

UPPINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SITE ASSESSMENT MODEL
MODEL TO BE USED FOR SMALL SITES (LESS THAN 10 DWELLINGS)

SECTION A LOCALITY TEMPLATE GIVING A 35% WEIGHTING TO THE OVERALL SCORE

SITE DETAILS	
Site Reference and name	
Site address	
Gross site area (hectares)	
Existing land use	
Land use being considered if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	
Land owner estimate of capacity (if known)	
Site identification method / source (Call for sites or identified by NPAG)	
Planning history (live or previous planning applications/decisions)	
Neighbouring uses	

Item no	Description	Additional Comments if required	Assessment
	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS		Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN
1	Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:		
	Ancient Woodland		
	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)		
	Biosphere Reserve		
	Local Nature Reserve (LNR)		
	National Nature Reserve (NNR)		
	National Park		
	Ramsar Site		
	Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)		
	Special Area of Conservation (SAC)		
	Special Protection Area (SPA)		
2	Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?		Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN
3	Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:		Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN
	Green Infrastructure Corridor		
	Local Wildlife Site (LWS)		
	Public Open Space		
	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)		
	Nature Improvement Area		
	Regionally Important Geological Site		
	Other		
			Score 3 for LOW: Score 2 for MEDIUM: Score 1 for HIGH Risk

4 Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?
 5 Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

6 Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)
 7 Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?
 8 Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?

Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

Is the site part of:
 9 A wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
 10 wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
 11 An area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?
 12 Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

PHYSICAL CONSTRAINTS

13 Is the site:
 a) Flat or relatively flat
 b) Gently sloping or uneven
 c) Steeply sloping

Score 3 for FLAT: Score 2 for UNEVEN: Score 1 for STEEP

--

14 Is there existing vehicle access, or potential to create vehicle access to the site?
 15 Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access, or potential to create pedestrian/cycle access to the site?
 a) Pedestrian
 b) Cycle

Score 3 for YES: Score 2 for NO: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

16 Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

--

17 Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?
 a) Significant Trees
 b) Potentially veteran or ancient trees
 c) Owned by third parties?

Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

18 Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?
 19 Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?
 20 Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?
 21 Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

ACCESSIBILITY

What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)

22 Town / local centre / shop

Score 3 for <400m: Score 2 for 440-1200m: Score 1 for >1200m

--

23 Bus stop

Score 3 for <400m: Score 2 for 400-800m: Score 1 for >800m

--

24 Primary School

Score 3 for <400m: Score 2 for 400-1200m: Score 1 for >1200m

25 Secondary School

Score 3 for <1600m: Score 2 for 1600-3900m: Score 1 for >3900m

26 Open Space / recreation facilities

Score 3 for <400m: Score 2 for 400-800m: Score 1 for >800m

27 Cycle Route

Score 3 for <400m: Score 2 for 400-800m: Score 1 for >800m

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL CONSTRAINTS

28 Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

Score 3 for LOW: Score 2 for MEDIUM: Score 1 for HIGH

29 Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

HERITAGE CONSTRAINTS

30 Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?

Score 3 for LIMITED: Score 2 for SOME: Score 1 for DIRECT impact

31 Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?

PLANNING POLICY CONSTRAINTS

32 Is the site allocated for a different particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?

Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

33 Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?

34 Is the site:

Score 3 for PREVIOUS: Score 2 for MIX: Score 1 for GREENFIELD

Greenfield
A mix of greenfield and previously developed land
Previously developed land

35 Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?

Score 3 for WITHIN: Score 2 for ADJACENT: Score 1 for OUTSIDE

Within the existing built up area (infill)?
Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area?
Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?

36 Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?

37 Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?

Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

38 Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?

ASSESSMENT OF AVAILABILITY AND VIABILITY - (these elements of the Locality model are considered separately at section D)

SECTION B PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON SITE GIVING A TOTAL OF 40% WEIGHTING TO THE OVERALL SCORE

Item no	Description	Additional Comments if required	Assessment
39	Ranking from Developers Morning (15%)		Score 7 for HIGHEST: Score 6 for SECOND ETC: Score 1 for DID NOT ATTEND
40	Ranking from Booklet (25%)		Score 7 for HIGHEST: Score 6 for SECOND ETC: Score 1 for LAST

SECTION C WILLINGNESS OF DEVELOPER/LANDOWNER TO WORK WITH NPAG/UTC GIVING A 15% WEIGHTING TO THE OVERALL SCORE

41	Attendance at NPAG/UTC Meetings		Score 3 for >ONCE: Score 2 for =ONCE: Score 1 for NEVER
42	Attendance at Vanguard Boards		
43	Letter of intent to collaborate		Score 5 for YES: Score 2 for NO: Score 1 for UNKNOWN

SECTION D ASSESSMENT OF LIKELIHOOD OF DELIVERY GIVING A 10% WEIGHTING TO THE OVERALL SCORE

44	Is the site available for development?		Score 3 for YES: Score 2 for NO: Score 1 for UNKNOWN
45	Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?		Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for UNKNOWN: Score 1 for YES
46	Is there a known time frame for availability of land?		Score 7 for 0-3 Yrs: Score 4 for 4-5 yrs:Score 1 for 6-10 yrs
47	Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?		Score 3 for NO: Score 2 for YES: Score 1 for UNKNOWN
48	What is the likely timeframe for development?		Score 7 for 0-3 Yrs: Score 4 for 4-5 yrs: Score 1 for 6-10 yrs