

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	
Reference number	
Settlement	
Size	
Proposed use/s	
Site Owner	
Agent / Promoter	

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?		Call for Sites pro-forma	
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary		Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?		Mapping	

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?		CBC Planning Portal	
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?		CBC Planning Portal, Magic	
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?			

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A		
Stage 1B		

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development		Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)		Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?		Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	<i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping		
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx		Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>		Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?		Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)		GP Capacity Info	[refer to separate report]	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>		Call for Sites proforma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>				

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s achievability

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?		Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?		Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?		Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC		
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?		Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)		Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.7	<p>What is the agricultural land classification?</p> <p>G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more)</p> <p>A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories)</p> <p>R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)</p>		Magic		
4.8	<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?</p>		<p>Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit</p>		
4.9	<p>Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>		<p>TPC response to call for sites</p>		!
4.10	<p>Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>		<p>Feedback from village surveys</p>		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0		Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?		Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m		Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m		Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m		Mapping		
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m		Mapping		

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

--

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments