

HALLATON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

SITE SELECTION FRAMEWORK

1. Introduction

1.1 The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Hallaton Parish Council has been prepared by the Hallaton Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee (NPAC) 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 Harborough District Council (HDC).

1.2 A final housing target for Hallaton has been identified by HDC based upon an agreed population and economic development increase in numbers and activity. HDC have then apportioned this District-wide housing provision target in line with their settlement hierarchy, this gave a minimum target number of residential dwellings required to be built by 2031 and was set by HDC for Hallaton parish as a minimum of 30 properties. The housing theme group discussed the evidence of need in the parish and agreed that to “future proof” the target of 30 units from HDC they would add an additional parish level buffer of 10%, this meant the Neighbourhood Plan target to be recommended to the community was for a minimum of 33 units to be built by 2031.

1.3 This site selection framework sets out how the Hallaton 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 from YourLocale.

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 are the most acceptable to the local community.

2. Where did the site suggestions come from?

2.1. HDC has prepared a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which identified the sites put forward by landowners for residential development. This exercise was completed in 2016 and identified 6 potential sites within Hallaton parish. The parish council undertook its own “call for sites” in April 2018. A scoring matrix based upon the methodology supported by the NPPF guidance (2012) was drafted by HTG members to reflect

the unique characteristics of Hallaton parish.

2.3 A total of 24 sites were offered for residential development, these sites would have yielded over 800 units. An initial “sifting” exercise by the HTG decided that 5 of the sites were so far removed from the built form of the village that they constituted “open countryside” in HDC planning terms so they were not assessed as they were outside of the policy options available. A total of 20 SSA reports (as one site was assessed as a whole and as a part) delivering 581 units were therefore completed 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 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

4.1. The HTG agreed 27 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 and NPPF (2018) (the twelve core planning principles). The SHLAA methodology jointly agreed between the Local Planning Authorities (including HDC) 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 Hallaton

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Green</u>	<u>Amber</u>	<u>Red</u>
1. Site capacity (note 1).	Small capacity up to 10 dwellings alone or in conjunction with another site	Medium capacity of between 11-21 dwellings	Large capacity of more than 22 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. Ridge and Furrow	Grade 1 or 2.	Grade 3.	Grade 4.
6. Greenfield or Previously Developed Land.	Previously developed land (brownfield)	Mixture of brownfield & greenfield land	Greenfield land
7. 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)
8. Site availability - Single ownership or multiple ownership.	Single ownership	Multiple ownership	Multiple ownership with one or more unwilling partners

9. Landscape Character Assessment and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).	No harm to quality	Less than substantial harm to quality	Substantial harm to quality
10. Important Trees, Woodlands & Hedgerows.	None affected	Mitigation measures required	Site would harm or require removal of Ancient tree or hedge (or TPO)
11. 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
12. Local Biodiversity considerations (note 2).	Low impact, score 1-2.	Small to medium impact, score 3.	High impact, score 4-5.
13. Listed Building or important built assets and their setting.	No harm to existing building	Less than substantial harm	Substantial harm
14. Impact on the Conservation Area or its setting.	No harm	Less than substantial harm	Substantial harm
15. Safe pedestrian access to and from the site.	Existing footpath	No footpath but can be created	No potential for footpath
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. Impact on existing vehicular traffic.	Impact on village centre minimal	Medium scale impact on village centre	Major impact on village centre
18. Distance to designated village centre (Stenning Hall).	A distance of 200m or less	A distance of 201 – 400m	A distance of greater than 401m
19. Distance to Primary School.	A distance of 200m or less	A distance of 201-400m	A distance of greater than 401m

20 Current existing informal/formal recreational opportunities on site.	No recreational uses on site	Informal recreational uses on site	Formal recreational uses on site
21. 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
22. 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
23. Gas and/or oil pipelines & electricity transmission network (Not water/sewage).	Site unaffected	Re-siting may be necessary	Re-siting may not be possible
24. Any noise issues.	No noise issues	Mitigation may be necessary	Noise issues will be an ongoing concern
25. Any contamination issues	No contamination issues	Minor mitigation required	Major mitigation required
26. 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
27. Any drainage issues.	No drainage issues identified	Need for mitigation	Drainage concerns.

Note 1. The site yield is obtained by using the Leicestershire wide agreed SHLAA methodology. On sites of 0 to 0.4 HA 100% of the land is developable, on sites of 0.4 to 2 HA, 82.5% of the land is developable and on sites of 2 to 35 HA, 62.5% of the land is developable.

Note 2. As defined by the NP Environmental Theme Group.

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. As discussion altered one site's assessment it meant that all of the sites had to be re-assessed to ensure a meaningful comparison, this work was clearly very time consuming.
- 5.2. 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.
- 5.3. 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. In view of the changed parish council members following the election in May 2019 the SSA reports were re-considered and re-issued.
- 5.4. A residential development site received a full planning consent from HDC and as construction of three units started on site in March 2019 this site (number ten) was withdrawn from the SSA process.
- 5.5. A further development site for 23 units was granted an outline planning consent in June 2019, this meant that the target for residential units was now effectively reduced to seven units.
- 5.6. 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.
- 5.7. The final approved sites are highlighted in the table below in bold type:

Table 2 – Site assessment outcomes

Site Location (SSA report number)	RAG Score	Number of units	Rank
Infill Rear of 31 High Street (6)	Green 21	2	First
Infill Rear 39-41 North End (13)	Green 16	4	Second
Infill adjacent to the Fox Inn (12)	Green 13	4	Third
Infill Hunts Lane corner plot (15)	Green 6	6	Fifth
Land off Horninghold Road (7)	Green 7	11	Fourth
Hogg Lane ** See note below	Green 6	8	Sixth
Land on Medbourne road opposite old petrol station (9)	Green 3	16	Seventh
Southern triangle of land off Medbourne Road (14)	Green 3	12	Seventh
Land North of Churchgate (2)	Green 3	34	Seventh
Land rear of Medbourne Road (8)	Green 2	60	Tenth
East Norton Road (19) (PART)	Green 2	20	Tenth
Horninghold Road North extension (16)	Green 1	30	Twelfth
The walnut paddock (5)	Amber	20	Thirteenth
Goods yard field (18)	Red minus 1	70	Fourteenth
East Norton Road (19) (FULL)	Red minus 1	56	Fourteenth
Land off Tugwell lane (1)	Red minus 4	16	Sixteenth
Land North of North End (4)	Red minus 4	35	Sixteenth
Bottom-Tomblins expansion site (17)	Red minus 4	75	Sixteenth
Land off Langton Road (3)	Red minus 6	26	Nineteenth

** A portion of this site has been allocated as a local green space in the Neighbourhood Plan. For this reason it is not available for residential development as it is clearly not deliverable and is effectively ineligible in the SSA process.

- 5.8. The NP has ranked the four infill sites as the most developable and deliverable highest scoring green sites, for a total of about 16 units.
- 5.9. Allocating these sites exceeds the HDC target and they are known to be both developable and deliverable.