in respecting the quieter more tranquil parts of the public right of way network. Therefore development of this whole site would unacceptably erode the rural setting of this landscape, neither conserving nor enhancing the varied countryside character or quality of the wider landscape, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.

It is not considered that this site is worthy of further consideration.

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

Site details	bite details				
Reference Number	Number NLP188				
Site Name Land to the North of Dawes Garage, 25 High Road					
Site Address	Land north of Dawes Garage				
Settlement	Shillington				
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 2.8 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 2.8 Ha				
	Measured GIS Area: 2.8 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 designated			ict with national policy designations.			
Provi	Provisional Site Capacity					
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 23 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 33			
Flood	<b>I Risk</b> (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	Site not in flood zone 2 or 3.			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	The site is at limited risk of surface water flooding.			
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 be	e subject to detailed assessment)			
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.			
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not located within an AONB.			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes			

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

This s insuffi towns provid	<b>STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT</b> This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>62</sup> . <b>Relationship to Settlement</b>				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	A	The site if developed as a whole would not appear as a logical extension to the settlement, however a portion o the site could be considered. There are no physical major constraints to development evident.		
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	Development of this site would not cause visual or physical coalescence with any neighbouring settlement.		
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>63</sup> .			
Critical Infrastructure				
8	Can the site meet the critical infrastructure	G	No constraints to meeting critical	
	requirements that will enable delivery <sup>64</sup> ?		infrastructure needs are evident.	
Does the site continue to next stage? Yes			Yes	

**STAGE 1D ASSESSMENT** 

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

Availa	Availability				
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	The site is disuses agricultural land, It is not considered that the existing use would limit the development potential of the site.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted on behalf of a private landowner. The intention of the landowner to develop the site has been expressed.		
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could	G	No legal or ownership issues that		

<sup>62</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. ( see https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locallyled garden villages towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical development. These infrastructure items are often known as 'blockers' or 'showstoppers', and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. Failure to provide these pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development. <sup>64</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure

requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

delay or prevent development?     Could delay or prevent development are evident.       If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcorme?     Could delay or prevent development are evident.       development are evident.     development are evident.       development are evident.     G     The site does not benefit from an extant planning permission for the proposed use?       Does the site continue to next stage?     Yes       STACE 1E ASSESMENT     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.       13     Is the site located within the Green Belt?     No     The site is not located within the Green Belt?       14     If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie within one of the parciels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?     N/A       15a     Does the site have ail of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may countibule to identification of exceptional circumstances?     N/A <ul> <li>Site nakes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in ordirectly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or directly adjacent to a settlem</li></ul>				
the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red proposed use.     extant planning permission for the proposed use.       Does the site continue to next stage?     Yes       STACE 1E ASSESSMENT     This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine any 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     The site is not located within the Green Belt that is deformed belt within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?     N/A       15a     Does the site have all of the following merits that may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?     N/A       4     . Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, wildle school, upper school, within the Luton HMA     Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)       Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*     N/A       15b     Sites which have support from the local community as demonst				could delay or prevent development are evident.
STAGE IE ASSESSMENT         This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan.         Greenbelt       1         13       Is the site located within the Green Belt?       No         The site is not located within the Green Belt?       N/A         within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt       N/A         Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.       N/A         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?       N/A          • 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)       N/A         • Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA       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          Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an ado	12	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red	G	extant planning permission for the
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.         13       Is the site located within the Green Belt?       No       The site is 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       N/A         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?       N/A         A 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 that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)         Site is in Green Belt ofter than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*       N/A         15b       Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has ben 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>6</sup>	Does			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.         13       Is the site located within the Green Belt?       No       The site is 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       N/A         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?       N/A         A 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 that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)         Site is in Green Belt ofter than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*       N/A         15b       Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has ben 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>6</sup>				
<ul> <li>13 Is the site located within the Green Belt?</li> <li>No The site is not located within the Green Belt?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, middle school, upper school, middle school, upper dibrave (Ito 2000) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites 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>55</sup></li> </ul>	This s scree Circur asses Plan.	section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt F ning of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable mstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined sement would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circu	of demo as suitab	nstrating Exceptional le based on the high level SHLAA
Image: state of the set				
<ul> <li>within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites sin Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> <li>N/A</li> <li>Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.<sup>65</sup></li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> <li>15b Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.<sup>65</sup></li> </ul>	14	within one of the parcels which have been identified in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage	N/A	
<b>15b</b> Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2.65N/A	15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of</li> </ul>	N/A	
	15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage	N/A	
	Does			Yes

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

 ${}^{\rm page}110$ 

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

	stage further assesses the site's suitability using detailed		
	tion does not mean that the site will be automatically exc		this stage as the ratings across
	e 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).	
	iously Developed Land	I -	
6	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition?	R	The use of the site is considered to be agricultural, whereby it is not
	<ul> <li>76% - 100% (G)</li> <li>26 - 75% (A)</li> </ul>		considered that the site would form previously developed land.
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
٦om	munity		
7	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	
	designated areas)		
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		
8	Community Consultation	No	No community consultation is
	Has any community consultation taken place?		evident.
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
	response.		
9	Sustainability of Settlement	No	Development of this site would not
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		result in the loss of services or
	the settlement through the loss of services and		facilities.
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
Cum	ulative Impact		
0	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 823
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	More than 20% growth (R)		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	G	Number of houses in 2016: 879
4	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	More than 20% growth (R)		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as		
	percentage of the total number of dwellings in April		
	2016 (as calculated using census and completions		
	data).		
Phys	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No physical constraints or
	features that affect the site's developability?		permanent features that would
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		affect the sites developability.
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
	tionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	Development of a portion of this
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		site would cause no unacceptable
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive	1	adverse impact on the historic,

	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?		unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form.
Agric	ultural Land Quality		
24	Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?	A	Development would result in the loss of Grade 3 agricultural land.
	<ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> </ul>		The split between grade 3a and 3b
	<ul> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> </ul>		is unknown.
	<ul> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>		

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



27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times): • Less than 400m (G)	R	Over 800m to bus stop with a frequent service. Development of this scale could not provide
	<ul> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul>		meaningful public transport improvements.
	<ul> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington – Meppershall.
			Service 89 – Henlow Camp - Shillington – Hitchin.
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	Over 1200m to Arlesey Station.
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>200m (A)</li> </ul>		
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
29	Over 1200m (R) Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	High Road
	ol Capacity	G	Tigh Koad
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not
			have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent lower may be able to
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	А	None identified.
•••	this?		
	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.
	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
	Leite allocatione un regarde to flood rick?	1	water flooding, assessment is
	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?		•
	<ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>		unlikely to be required.
	<ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>		•
Envir	<ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>		•
Envir 34	<ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> </ul>	R/A/G	•

	will there be any remediation required?		
35	Adjoining uses	А	Potential noise and fumes from
•••	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		neighbouring land uses (Garage
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		with MOT servicing and petrol
	noise and smell)		station),
Envir	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Development of site not
	What would the impacts of development be on the		acceptable; exposed, rural edge
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		site beyond settlement envelope /
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		Conservation Area. Potential wide
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		ranging views to south. Forms part
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		of landscape setting to
			Conservation Area, rural 'gaps'
			within settlement / intervening
			typical to village settlement pattern
			and defining characteristic 'end's.
			Site on gently rising ground – key concern is exposure of
			development on wider rural south /
			wide ranging views, especially in
			deciduous landscape setting and
			during winter months. However
			development of portion of site
			would partially mitigate impacts.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	А	The Council's Archaeologist has
	What would the impacts of development be on any		issued the following consultation
	heritage assets and their setting?		response:
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of		
	these assets?		Site has archaeological potential
			but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate
			mitigation is undertaken. This site
			lies adjacent to the historic core of
			the settlement of Shillington and
			another area of historic settlement
			at Clawders Hill Farm to the north
			east. Archaeological potential does
			not prevent allocation or
			development providing that an
			appropriate archaeological
			mitigation strategy in line with the
			requirements of para 141 of the NPPF is implemented.
			As this site has archaeological
			potential it is likely that an
			archaeological evaluation to satisfy
			para 128 of the NPPF would be
			required prior to a planning
			submission.
			Should the site be allocated, a
			contingency for archaeological
			works must be included in any
			proposal to prevent issues with
			viability.
		1	

