

# Babergh and Mid Suffolk SHLAA Proposed Approach (Aug 2024)

This document has been produced to allow representations to be made upon the technical criteria for the site assessment for both potential housing developments and potential Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites. Comments should be made on the proposed criteria approach only, as other matters will not be considered at this stage (as they are for consideration in further consultations upon the Joint Local Plan – Part 2).

## Introduction

- 1.1 A Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is an essential part of producing a Local Plan. Its purpose is to identify what land is capable of being developed and to assess the constraints and opportunities of developing that land. The SHLAA process highlights issues which help inform future decisions regarding the allocation of land. **However, please note SHLAA sites do not have any formal planning status and are produced as a reference only evidence base document for the Joint Local Plan. It is not a consultation document or a proposal of sites for development.**
- 1.2 The Councils have reviewed and refined the SHLAA methodology to reflect updates to national policy, local priorities and take account of the latest best practice. This document sets out the methodology, including details of the Call for Sites.

## Policy Context

- 1.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 69 sets out the requirement for local authorities to prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: “Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability”.
- 1.4 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessments expands on this by clarifying that:

*“An assessment of land availability identifies a future supply of land which is suitable, available and achievable for housing and economic development uses over the plan period. The assessment is an important source of evidence to inform plan-making and decision-taking, and the identification of a 5-year supply of housing land.*

*Plan-making authorities may carry out land availability assessments for housing and economic development as part of the same exercise, in order*

*that sites may be identified for the use(s) which is most appropriate. An assessment should:*

- *identify sites and broad locations with potential for development;*
- *assess their development potential; and*
- *assess their suitability for development and the likelihood of development coming forward (the availability and achievability)."*

## Methodology

- 2.1 The Councils' SHLAA methodology is to be prepared in accordance with the methodology set out in the PPG. This follows a five stage process, comprising:
- Stage 1 – Identification of sites and broad locations
  - Stage 2 – Assessment of sites and broad locations
  - Stage 3 – Windfall sites assessment
  - Stage 4 – Review of assessment
  - Stage 5 – Final evidence base.

### Stage 1 – Identifying sites and broad locations

#### Identifying the sites Geographical Area and type of sites

- 2.2 The first stage of the SHLAA is to determine the geographical area of the assessment. The PPG states this should be the plan making area. The geographical area of the assessment is the administrative area of Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council.
- 2.3 The scope of the sites for this assessment is residential development - primarily open market or affordable housing (C3 use class), supported and special needs housing, self-build and mixed use.

#### Site Thresholds

- 2.4 The PPG sets out that it may be appropriate to consider all sites capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings. The Councils will apply this minimum threshold for sites to be potentially considered for allocation in the Joint Local Plan Part 2.
- 2.5 Site proposals below these thresholds are not precluded from coming forward via the planning application process and can be considered for their windfall potential. Small sites being promoted in this way, are recommended to go through the Councils' pre-application processes at [Pre-application advice - Babergh District Council](#) or [Pre-application advice - Mid Suffolk District Council](#).

## Desktop Review

- 2.6 The PPG sets out that plan makers need to be proactive in identifying as wide a range of sites and broad locations for housing as possible and do not simply rely on sites that they have been informed about.
- 2.7 Below sets out the data sources that the Councils could use for the desktop identification of sites and broad locations.
- a) Existing housing allocations
  - b) Unimplemented planning permissions
  - c) Sites with a resolution to grant subject to a Section 106 agreement (“S106 sites”)
  - d) Land in the Councils’ ownership

