

**APPENDIX D2**  
**SITE SELECTION FRAMEWORK**  
**ASSESSMENT AND OUTCOME**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1. The Neighbourhood Plan for Desford Parish Council has been prepared by the Desford Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee on behalf of the Parish Council. One of the important objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan is to set out where new residential development should be built within the Parish to meet the parish housing target set by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC).
- 1.2. A final housing target for Desford has been identified by HBBC based upon an agreed population and economic development increase in numbers and activity. The objectively assessed need (OAN) between 2016 and 2036 is for 163 additional dwellings, based on the proportion of the population of Desford as a proportion of the Borough as a whole. However, as explained fully in the NP text, with dwellings completed, planning permissions already granted and a substantial site allocation the NP aims to deliver 238 units by 2036.
- 1.3. This site selection framework sets out how the Desford Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee (NPAC), identified sustainable sites for the allocation of land for housing development. The recommendations made by the Advisory Committee were informed by evidence collected and assessed by a Housing Theme Group (HTG), supported by an independent consultant.
- 1.4. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the provision of sustainable housing in the Parish and has embraced the desire to exceed the Borough-wide housing provision target by identifying potential housing sites within the Parish to meet these requirements within locations that are deliverable, developable and most acceptable to the local community.

**2. Where did the site suggestions come from?**

- 2.1. HBBC has prepared a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which identifies the sites put forward by landowners for residential development. This exercise was completed in 2014 and identified potential sites within Desford parish. A scoring matrix based upon the methodology supported by the NPPF (2012) was drafted by HTG members to reflect the unique characteristics of Desford parish.
- 2.2. A total of 15 sites were assessed for suitability through a SSA process to arrive at a ranking of sites to determine which were to be

presented to the community as being subject to allocation through the neighbourhood plan.

### **3. Site Selection Criteria**

- 3.1. The initial site assessments were undertaken by the Consultant from Your Locale to ensure a professional approach based upon past experience of similar assessments and to ensure a high level of objectivity and consistency in scoring. The assessment included a comprehensive desk top study followed by a visit to each of the sites. These initial results were then considered in detail by the HTG members including the Consultant to ensure that all local factors had been fully considered and were reflected in the reports. This led to some amendments being agreed by all members of the HTG and it was then possible to rank each site in order of overall sustainability.

### **4. The Criteria and the RAG Scoring System**

- 4.1. The HTG agreed 29 scoring criteria in a SSA scoring matrix that is relevant to the selection and allocation of sites for new dwellings using evidence from the NPPF 2012 (the twelve core planning principles). The SHLAA methodology jointly agreed between the Local Planning Authorities (including HBBC) of Leicester and Leicestershire was used, coupled with the experience of the consultant in devising past “made” neighbourhood plan site allocations.
- 4.2. A scoring system, based on a Red, Amber or Green (RAG) score was applied to each criterion and listed for each identified site. Red was scored for a negative assessment; Amber was scored where mitigation might be required; Green was scored for a positive assessment. A different methodology for scoring to give varying weights to different criteria was considered by the HTG but rejected as it would be more complicated, less transparent and could be more subjective.
- 4.3. The following site assessment framework was used to compare each site.

**Table 1 – Sustainability - housing land site assessment framework for Desford**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Amber</u>	<u>Red</u>
1. Site capacity.	Small capacity up to 15 dwellings alone or in conjunction with another site	Medium capacity of between 16-49 dwellings	Large capacity of more than 50 dwellings
2. Current Use.	Vacant	Existing uses need to be relocated	Loss of important local asset
3. Adjoining Uses.	Site wholly within residential area or village envelope	Site adjoining village envelope or residential location	Extending village envelope outside boundary
4. Topography.	Flat or gently sloping site	Undulating site or greater slope that can be mitigated	Severe slope that cannot be mitigated
5. Greenfield or Previously Developed Land.	Previously developed land (brownfield)	Mixture of brownfield & greenfield land	Greenfield land
6. Good Quality Agricultural Land (Natural England classification).	Land classified 4 or 5 (poor and very poor)	Land classified 3 (good to moderate)	Land classified 1 or 2 (Excellent and very good)
7. Site availability -Single ownership or multiple ownership.	Single ownership	Multiple ownership	Multiple ownership with one or more unwilling partners
8. Landscape Character Assessment and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).	No harm to quality	Less than substantial harm to quality	Substantial harm to quality
9. Important Trees, Woodlands& Hedgerows.	None affected	Mitigation measures required	Site would harm or require removal of Ancient tree or hedge (or TPO)

10. Relationship with existing pattern of built development.	Land visible from a small number of properties	Land visible from a range of sources mitigated through landscaping or planting	Prominent visibility Difficult to improve
11. Local Wildlife considerations.	No impact on wildlife site	Small to medium impact but with potential to mitigate	Statutorily protected species in place
12. Listed Building or important built assets and their setting.	No harm to existing building	Less than substantial harm	Substantial harm
13. Impact on the Conservation Area or its setting.	No harm	Less than substantial harm	Substantial harm
14. Safe pedestrian access to and from the site.	Existing footpath	No footpath but can be created	No potential for footpath
15. Safe vehicular traffic to and from the site.	Appropriate access can be easily provided	Appropriate access can only be provided with significant improvement	Appropriate access cannot be provided
16. Impact on existing vehicular traffic.	Impact on village centre minimal	Medium scale impact on village centre	Major impact on village centre
17. Safe access to public transport (specifically a bus stop with current service).	A distance of 250m or less	A distance of 251-500m	A distance of greater than 501m
18. Distance to designated village centre (the cross).	A distance of 250m or less	A distance of 251 – 500m	A distance of greater than 501m
19. Distance to GP/Health Centre.	A distance of 250m or less	A distance of 251-500m	A distance of greater than 501m
20. Distance to Primary School.	A distance of 250m or less	A distance of 251-500m	A distance of greater than 501m

21. Current existing informal/formal recreational opportunities on site.	No recreational uses on site	Informal recreational uses on site	Formal recreational uses on site
22. Ancient monuments or archaeological remains.	No harm to an ancient monument or remains site	Less than substantial harm to an ancient monument or remains site	Substantial harm to an ancient monument or remains
23. Any existing public rights of ways/bridle paths.	No impact on public right of way	Detriment to public right of way	Re-routing required or would cause significant harm
24. Gas and/or oil pipelines & electricity transmission network (Not water/sewage).	Site unaffected	Re-siting may be necessary	Re-siting may not be possible
25. Any noise issues.	No noise issues	Mitigation may be necessary	Noise issues will be an ongoing concern
26. Any contamination issues	No contamination issues	Minor mitigation required	Major mitigation required
27. Any known flooding issues.	Site in flood zone 1 or 2 or no flooding for more than 25 years	Site in flood zone 3a or flooded once in last 25 years	Site in flood zone 3b (functional flood plain) or flooded more than once in last 25 years
28. Any drainage issues.	No drainage issues identified	Need for mitigation	Drainage concerns.
29. Distance to nearest employment site.	A distance of less than 250m.	A distance of 251-500m.	A distance of more than 501m.
Issues related to planning history on the site (not scored).			

## 5. The assessment outcome

- 5.1. The assessments were considered at a number of meetings of the HTG to ensure that adequate local knowledge was central to the process. This led to an assessment of some sites by the Your Locale Consultant with amendments subsequently agreed with the HTG members to ensure an objective and transparent approach prior to the assessments being circulated more widely.
- 5.2. The 15 identified sites (without an indication of the assessment outcome) were shared at an Open Event in the Village Hall where Residents of the Village were asked to indicate which sites they preferred for development.
- 5.3. The assessments were amended to reflect this input and then circulated as drafts to the relevant site sponsor, usually the land owner or a professional agent working on their behalf. All parties were invited to discuss the reports in a “face to face” meeting and four landowners/site sponsors took up this opportunity. At the meeting with HTG members the reports were analysed line by line and further amendments made.
- 5.4. The responses from land owners were then further considered by HTG members and several meetings were held to ensure that all factors had been fairly considered. Some of the assessments were amended in the light of new information provided and the final SSA scores were then signed off by the NPAC.
- 5.5. The final outcome of the assessment is as recorded on the following table. The RAG Rating is obtained by deducting the “Red” scores from the “Green” scores. Amber remains neutral.
- 5.6. The final approved sites are highlighted in the table below in bold Green type:

**Table 2 – Site assessment outcomes**

<b>SSA number and Site Location</b>	<b>SHLAA reference</b>	<b>RAG SCORE</b>
1. Kirby Grange expansion site	AS 190	Red -3
2. Kirby Grange Extension site	AS 191	Red -1
3. Kirby Grange front extension site	AS 192	Red -1

4. Kirby Grange reclamation site	AS 193	Green 8
5. New Botcheston expansion site	AS 194	Red -6
6. Hinds Quarters Main Street	AS195	Green 5
7. The New Desford	AS 200	Red -12
8. Meadow way extension	AS 201	Green 4
9. Forest Rise expansion	AS 202	Red - 3
10. Barns Way extension	AS203	Green 12
11. Rear of Newbold Road	AS 208	Red -3
12. Kirby Lane and Ashfield Road extension	AS 210 and AS 211	Red -3
13. Hunts Lane development	AS 466	Green 1

5.7. The owner of the land at the Kirby Grange reclamation site has not responded to several contact attempts, so the site cannot be considered developable and has not been allocated in the NP.

5.8. The NP has allocated the highest scoring green site, the Barns Way extension site, this allocation and other consents exceed the HBBC target and this site is known to be developable and deliverable.

5.9. The NPAC has recommended that site 10 is proposed as a residential allocation in the neighbourhood plan.

Desford Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee November 2018