38	Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are	G	The Council's Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the development of this site. However it is noted that the site is within the wider setting of listed buildings and beyond but adjoining the Shillington Conservation Area. Potential for enhancement, retain existing hedgerow and buffer. Development would be required to
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		provide a net gain for biodiversity.
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	A	Retain hedgerows.
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	Development of the site would impact upon existing or allocated minerals and waste sites or mineral safeguarding areas.
Plann	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None relevant.
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site adjoins, but is located beyond the Shillington Conservation Area and is located within the wider setting of the Listed Church which can be viewed over the site from the Bridleway to the east of the site. Thereby any harm caused by the development upon heritage assets shall be assessed in the context of paragraphs 132-134 of the NPPF. The Council's Conservation Officer, has raised no objection to development of this site provided that the site would be of an appropriate design, when considering the limited harm that would be caused by development upon the significance of heritage assets, it is considered that the public benefits of development within this site could outweigh the harm. Therefore it is considered that the site should not be precluded from development on grounds relating to impact upon the significance of heritage assets.

Furthermore; the site has archaeological potential but this would not prevent development providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken.

An objection has been raised by the Council's Landscape Officer in relation to the loss of a rural edge to the settlement and setting of the Conservation Area, and the harm to the settlement pattern and character. In addition concern raised in relation to the exposure of development to wider southern views, especially during the winter months. However it is considered that the impact upon the significance of heritage assets including their setting could be outweighed by appropriate design and the public benefits of development. The concern relating to the impact open views from the wider landscape is noted however, subject to appropriate landscaping and a logical portion of the site being developed it is considered that the harm caused by development would be outweighed by the benefits.

It is considered that the site if fully developed would not form a logical extension to the settlement with development appearing as an incursion of built development into the open countryside, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside. However it is considered that a portion of the site could be acceptable.  ${}^{\rm Page}115$ 

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

Page 1

		value areas of the Authority.
45	<ul> <li>When can the scheme realistically commence delivery?</li> <li>0 to 5 years (deliverable)</li> <li>6 to 10 years</li> <li>11 to 15 years</li> <li>15 to 20 years</li> <li>Outside Plan Period</li> </ul>	0 to 5 years
46	What is the indicative build out time of the site?	The Case Study Sites outlined within the Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that after the site has received detailed planning permission a single housebuilder would likely take one year to build out this site.
Does	the site pass this stage?	Yes

#### SUMMARY

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

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

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

 $P_{age}1$ 

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

Site details	
Reference Number	NLP241
Site Name	Land east of the High Road
Site Address	Land east of High Road, Shillington
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 5.5ha
	Submitted Whole Site Area: 5.5ha Measured GIS Area: 5.2ha
Proposed Use	Residential development
Any other information	

# STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provisional Site Capacity				
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 <ul> <li>Up to 0.4 hectare 100%</li> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul> <li>Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.</li>	lo Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 165 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 100			
Flood Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to the S	Sequential Test)			
2 Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 No or 3?	o Site not in floodzone 2 or 3			
3 Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface No water flooding?	o Site not at risk from surface water flooding			
Nationally significant designations (All sites which reach Stage	e 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.				
5 Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	o Not in AONB			
Does the site continue to next stage?	Yes			

Page 118

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

	STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT				
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an				
	insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing				
	or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a sel	f-contain	ed site is defined as a site which will		
provid	le 1,500 homes or more <sup>67</sup> .				
Relati	ionship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	A	The site forms an extension to Shillington in the south east. However, it is considered that this site would extend Shillington beyond the settlement envelope and therefore extend it unnaturally outwards as the site is separated from Shillington by the High Road in the west and a water course in 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		
	v				

### STAGE 1C ASSESSMENT

 This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not able to meet their critical infrastructure needs<sup>68</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>69</sup>?
 G
 Can be provided on 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** What is the existing use of the site? 9 G Agricultural Would the existing use limit the development potential? 10 Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner G The land is controlled by land who has expressed an intention to develop the site? owners intending to develop the site. 11 Are there any legal or ownership problems that could G There are no known legal or

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</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>69</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

	1	1	1
	delay or prevent development?		ownership problems that could
	If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?		prevent or delay development.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	There are no planning
	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red		applications on the site.
	because it's not eligible for allocation.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes
STAG	GE 1E ASSESSMENT		
This s	section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt F	Review a	nd also provides a preliminary
scree	ning of sites to determine whether they may be capable	of demo	nstrating Exceptional
Circu	mstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined	as suitab	ble based on the high level SHLAA
asses	ssment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circ	umstance	es to considered for allocation in the
Plan.			
Gree			
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	Not located in Green Belt
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	Yes or	N/A
	within one of the parcels which have been identified	No	
	in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt		
	Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no		
	contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage		
	2.		
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	Yes or	N/A
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which	No	
	may contribute to identification of exceptional		
	circumstances?		
	Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the		
	following key local services - convenience		
	shop, lower school, middle school, upper		
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,		
	library (use settlement audit)		
	Site makes a strong contribution to housing		
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA		
	• Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement		
	that has a mainline rail station or direct		
	assess (junction) to the strategic road		
	network (A road or motorway)		
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14		
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not		
	progress any further in this assessment of		
	suitability.*		
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	No	Site is not supported by a
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted		Neighbourhood Plan
	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 $2.^{70}$		

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

## **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

 ${}^{\rm Page}120$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

	e 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	)	
Prev	iously Developed Land		
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition?	R	Greenfield
	<ul> <li>76% - 100% (G)</li> <li>26 - 75% (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Com	munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	N/A
	designated areas)		
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		
18	Community Consultation	No	No consultation
	Has any community consultation taken place?		
	If yes, provide brief details on the form this		
	consultation took and any overall community		
19	response. Sustainability of Settlement	No	No import on systemshillty
19	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of	No	No impact on sustainability. The proposed development
	the settlement through the loss of services and		would require the reorganisation
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		of the allotments.
	house etc)		or the anotherits.
	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	There has been a 6.8% growth
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		in housing in Shillington.
	<ul><li>the parish?</li><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	There would be an additional
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed?		0.34% housing growth.
	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		
Phys	data). Sical Constraints		
<u>-11ys</u> 22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	A	Separated from Shillington by
	features that affect the site's developability?		High Road.
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
	tionship to Settlement	1	
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	R	The site would extend
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		development southwards,
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		beyond High Road. This would
	form?		not complement the existing
			settlement pattern.

Agric	ricultural Land Quality			
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	Grade 3	

STAC	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
This :	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents from	technical specialists. A red rating for
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		
Stage	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance	).	
Trans	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the si	te for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	A	Adjoining settlement
	applicable)?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Adjoining settlement
	school?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	A	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Not in the settlement or an adjoining		
00	settlement (R)	•	
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	A	Convenience store and Post
	Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)     Conversion on Store (Depth Office (Neuropean)		Office
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A) Nore (D)		
27	None (R)		Over 800m to hus star with a
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop with a
	least hourly at peak times):		frequent service. Development of
	• Less than 400m (G)		this scale could not provide meaningful public transport
	• 400m-800m (A)		

<ul> <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> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul> </li> <li>29 Is the site accessible from the existing road network? G yes         <ul> <li>School Capacity</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?</li> <li>A Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.</li> </ul> </li> <li>31 If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> <li>A Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and upper schools network</li> </ul>	
public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)       Provided as part of the development (G)         28       Distance to nearest train station: <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul> R     Over 1200m         29       Is the site accessible from the existing road network?       G       yes         School Capacity	
part of the development (G)       R         28       Distance to nearest train station: <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul> R <li>Over 1200m</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> <li>29</li> <li>Is the site accessible from the existing road network?</li> <li>G</li> <li>yes</li> <li>School Capacity</li> <li>30</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?</li> <li>A</li> <li>Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.</li> <li>31</li> <li>If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> <li>A</li> <li>Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and</li>	
28       Distance to nearest train station: <ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul> R     Over 1200m           29         Is the site accessible from the existing road network?         G         yes           School Capacity         School Capacity         A         Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.           30         Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?         A         Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and	
<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> <li>Is the site accessible from the existing road network? G yes</li> <li>School Capacity</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers? A</li> <li>Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.</li> <li>If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> <li>If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> <li>Is the site accessible from the existing road network? G yes</li> <li>School Capacity</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?</li> <li>A Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.</li> <li>If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> <li>A Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> <li>29 Is the site accessible from the existing road network? G yes</li> <li>School Capacity</li> <li>30 Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers? A Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.</li> <li>31 If not, has a commitment been made to address this? A Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and</li> </ul>	
29       Is the site accessible from the existing road network?       G       yes         School Capacity       30       Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?       A       Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.         31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A       Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and	
School Capacity         30       Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?       A       Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.         31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A       Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and	
<ul> <li>30 Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?</li> <li>31 If not, has a commitment been made to address this?</li> <li>31 A Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and</li> </ul>	
31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A       Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the improvide the to be able to be abl	
31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A       Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the implied of development without expansion. New middle and	
31       If not, has a commitment been made to address this?       A       Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and	
this? schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the impo of development without expansion. New middle and	
this? schools in this area are unlike to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and	
to be able to manage the import of development without expansion. New middle and	
of development without expansion. New middle and	Juor
expansion. New middle and	
upper school places may be	
provided within the proposed	
Brook Free School, if the	
application for that is approve	ed
by the EFA.	
Water Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastructure 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	nd
waste water infrastructure to new	w
development sites and a lack of	f
available capacity does not prev	vent
future development. Any	
infrastructure upgrades required	
will depend on the quantum and	d
location of growth falling within	
each catchment area. Whilst the	
Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (Apr	
2017) identifies the current capa	
of existing water infrastructure, a	
Stage 2 study will be prepared to	
test the cumulative effect of sites	es
that have been shortlisted for	
allocation in the Local Plan and	
identify the nature and timing of	ľ
any upgrades required.	
Drainage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Test)	~
<b>33</b> What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to A OW present, JFlow modelling	
site allocations, in regards to flood risk? required to confirm flood risk	
No assessment required (G)     Consider Further Assessment (A)	
Consider Further Assessment (A)	
Further Assessment Required (R)	
Environmental Health	
<b>34 Contamination</b> R/A/G Awaiting Comments	
Are there any contamination constraints on site and	
will there be any remediation required?	
35 Adjoining uses G No issues	
Would any adjoining uses have the potential to	

	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		
	noise and smell)		
Envi	ronmental Constraints	1	
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	inappropriate extension of development beyond settlement envelope in to open rural countryside.
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?	A	Site has multi-period archaeological potential but this would not prevent allocation providing appropriate mitigation is undertaken
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	R	Long established grassland, likely valuable foraging land for birds and mammals, old hedgerows & trees H/SPI
39	Open space/leisure and Gl assets Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	G/A	Aspiration identified in Parish GI plan to upgrade bridleway that runs along the northern edge of the site to a cycleway. Could be delivered as part of development. No loss of LS open space.
Mine	rals and Waste		
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues
	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		No planning history
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No

## STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is not to be considered further.

- The site is located to the south of High Road.
- Development does not extend beyond the road southwards.
- It is therefore considered that this would have an adverse impact on the settlement pattern of Shillington.

24 Page 1

# Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>71</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	NLP243
Site Name	The Gables, Land at New Walk
Site Address	New Walk, Shillington. SG5 3NP
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 5ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 5ha Measured GIS Area: 5.8
Proposed Use	Residential development
Any other information	ALP402 and ALP166

# STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)

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

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

 $_{\rm Page} 125$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

<b>STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT</b> This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>72</sup> . <b>Relationship to Settlement</b>					
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Shillington and there are no barriers to development. However, the proposed site would, join up two ends in Shillington.		
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	It would joins two ends of Shillington but not cause coalescence between two different villages.		
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 needs73.Critical InfrastructureGCan be provided on site8Can the site meet the critical infrastructureGCan be provided on site

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>74</sup>?
 G
 Can be provided on 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.

Availa	Availability				
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	The land is controlled by land owners intending to develop 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	There are no known legal or ownership problems that could prevent or delay development.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )
<sup>73</sup> Critical infrastructure is that which has been identified as infrastructure that must happen to enable physical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</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>74</sup> This is an approximate the provide the provide the provide the pieces of infrastructure could result in significant delays in the delivery of development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	There are no planning	
	the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red		applications on the site.	
	because it's not eligible for allocation.			
Doest	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	
STAG	E 1E ASSESSMENT			
	ection records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt F			
	ning of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable			
	nstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined			
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circ	umstance	es to considered for allocation in the	
Plan.				
Green				
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	Not located in Green Belt	
14	If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie	Yes	N/A	
	within one of the parcels which have been identified	or No		
	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			
45-	2.	Mar		
15a	Does the site have all of the following merits that	Yes	N/A	
	may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional	or No	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	circumstances?			
	<ul> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key least convision</li> </ul>			
	following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper			
	school, village hall, GP surgery, post office,			
	library (use settlement audit)			
	<ul> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing</li> </ul>			
	need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA			
	<ul> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement</li> </ul>		~	
	that has a mainline rail station or direct			
	assess (junction) to the strategic road			
	network (A road or motorway)			
	Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14			
	and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not			
	progress any further in this assessment of			
	suitability.*			
15b	Sites which have support from the local community	No	Site is not supported by a	
	as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted		Neighbourhood Plan	
	or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject		<b>J</b>	
	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>75</sup>			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes	

# STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

## **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

Page L

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

		-	
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition?	R	Greenfield
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)		
	munity	T	
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	N/A
	designated areas)		
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		
18	Community Consultation	No	No consultation
	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 house etc)		
Cum	ulative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Thoro has been a 6.99/ growth
20	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		There has been a 6.8% growth
	the parish?		in housing in Shillington.
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	<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	There would be an additional
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		0.34% housing growth.
	be completed?		
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	<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).		
	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No physical constraints
	features that affect the site's developability?		
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		
<b>D</b>	works, topography or wind turbines.		
	tionship to Settlement		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to		Although the site doesn't
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an	A	necessarily cause complete
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		coalescence between two
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		settlements it does infill a large
	form?		paddock which separates the
			main village of Shillington from
			Hillfoot End and this would have

			an adverse impact on the settlement pattern of Shillington.
Agricultural Land Quality			
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	Grade 3

STAG	E 2 ASSESSMENT		
This s	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents from	technical specialists. A red rating for
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		
	e 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		5 5
	sport and Access to Services		
25	Facilities and services		
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement
	• 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	А	Adjoining settlement
	applicable)?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		~
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	А	Adjoining settlement
	school?		, ,
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		
	<ul> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	А	Convenience store and Post
	<ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>		Office
	<ul> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent</li> </ul>		
	(A)		
	None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop with a
	least hourly at peak times):		frequent service. Development of
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>		this scale could not provide
	• 400m-800m (A)		meaningful public transport
	• Over 800m (R)		improvements.