## Call for Sites

- 2.8 The Councils issued a [residential Call for Sites](#) to enable people to promote sites for consideration and assessment. In accordance with the PPG, this was aimed at as wide an audience as is practical so that those not normally involved in development have the opportunity to contribute.
- 2.9 A [residential Call for Sites](#) was launched on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2024 until 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2024. The Call for Sites has been advertised on the Council’s website and notifications sent to those on the Councils Joint Local Plan Database. This has been hosted on the Councils’ Consultation Portal where site promoters, developers, landowners and members of public are required to complete an online survey covering a number of categories including:
- Contact Details
  - Site Details
  - Planning History
  - Proposed Future Use
  - Site Ownership
  - Site Constraints
  - Existing Infrastructure and Utilities
  - Site Availability
- 2.10 For transparency, the Councils have made basic details and maps for all the residential call for sites process available online – [BMSDC residential Call for Sites](#). **Please note SHLAA sites do not have any formal planning status and are produced as a reference only evidence base document for the Joint Local Plan. It is not a consultation document or a proposal of sites for development.**

## Stage 2 – Identifying sites and broad locations

### Part 1: Initial Survey

- 2.11 As outlined above, the Call for Sites process has been managed through the Councils' Consultation Portal. This system will also enable officers to complete the more detailed site assessments in a more digital and efficient manner. However, not all of the information will be accessible to the public, due to the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) and commercial sensitivities.
- 2.12 The PPG sets out that an initial survey can be undertaken at this stage to establish up to date, high level information on each site in relation to its character and key constraints. This is also a way to check if any sites have been duplicated through the Call for Sites and desktop review. At this stage, the PPG also enables the identification of any sites which, when taking into account national policy and designations, it would not be appropriate to carry out the more detailed assessment as it is clear they will not be suitable for development.
- 2.13 An initial Part 1 assessment will be carried out on sites as per the criteria below.

#### *SHLAA Site Assessment – Part 1 Criteria*

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
1.	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha.?	Site thresholds not met.	Unsuitable – site is below 0.25ha or does not have capacity to accommodate at least five dwellings.  Suitable – site is above 0.25ha or has capacity to accommodate more than five dwellings.
2.	Does the site have extant planning permission? Has development commenced?	If the site has extant planning permission and development has commenced there is no further development potential. If a site has extant planning permission but that has not been implemented, the site will not be ruled out at this stage.	Unsuitable – site has extant planning permission and has commenced development.  Suitable – site does not have an extant planning permission or site has extant planning permission but development has not commenced.
3.	Is the site already allocated for residential development in the Babergh or Mid Suffolk Development Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan, with extant planning	If the site is allocated and there is evidence to suggest it is going to be delivered in the near future i.e., pre application discussions with Local	Unsuitable – site is allocated in the Development Plan and has extant planning permission or site is allocated in the

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
	permission or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of planning application being submitted by 2037?	Planning Authority, Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) in place, Masterplan being progressed or adopted or information provided by the developer/landowner there is no requirement to assess the site for its deliverability as the principle of development has already been established.	Development Plan and there is a strong likelihood a planning application will be submitted by 2037.  Suitable – site is not allocated in the Development Plan and does not have an extant planning permission or site is allocated in the Development and does not have a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted by 2037. Or site is allocated in the Development Plan for residential and has potential for net additional development.
4.	What is the site ownership situation?	Assessing a site’s availability is a key component of its overall deliverability. Information regarding any issues with ownership of the land are important to this assessment.	Unsuitable – ownership not known or uncertain.  Suitable – ownership identified.
5.	Is the site physically isolated in the open countryside?	Locating new development in close proximity to existing services and facilities is a key principle of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). To not prejudice the Settlement Boundary Review (another evidence base document to support the Local Plan Review) those sites in close proximity to an existing settlement boundary will not be ruled out at this stage.	Unsuitable – site is physically isolated in the open countryside.  Suitable – site is not physically isolated in the open countryside.
6.	Is the site wholly located within flood zone 3?	Sites will be excluded for development if the site is within Flood Zone 3. The NPPF is clear	Unsuitable – site is wholly in Flood Zone 3.

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
		that development should be directed away from areas at the highest risk of flooding.	Suitable – site is partially or not at all located within Flood Zone 3.
7.	Is the site wholly located within any of the following designations?  Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Special Protection Area (SPA) Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) Ancient Woodlands RAMSAR	Sites wholly located within a designation will be excluded. The NPPF contains many commitments to protecting sites nationally or internationally designated for their biological, geological, archaeological importance.	Unsuitable – site is wholly located within the designation.  Suitable – site is partially or not at all located within the designation.
8.	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	Highways access both for resident vehicles and service vehicles (as well as emergency vehicles).	Unsuitable – site does not have direct highways access. Site is not adjacent to a classified road.  Suitable – site has highways access. Site is adjacent to a classified road.

## Part 2: Detailed assessment

2.14 Following the initial survey, all remaining sites will proceed to the full site assessment as outlined in Stage 2 below.

### *SHLAA Site Assessment – Part 2 Detailed Assessment Criteria*

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
	<b><u>Physical constraints</u></b>		
9.	Is the site within or adjacent to the existing settlement?	Locating new development in close proximity to existing services and facilities is a key principle of sustainable development which is strongly supported by national policy.	Red – removed from settlement with significant area separating site from settlement or other commenced residential development.  Amber – adjacent to or within close proximity of an existing settlement or

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
			<p>commenced residential development.</p> <p>Green – within an existing settlement.</p>
10.	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	Protecting the individual identity of settlements is considered an important principle of planning and remains an important issue locally for settlements that are in close proximity to each other.	<p>Red – significant contribution to coalescence.</p> <p>Amber – some contribution which results in a reduction of green space between settlements.</p> <p>Green – no contribution to coalescence.</p>
11.	What is the main access point/s to the site? Is the access safe and suitable? Are there any highway constraints?	Establishing the capacity to deliver adequate highways access is essential to the operation of a development site. Following on from the Initial Survey, this criterion allows for any highways constraints to be explored. For example, highway access to a site may be feasible (and would have passed the initial survey) but may be constrained in its capacity, thereby reducing the overall capacity of the site to accommodate new development. In addition to vehicle access, access by active modes will also be a consideration. Comments related to this criterion will be provided by Suffolk County Council (SCC) (the relevant highway authority in the districts).	<p>Red – significant constraints identified and access is not considered safe and suitable which are likely to affect the site’s deliverability.</p> <p>Amber – some constraints identified but not likely significant enough to affect the site’s deliverability and potential design solutions.</p> <p>Green – no likely reasonable constraints and highways access is considered safe and suitable.</p>
12.	Is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	Utility provision is a key component of development viability. The Call for Sites proforma requests specific information on utility provision in order to	<p>Red – significant issues with utility provision which are likely to affect the site’s deliverability.</p> <p>Amber – some issues with utility provision.</p>

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
		gain a general understanding of provision in the locality.	Green – no known issues with utility provision.
13.	Are there any issues that could prevent/limit the developable area of the site? e.g. pylons, major pipelines, ground instability and/or contamination.	The presence of site-specific issues can significantly affect deliverability through the impact of achievability and availability. Identifying site-specific issues early ensure sites are not allocated which are not capable of being delivered within reasonable timescales.	Red – significant site-specific issues which are likely to affect the site’s deliverability.  Amber – some site-specific issues which could be addressed.  Green – no known site-specific issues or evidence has been provided which demonstrates that site constraints can be adequately addressed.
14.	Is the site brownfield or greenfield?	The inclusion of this criterion reflects the NPPF’s preference for utilising previously developed land (brownfield land) over greenfield land.	Red – n/a.  Amber – greenfield site.  Green – wholly or partially brownfield site.
15.	What is the agricultural land classification?	The NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The most obvious way of doing this is to identify the quality of agricultural land on potential development sites through the assessment.	Red – n/a.  Amber – wholly or partly Grades 1, 2 and/or 3.  Green – Grade 4 or Urban.
16.	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	The NPPF requires plan makers to achieve high quality design and good standards of amenity for occupants. Ensuring sensitive uses such as housing, are not located in close proximity to other uses which may compromise the health and wellbeing of occupants is fundamental	Red – there is a strong possibility development would be significantly affected by neighbouring use issues.  Amber – there is a possibility development would result in some neighbouring use issues.  Green – there are no neighbouring use issues.

