

## **SILEBY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

### **SITE SELECTION FRAMEWORK**

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. The Neighbourhood Plan for Sileby Parish Council has been prepared by the Sileby 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 Charnwood Borough Council.
- 1.2. A final housing target for Sileby has not been identified by Charnwood Borough Council (CBC). Based on information contained in the discussion document 'Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood' published in April 2018, the quantum range of new housing required in Charnwood throughout the Plan period will range from 8,100 to 15,700. The proportion of new residential development required Borough wide in Sileby has been agreed with CBC as an estimate of 12,000 units up to 2036. For Sileby, this target equates to a range from 382 to 566 units based on the proportion of the population of Sileby as a proportion of the Borough as a whole. However, as explained in the NP text, although the target for Sileby is actually a negative one as there is already a surplus of 56 units in the projection the HTG has still considered additional residential allocations.
- 1.3. This site selection framework sets out how the Sileby 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 meet the Borough-wide housing provision targets 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. CBC 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 January 2018 and identified potential sites within Sileby parish, the parish council then undertook an additional call for sites and wrote to the landowners/site sponsors who had submitted SHLAA sites and other known landowners

inviting them to have their land assessed by the HTG. An open meeting was then held with members of the HTG where the process was explained and amended to reflect site owners responses to the Sustainable Site Assessment SSA scoring matrix. The scoring matrix was based upon the methodology supported by the NPPF (2012) and had been drafted by HTG members to reflect the unique characteristics of Sileby parish.

22. A total of 22 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**

31. The initial site assessments were undertaken by the Consultant from YourLocale 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**

41. The HTG agreed 28 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 Charnwood Borough) 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 Sibleby**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Amber</u>	<u>Red</u>
1. Site capacity.	Small capacity up to 10 dwellings alone or in conjunction with another site	Medium capacity of between 11-24 dwellings	Large capacity of more than 25 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. Impact on existing vehicular traffic.	Impact on village centre minimal	Medium scale impact on village centre	Major impact on village centre
16. 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
17. Safe access to public transport (specifically a bus stop with current service).	A distance of 500m or less	A distance of 501-750m	A distance of greater than 751m

18. Distance to designated village centre (village hall).	A distance of 500m or less	A distance of 501 – 750m	A distance of greater than 751m
19. Distance to GP/Health Centre.	A distance of 500m or less	A distance of 501 – 750m	A distance of greater than 751m
20. Distance to Primary School.	A distance of 500m or less	A distance of 501-751m	A distance of greater than 751m
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 nuisance issues – light pollution, noise pollution, odour/noxious smell.	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.
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 a reassessment of some sites by the YourLocale 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 21 identified sites (without an indication of the assessment outcome) were shared at an Open Event in the Village Hall in September 2018 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 boldGreen type:

**Table 2 – Site assessment outcomes**

Site Location	SHLAA reference	Red/Amber/Green Score	Rank
SSA number and Site Location	SHLAA reference	Estimated number of units	RAG SCORE
1. Peashill Farm expansion	PSH 346	145 units	Red -4
2. Ratcliffe Road expansion	NO SHLAA	525 units	Red -10
3. Memorial Park	NO SHLAA	90 units	Green 1
4. Paynes Barn expansion	NO SHLAA	215 units	Red -5
5. Rear Herrick Close	PSH 179	10 units	Green 1
6. Cossington infill	NO SHLAA	181 units	Red -8
7. Brook Farm Cossington expansion	NO SHLAA	319 units	Red -10
8. East of Seagrave Road	PSH76	200 units	Consent granted.
9. 245, Ratcliffe Road	PSH 150	22 units	Red -1
<b>10. The Oaks, Ratcliffe Road</b>	<b>SH 136</b>	<b>11 units</b>	<b>Green 13</b>
<b>11. 36, Charles Street</b>	<b>SH129</b>	<b>11 units</b>	<b>Green 15</b>
<b>12. Rear 107, Cossington Road</b>	<b>SH135</b>	<b>18 units</b>	<b>Green 18</b>
<b>13. Barrow Road, Sileby</b>	<b>SH138</b>	<b>12 units</b>	<b>Green 11</b>

Site Location	SHLAA reference	Red/Amber/Green Score	Rank
14. Land off 115 Barrow Road	PSH 262	10 units	Green 3
15. Land off Homefield Road	PSH 261	64 units	Red -2
16. Land off 230 Seagrave Road	PSH 379	68 units	Red -6
17. Land off Kendal Road	PSH 64	33 units	SHLAA not developable
18. Sunrise poultry farm	NO SHLAA	300 units	Red - 2
19. Blossom Farm	PSH318	120 units	Red - 4
<b>20. Factory – corner of park and Seagrave Road</b>	<b>PSH 111</b>	<b>11 units</b>	<b>Green 15</b>
<b>21. 9, King Street</b>	<b>SH132</b>	<b>14 units</b>	<b>Green 12</b>

5.7. The land East of Seagrave Road (site 8) had been refused planning consent by CBC but the decision was overturned and planning consent granted at appeal.

5.8. The NP has identified the seven highest scoring green sites that are known to be developable and deliverable.

5.9. The NPAC has recommended that sites 10, 11, 12, 13, 20 and 21 are proposed as reserve sites in the neighbourhood plan.