	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	Over 1200m
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>800m-1200m (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Over 1200m (R)</li> </ul>		
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	yes
Scho	ol Capacity		
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	А	Cumulative impact of
			developments could be a
			concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	A	Lower, middle and upper
51	this?		
			schools in this area are unlikely
			to be able to manage the impact
			of development without
			expansion. New middle and
			upper school places may be
			provided within the proposed Pix
			Brook Free School, if the
			application for that is approved
			by the EFA.
Water	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.
Drain	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	st)	
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
	Consider Further Assessment (A)		
	<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	G	No issues
		0	
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		

	noise and smell)		
Envi	ronmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character What would the impacts of development be on the landscape character or setting of the area or any designated landscapes? Would there be any direct or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?	A	Limited potential for low density development. Significant landscape corridor would be required connecting village green with sports fields and wider countryside.
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?	G	Site is considered to have low archaeological potential. No objection to allocation
38	<b>Ecological Assets</b> What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A/R	Important hedgerows/ trees to be retained, buffered and enhanced. Valuable for SPI
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?	R	Parish GI plan aspiration for this area to create new open access sites to maintain the green centre of the village. No loss of LS open space.
Mine	rals and Waste		· · ·
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	No issues
Plan	ning History		
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		No planning history
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site if fully developed would on plan appear to join High Road and Hillfoot Road, whereby the Landscaping Officer has objected to the development of the entire site on grounds relating to the character of the settlement. However, it is considered that subject to an appropriate scale of development, that development within the site will not be visually prominent within the landscape or the streetscene of either Hillfoot Road or High Road due to mature landscaping which would be sought to be retained and enhanced. Thereby it is considered that such harm would not be significant. It is considered that the development of this site is suitable subject to appropriate details and infrastructure capacity. More detail relating to the access to the site will be required.

#### **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?	G	The Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that	

	<ul> <li>High (G) Benchmark land value comfortably exceeded by likely residual value</li> <li>Low (A) Marginal viability, with likely residual land value close to benchmark land value</li> <li>Very Low (R) Likely residual value well below benchmark land value</li> </ul>	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?	Site not under option from developer 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	<ul> <li>When can the scheme realistically commence delivery?</li> <li>0 to 5 years (deliverable)</li> <li>6 to 10 years</li> <li>11 to 15 years</li> <li>15 to 20 years</li> <li>Outside Plan Period</li> </ul>	0 to 5 years
46	What is the indicative build out time of the site?	Over a two year period The Case Study Sites outlined within the Council's Residential Development Viability Report (Feb 2017) indicates that after the site has received detailed planning permission a single housebuilder would likely take one year to build out this site.
Does	the site pass this stage?	Yes

SUMMARY

# Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>76</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	NLP252
Site Name	Church Land
Site Address	Hill Side, Shillington, SG5 3NN
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 2.4ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 5ha Measured GIS Area: 5.9ha
Proposed Use	Residential development
Any other information	

**STAGE 1 : SUITABILITY AND AVAILABILITY (EXCLUSIONARY STAGE)** This section will exclude any sites which do not pass the exclusionary suitability criteria and they will not be assessed further.

OTAC					
	STAGE 1A ASSESSMENT				
	stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too sma	II OF CONI	lict with hational policy designations.		
	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 20-30 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 58		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ential Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	Site not in floodzone 2 or 3		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	Site not at risk from surface water flooding		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally 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 in AONB		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

 $_{\rm Page}134$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

<b>STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT</b> This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more <sup>77</sup> .			
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	A	The site could potentially form an extension to Shillington. However, it would be more suitable is only a portion of the site were considered for development. The site is considered large in scale in relation to the village.
	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 t	he 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>78</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure requirements that will enable delivery<sup>79</sup>?
 G
 Can be provided on site

 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes/No

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

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

Availa	Availability				
9	What is the existing use of the site?	G	Agricultural		
	Would the existing use limit the development				
	potential?				
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	IJ	The land is controlled by land owners intending to develop the site.		
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development?	G	There are no known legal or ownership problems that could		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>77</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>78</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>79</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.

	If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?		prevent or delay development.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	G	There are no planning applications on the site.
Does	the site continue to next stage?	•	Yes

**STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT** This section records the findings of the Strategic Green Belt Review and also provides a preliminary screening of sites to determine whether they may be capable of demonstrating Exceptional Circumstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined as suitable based on the high level SHLAA assessment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circumstances to considered for allocation in the Plan. Greenbelt 13 Is the site located within the Green Belt? No Not located in Green Belt 14 If answer to question 13 is yes, then does the site lie Yes or Details within one of the parcels which have been identified No in the Central Bedfordshire and Luton Green Belt Study as making only a relatively weak, weak, or no contribution? If yes, site progresses through to Stage 2. 15a Does the site have all of the following merits that Yes or Details may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which No 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.\*
 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>80</sup>

Does the site continue to next stage?

## Yes

## STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)

## **STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT**

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>80</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

Stage	Stage 2A will be looked at as a whole using planning balance.				
	ously Developed Land				
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance with the NPPF definition? • 76% - 100% (G) • 26 - 75% (A) • 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)	R	Greenfield		
Com	munity				
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	N/A		
17	designated areas) Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan?				
18	<b>Community Consultation</b> Has any community consultation taken place? If yes, provide brief details on the form this consultation took and any overall community response.	No	No consultation		
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	No impact on sustainability. The proposed development would require the reorganisation of the allotments.		
Cum	ulative Impact				
20 21	Considering housing completions over the past 10 years, what has been the level of housing growth in the parish? <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> <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> <li>What level of housing growth would there be if all the outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to be completed? <ul> <li>Less than 5% growth (G)</li> <li>5% to 20% growth (A)</li> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul> </li> <li>This is calculated by working out the total number of outstanding permissions as of April 1st 2016 as percentage of the total number of dwellings in April 2016 (as calculated using census and completions</li>	G	There has been a 6.8% growth in housing in Shillington. There would be an additional 0.34% housing growth.		
Dhye	data). ical Constraints				
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent features that affect the site's developability? For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment works, topography or wind turbines.	G	No physical constraints		
Relat	ionship to Settlement		·		
23	Would development of the site be complementary to the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?	A	The site would extend development southwards and result in an under developed parcel of land between the existing settlement and new development.		

Agricultural Land Quality				
24	<ul> <li>Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?</li> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)</li> </ul>	A	Grade 3	

STAG	GE 2 ASSESSMENT		
	stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme	ents from	technical specialists. A red rating for
	uestion does not mean that the site will be automatically		
	2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance		
	sport and Access to Services	-	
25	Facilities and services		
20	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the
	Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.		
	Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately		
25a	Does the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?	G	In settlement
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)	•	
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)		
25b	Does the settlement have a Middle school (if	A	Adjoining settlement
250	applicable)?	~	Aujoining 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>		
25.0	Other catchment school available (A)	٨	A disining softland at
25c	Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper	A	Adjoining settlement
	school?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)		
	Other catchment school available (A)		
25d	Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical	А	Adjoining settlement
	centre?		
	• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
	<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining</li> </ul>		
	settlement (R)	_	
26	What retail provision does the settlement offer?	А	Convenience store and Post
	<ul> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> </ul>		Office
	Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent		
	(A)		
	None (R)		
27	Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at	R	Over 800m to bus stop with a
	least hourly at peak times):		frequent service. Development of
	<ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> </ul>		this scale could not provide
	• 400m-800m (A)		meaningful public transport
	• Over 800m (R)		improvements.
	OR submission form stated that improved		
	public transport facilities could be provided as		
	· · · ·		-

 ${}^{\rm Page}138$ 

	part of the dovelopment (C)		
	part of the development (G)		
28	Distance to nearest train station: • Less than 800m (G) • 800m-1200m (A) • Over 1200m (R)	R	Over 1200m
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	yes
	ol Capacity	1	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Cumulative impact of developments could be a concern.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address this?	A	Lower, middle and upper schools in this area are unlikely to be able to manage the impact of development without expansion. New middle and upper school places may be provided within the proposed Pix Brook Free School, if the application for that is approved by the EFA.
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required infrastructure for waste water and potable water?	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a statutory duty to supply water and waste water infrastructure to new development sites and a lack of available capacity does not prevent future development. Any infrastructure upgrades required will depend on the quantum and location of growth falling within each catchment area. Whilst the Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April 2017) identifies the current capacity of existing water infrastructure, a Stage 2 study will be prepared to test the cumulative effect of sites that have been shortlisted for allocation in the Local Plan and identify the nature and timing of any upgrades required.
Drain	age and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te	et)	any upgrades required.
33	<ul> <li>What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> <li>Consider Further Assessment (A)</li> <li>Further Assessment Required (R)</li> </ul>	G	Site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required
	onmental Health		
34	<b>Contamination</b> Are there any contamination constraints on site and will there be any remediation required?	R/A/G	Awaiting comments
35	Adjoining uses Would any adjoining uses have the potential to cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example; noise and smell)	G	No issues

36 Landscape character R historic landscape sett	
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?	ntal impact
<ul> <li>37 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 these assets?</li> <li>R Site has multi-period archaeological potentia would not prevent allo providing appropriate is undertaken.</li> <li>Impact on setting of LE Church and Farm with sensitive location.</li> </ul>	cation mitigation 3s –
38Ecological Assets What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/GSmall area of housing with potential GI enhancement?38Ecological Assets what would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are there any opportunities for their enhancement?A/GSmall area of housing with potential GI enhancement?	ncement.
<b>39 Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	plan.
Minerals and Waste	
40       What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?       G       No issues	
Planning History	
41What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)No planning history	
Does the site continue to next stage? No	

## STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is not to be considered further.

- The site would result in development that would have an adverse impact on the settlement pattern.
- It would also result in a parcel of under developed land between the new development and existing settlement envelope.
- There are also concerns about the development on the impact on the setting on the listed building which is located within a very sensitive location.
- In terms of landscape, the site is elevated and would result in detriment al impact on the character and views.

# Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>81</sup>

Site details	Site details					
Reference Number	NLP395					
Site Name	Land at Hillfort Road					
Site Address	Land at Hillfort Road					
Settlement	Shillington					
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 1.67 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 1.67 Ha Measured GIS Area: 1.67 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.

STVC	E 1A ASSESSMENT				
-	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
	sional Site Capacity	Na	Number of supercool duallings of		
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 %		40		
	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>				
	<ul> <li>0.4 to 2 hectares 80%</li> </ul>		50		
	<ul> <li>2 hectares or above 60%</li> </ul>				
	Note: for this calculation use the submitted				
	Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if				
	this is smaller.				
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2	No	Site is not located within flood zone		
	or 3?		2 or 3.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface	No	Less than 50% of the site is at risk		
	water flooding?		from surface water flooding.		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally	No	The site is not covered by a		
	significant designations? These are: Sites of Special		nationally significant designation.		
	Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves,				
	Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and				
	Gardens.				
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area	No	The site is not located within an		
	of Outstanding Natural Beauty?		AONB.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes		

 $P_{age}$ 141

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>81</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

### **STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT**

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>82</sup>.

Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	G	The site is well related to Shillington and there are no physical barriers.	
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 does impact the existing village pattern by coalescing Hillfoot End and Shillington.	
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>83</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>84</sup>?
 G
 None identified.

 9
 Does the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

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

Availa	ability		
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	G	It is considered that the existing use of the site would not limit the development potential of the site.
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted on behalf of the sole landowner, intention to develop is stated.
11	Are there any legal or ownership problems that could delay or prevent development? If Yes, then can these be issues be realistically overcome?	G	Submission states no legal or ownership issues.
12	Does the site already have planning permission for the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red	G	The site does not benefit from planning permission for the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>82</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>83</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>84</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

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

<b>STAGE 1E ASSESSMENT</b> 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							
asses Plan.	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	The site is 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					
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A					
15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage 2. <sup>85</sup>	N/A					
Does the site continue to next stage?			Yes				

STAGE 2 : SUITABILITY (DETAILED ASSESSMENT)						
STAG	GE 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 not considered to form			
	· · ·	•	•			

 $_{\rm Page}143$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>85</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?		previously developed land.
	• 76% - 100% (G)		previously developed faild.
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
Com	• 25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R) munity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	
17	designated areas)	INU	
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		
18	emerging Neighbourhood Plan? Community Consultation	No	None evident.
10		INO	None evident.
	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	Development of the site would not
19	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		result in the loss of services and
	the settlement through the loss of services and		facilities.
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		lacinities.
	house etc)		
Cum	ulative Impact	1	
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	А	Number of houses in 2006: 823
20	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2000. 025
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Tereentage Growth. 0.078
	More than 20% growth (R)  This is calculated by warking out the total number of		
	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: 879
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	G	
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to		Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	• 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		
DI	data).		
	ical Constraints		
22	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	G	No physical constraints or
	features that affect the site's developability?		permanent features that affect the
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		site's developability.
Dalat	works, topography or wind turbines.		
	ionship to Settlement	D	Douglopmont of the site would
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	R	Development of the site would
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an		cause harm to the character and
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		appearance and the significance of
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		the Conservation Area of
	form?		Shillington, which includes its
And	ultural Land Quality		setting.
-	ultural Land Quality		Less of lend within Orada 2 of the
24	Would the development impact on high quality agricultural land?	A	Loss of land within Grade 3 of the
	1 2000000020120007	1	Agricultural Land Classification.