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
		to achieving these objectives.	
17.	Impact upon a formal recreational provision? (e.g. sports pitch, play area, allotments, parks, Public Rights of Way).	Recreation areas are of public value and provide important opportunities to improve health and well-being. Sites will normally only be suitable if the recreational provision is surplus to requirements, or can be replaced by a better or equivalent provision of size and quality.	Red – would result in loss of provision.  Amber – potential for loss of provision to be mitigated.  Green – site would not impact on provision.
<b><u>Natural and Historic Environmental Constraints</u></b>			
18.	Is the site partially located within/adjoining any of the following designations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB))</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</li> <li>• Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</li> <li>• Special Protection Area (SPA)</li> <li>• Ancient Woodlands</li> <li>• RAMSAR</li> </ul>	The NPPF contains many commitments to protecting sites nationally or internationally designated for their landscape, biological, geological importance.	Red – site is partially or wholly located within a designation.  Amber – site is adjoining a designation.  Green – site is not located within or adjoining any designations listed.
19.	Is the site part of any designations within a made Neighbourhood Plan?	Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, (which includes neighbourhood plans that have been brought into force), unless material considerations indicate otherwise.  It is appropriate that the similar weight is provided to neighbourhood plans in considering future allocations.	Red – site is partially or wholly located within a designation.  Amber – site is adjoining a designation.  Green – site is not within any designations.
20.	Is the site located within the Protected Habitats Zone of Influence and/or SSSI impact risk zones?	A number of internationally protected habitat sites are located within or close proximity	Red – n/a.  Amber – site is partially or wholly located within a

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
		to the Plan area. These sites are protected under the provisions of Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. National policy identifies that development should initially consider whether avoidance of these sensitive areas is practical. In circumstances where this is not possible, appropriate mitigation should be provided. Habitats Regulation Assessments should be carried out to identify the scope of impacts and appropriately consider actions required.	designation  Green – site is not within this designation.
21.	Is the site located within any of the following local designations? • Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) • Local Nature Reserve (LNR)	The NPPF encourages the protection and enhancement of sites of biodiversity and geological value.	Red – site is wholly or partially within a designation.  Amber – site is wholly or partially adjoining a designation.  Green – site is not located wholly or partially within any designations listed.
22.	Could development of the site significantly enhance or create green infrastructure e.g. Open Space, Biodiversity Net Gain provision, Park, Sport and/or recreation grounds, Country Park, Allotments?	This criterion helps to identify opportunities for green infrastructure through development at a level greater than policy requirements.	Red – n/a.  Amber – uncertain.  Green – yes, there are opportunities to significantly enhance or create green infrastructure.
23.	Would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any archaeological or heritage assets or their setting? Grade 1, Grade 2 Grade 2* Listed Building, Scheduled Ancient	The NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a	Red – there is a strong possibility of harm to a known/ designated heritage asset.  Amber – there is a possibility of harm to non

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
	Monument, (SAM) Registered Parks and Gardens, Conservation Areas, adopted Neighbourhood Plan identified Locally Listed Heritage Asset, archaeological assets.	manner appropriate to their significance.	designated heritage assets.  Green – no potential harm.
24.	What flood zone is the site located in?	The NPPF is clear that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.	Red – approximately 25% or more of the site is within Flood Zone 2 or 3 and/or surface water flooding with 1% (1 in 100yr) chance.  Amber – some areas of the site within or adjacent to Flood Zone 2 or 3 and/or surface water flooding.  Green – site is wholly located in Flood Zone 1.
<b><u>Access to Key Services</u></b>			
25.	Distance to primary schools	NPPF states that all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development. Limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health.	Red – site is in excess of 801m of a primary school.  Amber – site is within 401 and 800m of a primary school.  Green – site is within 400m of a primary school.
26.	Distance to secondary school	NPPF states that all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development. Limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health.	Red – site is in excess of 5km of a secondary school.  Amber – site is within 800m – 5km of a secondary school.  Green – site is less than 800m of a secondary school.
27.	Relationship to strategic transport corridor (within 2km of A12, A14, A140 and railway line)	NPPF states that all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development. Limiting	Red – n/a.