•	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 d</li> </ul>	or 3a (	(R)
---	---------	-----

further assesses the site's suitability using comme on does not mean that the site will be automatically will be looked at as a whole using planning balance and Access to Services silities and services estion 26 considers the suitability and sustainability uncil's Settlement Hierarchy Audit. uses relating to capacity are assessed separately es the settlement have a Primary/Lower school? • Yes, in the settlement (G)	of the sit	d at this stage as the ratings across
will be looked at as a whole using planning balance and Access to Services illities and services estion 26 considers the suitability and sustainability uncil's Settlement Hierarchy Audit. ues relating to capacity are assessed separately es the settlement have a Primary/Lower school? • Yes, in the settlement (G)	of the sit	
<ul> <li>and Access to Services</li> <li>ilities and services</li> <li>estion 26 considers the suitability and sustainability</li> <li>uncil's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.</li> <li>ues relating to capacity are assessed separately</li> <li>es the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>	of the sit	e for housing. It links to the
<ul> <li>ilities and services</li> <li>estion 26 considers the suitability and sustainability</li> <li>uncil's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.</li> <li>ues relating to capacity are assessed separately</li> <li>es the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		e for housing. It links to the
estion 26 considers the suitability and sustainability uncil's Settlement Hierarchy Audit. ues relating to capacity are assessed separately es the settlement have a Primary/Lower school? • Yes, in the settlement (G)		e for housing. It links to the
<ul> <li>Incil's Settlement Hierarchy Audit.</li> <li>Incil's Sett</li></ul>		e for housing. It links to the
<ul> <li>es relating to capacity are assessed separately</li> <li>es the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li> <li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li> </ul>		
<ul><li>s the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li><li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li></ul>		
<ul><li>s the settlement have a Primary/Lower school?</li><li>Yes, in the settlement (G)</li></ul>		
• Yes, in the settlement (G)		
	G	In settlement
• Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)		
<ul> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> </ul>	r	
	A	Adjoining settlement
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	A	Adjoining settlement
	•	
	А	Adjoining settlement
	^	Convenience store and Dest Office
	А	Convenience store and Post Office
	D	Over 800m to bus stop with a
	ĸ	frequent service. Development of
		this scale could not provide
		meaningful public transport
		improvements.
•		Service 79 – Luton – Shillington –
· · · ·		Meppershall
		Service 89 – Henlow Camp -
	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> <li>es the settlement have a Middle school (if blicable)?</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>Other catchment school available (A)</li> <li>es the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper ool?</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>Other catchment school available (A)</li> <li>es the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper ool?</li> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> <li>es the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical tire?</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>Other catchment or an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> <li>at retail provision does the settlement offer?</li> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)</li> <li>None (R)</li> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Not in the settlement or an adjoining settlement (R)</li> <li>as the settlement have a Middle school (if blicable)?</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>Other catchment school available (A)</li> <li>as the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper ool?</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>Other catchment school available (A)</li> <li>es the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper ool?</li> <li>Yes, proposed as part of the development (G)</li> <li>No, but an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Other catchment school available (A)</li> <li>Bes the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical ttre?</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>Other catchment or an adjoining settlement does (A)</li> <li>Not in the settlement 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> <li>at retail provision does the settlement offer?</li> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)</li> <li>None (R)</li> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as</li> </ul>

			Shillington - Hitchin
20	Distance to persent train station:	D	
28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	Over 1200m to Arlesey Train Station.
	<ul> <li>Less than 800m (G)</li> <li>800m 1200m (A)</li> </ul>		Station:
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
29	Over 1200m (R)     Is the site accessible from the existing read network?	G	Hillfort Road
	Is the site accessible from the existing road network? ol Capacity	G	
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not
00		~	have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent lower may be able to
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	А	None identified
	this?		
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	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	Ġ	Site is at limited risk of surface
	site allocations, in regards to flood risk?		water flooding, no further
	<ul> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>		assessment 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	G	No identified neighbouring land
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		uses would likely cause conflict
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		with the proposed use in relation to
	noise and smell)		pollution.
	onmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Development of site not
	What would the impacts of development be on the		acceptable; highly important
	landscape character or setting of the area or any	1	landscape / spatial gap within

	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		settlement pattern - forms part of
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		landscape setting within
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		Conservation Area. Site forms landscape feature
			separating village 'ends' highly
			typical of layout of Shillington. Site
			forms part of landscape setting
			within Conservation Area and must
			be retained as such, relates to links
			with rural landscape beyond.
			Development would result in infill, would have a highly detrimental
			impact on landscape character
			within the village envelope and is
			not acceptable.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology	R	The site is located beyond the
	What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?		Settlement Envelope of Shillington and is within the conservation
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of		area and is within the open
	these assets?	r	countryside. The proposed
			development would, by virtue
			of its open countryside location and
			its relationship with the existing settlement, result
			in the loss of an area of valued
			open space and the introduction of
			built form would have a harmful
			impact on character of the area and
			local amenity and would fail to
			either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the
			Conservation Area at this edge of
			settlement location.
			The Council's Archaeologist has
			issued the following consultation
			response:
			This site is considered to have low
			archaeological potential on the
			basis of the results of an
			archaeological field evaluation
			undertaken as part of planning
			application CB/16/02901/FULL,
			therefore the Archaeology Team have no objection to its allocation.
38	Ecological Assets	A	Planning application
	What would the impacts of development be on any		CB/16/02901/FULL, illustrative
	biological, geological or ecological assets and are		layout too dense to deliver net gain.
39	there any opportunities for their enhancement?	A	Hodgorows would pood to be
29	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space,	A	Hedgerows would need to be retained and enhanced, and
	leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there		access provision enhanced – RoW
	capacity to provide the required levels of open space		running across site
	and green infrastructure?		
Miner	als and Waste		

 $P_{age}147$ 

40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	Development of the site would not impact upon any existing or allocated minerals and waste sites or mineral safeguarding areas.
Planning History			
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		Refusal for 41 dwellings - CB/16/02901/FULL
Does the site continue to next stage?			No

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

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The site is within the conservation area and is within the open countryside. The development of this site, by virtue of its open countryside location and its relationship with the existing settlement, result in the loss of an area of valued open space and the introduction of built form would have a harmful impact on character of the area and local amenity and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area at this edge of settlement location. It is considered that the public benefits of developing the site would not outweigh the harm to designated heritage assets which includes their setting, and as such paragraph 132-134 indicated development should be restricted. The adverse impacts of the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal would not amount to sustainable development.

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>86</sup>

Site details	
Reference Number	NLP423
Site Name	Land at Archers Farm, Handscombe End Road
Site Address	Land at Archers Farm Handscombe End Road
Settlement	Shillington
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 0.52 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 3.3 Ha
	Measured GIS Area: 3.3 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					
	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.					
	sional Site Capacity					
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: 11 Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 12			
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	A small section of the site is within Flood Zone 2.			
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	The site is at limited risk of surface water flooding, assessment is unlikely to be required.			
	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	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation.			
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not located within the AONB.			
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes/			

<sup>86</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

STAG	STAGE 1B ASSESSMENT				
	tage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well	related to	o existing settlements but are of an		
	cient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites wh				
	or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a sel				
provid	le 1,500 homes or more <sup>87</sup> .				
Relati	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 is isolated from Shillington and would appear as a stand alone development within the Countryside. It is not considered that the development of this site would be of a scale that is sufficient to enable the development to be self contained in relation to services and facilities.		
<ul> <li>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.</li> </ul>			The site would not cause visual or physical coalescence between settlements.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No		

 $_{\rm Page}150$ 

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

#### Site Assessment Framework for HOUSING<sup>88</sup>

Site details		
Reference Number	NLP524	
Site Name	Land off Bury Road	
Site Address	Land off Bury Road	
Settlement	Shillington	
Size	Submitted Developable Area: 2.8 Ha Submitted Whole Site Area: 2.8 Ha Measured GIS Area: 2.8 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 s	This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are too small or conflict with national policy designations.				
Provi	sional Site Capacity				
1	Is the site likely to accommodate less than 10 dwellings? Work out the number of new homes from site size using density of 30dph and exclude up to 40 % depending on site size of land for infrastructure and services, take into account topography or significant areas of undevelopable land. Site Size Gross to net ratio standards • Up to 0.4 hectare 100% • 0.4 to 2 hectares 80% • 2 hectares or above 60% Note: for this calculation use the submitted Developable Area, or the area measured in GIS if this is smaller.	No	Number of proposed dwellings as per proforma: Number of proposed dwellings as per CBC methodology: 30		
Flood	Risk (All sites which reach Stage 2 will be subject to th	ne Seque	ntial Test)		
2	Is more than 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	No	A portion of the site is within Flood Zone 2 however this area is less than 50%.		
3	Is more than 50% of the site at risk from surface water flooding?	No	The site is at limited risk of surface water flooding.		
Natio	nally significant designations (All sites which reach S	tage 2 b	e subject to detailed assessment)		
4	Is more than 50% of the site covered by nationally significant designations? These are: Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens.	No	The site is not covered by a nationally significant designation		
5	Is more than 50% of the site located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	The site is not located within an AONB.		
Does	Does the site continue to next stage? Yes				

Page 151

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>88</sup> Employment sites and Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed using separate bespoke site assessment criteria.

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

This stage of the assessment rules out sites that are not well related to existing settlements but are of an insufficient size to be self contained. It also rules out sites which would cause coalescence of existing towns or villages. For the purposes of this assessment, a self-contained site is defined as a site which will provide 1,500 homes or more<sup>89</sup>.

Relat	Relationship to Settlement				
6	For sites that are not of a sufficient scale to be self- contained, is the site a logical extension to the settlement or are there any major physical constraints(for example A roads, rivers or railways) that separate it from the main settlement?	A	The site is connected to Woodmer End, however it is not considered that development of the entire site would form a logical extension to the 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	It is considered that development of the site would not cause physical or visual coalescence of settlements.		
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>90</sup>.

 Critical Infrastructure

 8
 Can the site meet the critical infrastructure needs<sup>91</sup>?
 G
 None identified.

 Boes the site continue to next stage?
 Yes

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

Avail	Availability				
9	What is the existing use of the site? Would the existing use limit the development potential?	A	The existing use of the site would not limit the development potential of the site.		
10	Is the land controlled by a developer or land owner who has expressed an intention to develop the site?	G	The site has been submitted on behalf of the private landowner. The intention to develop the site is expressed.		
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 that could delay or prevent development are evident.		
12	Does the site already have planning permission for	G	The site does not benefit from an		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>89</sup> The figure of 1,500 homes has been taken from the Government Publication 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities'. This defines the eligibility criteria for Garden Villages as standalone settlements of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. (see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/508205/Locally-led garden villages</a> towns and cities.pdf )

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>90</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>91</sup> This is an assessment based on the information known at this stage, a full assessment of infrastructure requirements will be undertaken before any sites are allocated.

the proposed use? If yes, then score as Red because it's not eligible for allocation.	extant planning permission for the proposed use.
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			
	ning of sites to determine whether they <u>may</u> be capable		
	nstances. Any site in the Green Belt that is determined		
	sment would still have to demonstrate Exceptional Circ	umstance	es to considered for allocation in the
Plan.	• •		
Greer			
13	Is the site located within the Green Belt?	No	The site is 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	
15a	<ul> <li>Does the site have all of the following merits that may outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and which may contribute to identification of exceptional circumstances?</li> <li>Adjoining settlement has at least 3 of the following key local services - convenience shop, lower school, middle school, upper school, village hall, GP surgery, post office, library (use settlement audit)</li> <li>Site makes a strong contribution to housing need (100 plus homes) within the Luton HMA</li> <li>Site is in or directly adjacent to a settlement that has a mainline rail station or direct assess (junction) to the strategic road network (A road or motorway)</li> <li>Sites in Green Belt other than those covered by 14 and 15b that cannot meet these criteria, will not progress any further in this assessment of suitability.*</li> </ul>	N/A	
15b	Sites which have support from the local community as demonstrated through an allocation in an adopted or draft Neighbourhood Plan (that has been subject to Regulation 14 consultation) that do not meet the criteria in question 15a will automatically progress through this stage to be considered further at Stage $2.^{92}$	N/A	
Does	the site continue to next stage?		Yes
			1

#### **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** 

23 Page **L** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>92</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan allocations in Green Belt that are proposed after this site assessment phase has concluded, may still be considered for allocation.

		_	
16	Is the site Previously Developed Land in accordance	R	The site is not considered to form
	with the NPPF definition?		previously developed land.
	• 76% - 100% (G)		
	• 26 - 75% (A)		
	<ul> <li>25% - 0% (Greenfield) (R)</li> </ul>		
Comr	nunity		
17	Neighbourhood Planning (only applicable in	No	
	designated areas)		
	Is the site identified as a housing allocation in an		
	emerging Neighbourhood Plan?		
18	Community Consultation	No	None evident.
	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	Development of the site would not
	Would this proposal impact on the sustainability of		result in the loss of services or
	the settlement through the loss of services and		facilities.
	facilities (for example, employment, retail, public		
	house etc)		
Cum	Jative Impact		
20	Considering housing completions over the past 10	A	Number of houses in 2006: 823
	years, what has been the level of housing growth in		Number of houses in 2016: 879
	the parish?		Percentage Growth: 6.8%
	Less than 5% growth (G)		
	• 5% to 20% growth (A)		
	<ul> <li>More than 20% growth (R)</li> </ul>		
	This is calculated by working out the total number of		
	completions over the last ten years as a percentage		
	of the dwellings in April 2006 (as calculated using		
	census and completions data).		
21	What level of housing growth would there be if all the	G	Number of houses in 2016: 879
	outstanding permissions (as of April 2016) were to	-	Number of outstanding completions
	be completed?		2016: 3
	Less than 5% growth (G)		Percentage Growth: 0.34%
	• 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	ical Constraints	I	I
<u>22</u>	Are there any physical constraints or permanent	Α	Telegraph pole/cables within the
-	features that affect the site's developability?		site, and public rights of way
	For example pylons, gas works, sewage treatment		through the site.
	works, topography or wind turbines.		
Relat	ionship to Settlement		1
23	Would development of the site be complementary to	G	Development of the site would
	the existing settlement pattern, and would it have an	-	nucleate development to the west
	adverse impact on any historic, unique or distinctive		of Bury Road.
		1	
	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural		
Aaric	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural form?		
Agric 24	characteristics of the settlement's built or natural	A	Development of the site would

	<ul> <li>50% or more in non-agricultural land (G)</li> <li>50% of more in Grade 3b, 4 or 5 (A)</li> <li>50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 32 (B)</li> </ul>		agricultural land. The split between grade 3a and 3b is not known.
	• 50% or more in Grade 1, 2 or 3a (R)		
This s any q Stage	GE 2 ASSESSMENT stage further assesses the site's suitability using comme juestion does not mean that the site will be automatically a 2B will be looked at as a whole using planning balance sport and Access to Services Facilities and services	/ exclude e.	d at this stage as the ratings across
	Question 26 considers the suitability and sustainability Council's Settlement Hierarchy Audit. Issues relating to capacity are assessed separately	of the sit	e 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 settlement (R)</li> </ul>	G	In settlement
25b	<ul> <li>Does the settlement have a Middle school (if applicable)?</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>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>	A	Adjoining settlement
25c	<ul> <li>Does the settlement have a Secondary/ Upper 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>Other catchment school available (A)</li> </ul>	A	Adjoining settlement
25d	<ul> <li>Does the settlement have a GPs surgery or medical centre?</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>	A	Adjoining settlement
26	<ul> <li>What retail provision does the settlement offer?</li> <li>Town Centre/ Supermarket (G)</li> <li>Convenience Store / Post Office / Newsagent (A)</li> <li>None (R)</li> </ul>	A	Convenience store and Post Office
27	<ul> <li>Distance to bus stops with a frequent service (at least hourly at peak times): <ul> <li>Less than 400m (G)</li> <li>400m-800m (A)</li> <li>Over 800m (R)</li> </ul> </li> <li>OR submission form stated that improved public transport facilities could be provided as part of the development (G)</li> </ul>	R	Over 800m to bus stop with a frequent service. Development of this scale could not provide meaningful public transport improvements. Service 79 – Luton – Shillington – Meppershall Service 89 – Henlow Camp - Shillington - Hitchin

28	Distance to nearest train station:	R	Over 1200m to Arlesey Station
	• Less than 800m (G)		
	• 800m-1200m (A)		
	• Over 1200m (R)	-	
29	Is the site accessible from the existing road network?	G	Bury Road
	ol Capacity		Objillio et en la entre Och e el de en ret
30	Do the local schools have capacity at all tiers?	A	Shillington Lower School does not
			have existing capacity to
			accommodate new growth.
			Derwent lower may be able to
			accommodate some expansion.
			Middle and upper school places are
			very tight in this area.
31	If not, has a commitment been made to address	A	None identified
51	this?		None identified
Wate	r Utilities (Gas, Electricity and Broadband Infrastruc	ture will	be assessed at a later stage)
32	Is there the capacity to provide all required	R/A/G	Water utilities companies have a
_	infrastructure for waste water and potable water?		statutory duty to supply water and
			waste water infrastructure to new
			development sites and a lack of
			available capacity does not prevent
			future development. Any
			infrastructure upgrades required
			will depend on the quantum and
			location of growth falling within
			each catchment area. Whilst the
			Stage 1 Water Cycle Study (April
			2017) identifies the current capacity
			of existing water infrastructure, a
			Stage 2 study will be prepared to
			test the cumulative effect of sites
			that have been shortlisted for
			allocation in the Local Plan and
			identify the nature and timing of
			any upgrades required.
	nage and Flooding (All sites subject to Sequential Te		Firstly an end of the strike d
33	What is the conclusion of the sequential approach to	R	Further assessment required.
	<ul> <li>site allocations, in regards to flood risk?</li> <li>No assessment required (G)</li> </ul>		
	Consider Further Assessment (A)		
Envi	Further Assessment Required (R) ronmental 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 identified sources of pollution
	Would any adjoining uses have the potential to		on neighbouring land uses that
	cause conflict with the proposed use? (for example;		would conflict within the proposed
	noise and smell)		use.
Envi	ronmental Constraints		
36	Landscape character	R	Development of site not
	What would the impacts of development be on the		acceptable; impact on character of
	landscape character or setting of the area or any		landscape setting to village
	designated landscapes? Would there be any direct		envelope, development will be
	or indirect harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural		poorly related to settlement / rural
			· · ·

1	$\mathbf{O}$
L	S
۲	-
	ge
	Ра

		1	
	Beauty or the Nature Improvement Area?		setting.
			Shillington settlement pattern typically linked 'ends' separated by rural spatial 'gaps', development of site would impact on spatial setting on Woodmer End, result in built form extending beyond village envelope, poorly related to settlement and rural setting, impacting on landscape character within and beyond settlement envelope.
			Negative impact on Public Rights of Way and landscape amenity.
37	Heritage/ Archaeology What would the impacts of development be on any heritage assets and their setting?	A	No objection in relation to build heritage.
	Are there any opportunities for enhancement of these assets?		The site lies within an area of archaeological potential, it site also forms part of the setting of Church Panel moated site Scheduled Monument. Therefore this site has archaeological potential. Archaeological potential does not necessarily prevent allocation or development providing that an appropriate mitigation strategy in line with para 141 of the NPPF was implemented; this would include the mitigation of the impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument.
			Any planning submission would need to be accompanied by the results of an intrusive archaeological field evaluation to satisfy para 128 of the NPPF and a consideration of the impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument using the Historic England guidance on the setting of heritage assets and in the context of paragraphs 132-134 of the NPPF.
		_	Should the site be allocated, a contingency for archaeological works must be included in any proposal to prevent issues with viability.
38	Ecological Assets	R	Site appears to be rough grazing –
	What would the impacts of development be on any biological, geological or ecological assets and are		No info on system. Development will be required to provide a net
	there any opportunities for their enhancement?		gain for biodiversity which will be

			difficult on this site.		
39	<b>Open space/leisure and GI assets</b> Are there any potential conflicts with open space, leisure designations or Rights of Way? Is there capacity to provide the required levels of open space and green infrastructure?	R	Extensive network of Right of way across the site, open ditch to three sides. Established hedgerows and trees. Access would need to be enhanced (including visual amenity) and hedgerows and waterbodies retained and enhanced.		
Mine	Minerals and Waste				
40	What would the impacts of development be on safeguarded minerals and waste sites, including mineral safeguarding sites?	G	Development of this site would not impact upon any existing or allocated minerals or waste sites or mineral safeguarding areas.		
Plan	Planning History				
41	What is the sites planning history? (For example planning applications and submissions to previous Allocations Plans)		None relevant.		
Does	the site continue to next stage?		No		

#### STAGE 2 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Is the site suitable for the proposed development?

The golden thread running through plan making and decision taking is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF outlines that there are three dimensions to sustainable development which are the environmental, social and economic. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF outlines the Core Planning principles which includes: take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it; and take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

Development of entire site would cause a negative impact on the character of the landscape setting of the settlement, whereby the projection of built development would not visually appear as a logical extension to the settlement and would poorly relate to the surrounding built environment. Furthermore; due to Shillington's settlement pattern which features linked 'ends' that are separated by rural spatial 'gaps', the development of this site would result in the coalescence of and negative impact upon spatial setting of Woodmer End and Shillington, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. The latter is considered to form environmental harm which weighs heavily against development of this site.

The landscape here is clearly valued by local people, featuring an extensive and well used right of way network through the site which connects to a network of public right of ways through the landscape and is a landscape in which people spend their leisure time, which is experienced close up and at a distance.

There is no doubt that any development on this site would lead to a change in character and appearance and that development would be immediately apparent to those using the associated footpath network. Even given a potential for provision of landscape buffers development of the site would fail to provide the isolation necessary either in landscape terms or in respecting the quieter more tranquil parts of the public right of way network. Therefore development of this whole site would unacceptably erode the rural setting of this landscape, neither conserving nor enhancing the varied countryside character or quality of the wider landscape, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.

It is not considered that this site is not worthy of further consideration.

# Central Bedfordshire

## A great place to live and work