#	Assessment Criterion	Explanation	Assessment
		the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of sustainable transport modes can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health.	Amber – outside of strategic transport corridor.  Green – within strategic transport corridor.

2.15 A list of all omitted sites will be prepared, identifying the reason for their omission and this will be published on the Councils’ websites.

## Part 2: Availability assessment

2.16 A site is considered to be available for development when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership impediments to development. For example, land controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop may be considered available. The availability of a site could be adversely affected if it is in multiple ownership and the intentions of all interested parties are not known.

### SHLAA Site Assessment – Part 2 Availability Criteria

<u>Availability</u>			
#	Assessment Criterion	Justification	Assessment
28.	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?	Information regarding a site’s current use is important in determining availability and the timescale of it being available to be developed.	Red – site is occupied/in use and there are likely to be significant delays to relocating its current use and/or potential policy conflict.  Amber – site is occupied/in use but its current use does not require relocation.  Green – site is vacant or its current use can cease at short notice.
29.	Does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?		Red – three or more unimplemented permissions.

#	Assessment Criterion	Justification	Assessment
			Amber – up to two recent lapsed permissions.  Green – no unimplemented permissions.
30.	Is the site ownership and/or cooperation evidenced clearly with official documentation?	Evidence of ownership and cooperation would include Land Registry Title Deeds and Title Plans, land options and development agreements with relevant land parties.	Red – no evidence provided.  Amber – incomplete evidence provided.  Green – full evidence provided.

## Part 2: Achievability (inc. viability) assessment

- 2.17 A site is considered achievable if there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular time and whether it is financially viable to do so. For example, a site could be both suitable and available, but the level of financial mitigation required to make it acceptable could result in the site being considered unviable.

### SHLAA Site Assessment – Part 2 Detailed Achievability Criteria

<b>Achievability</b>			
#	Assessment Criterion	Justification	Assessment
31.	Is development of the site in line with existing policies requiring a contribution, i.e., affordable housing, is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	Economic viability is a key component of a site’s deliverability as defined in the NPPF. Establishing the viability of development sites ensures that decisions on future allocations take into account any abnormal costs which may affect development outcomes.	Red – development is likely unviable.  Amber – development is marginal or unknown.  Green – development is likely viable.
32.	Does the development of, or access to, the site rely on	Relying on another piece of land to come	Red – the site relies on another piece of

#	Assessment Criterion	Justification	Assessment
	another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	forward (e.g. ransom strips) can prevent development from coming forward or render development unviable. Establishing the presence of ransom strips through the assessment process provides the Council with reasonable assumptions about a site's achievability.	land and that land has not been put forward for development and/or a ransom strip has been identified.  Amber – the site relies on another piece of land but that land has been put forward for development.  Green – the site does not rely on another piece of land.
33.	Is the site within a Minerals Safeguarding Area and/or Minerals and Waste Consultation Area?	Land may be protected for a number of different uses irrespective of the land ownership. For example, the land may be safeguarded because of its value as a minerals extraction site. Where a promoted site lies within a Minerals Safeguarding Area, SCC will be consulted to confirm whether a Minerals Resource Assessment is required (this applies where the area of a site within a Minerals Safeguarding Area is 5ha or over – this includes contiguous parcels i.e. cant split Site into 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d etc. to negate the threshold) Where a promoted site lies within a Minerals and/or Waste Consultation Area, a Minerals and/or Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment is required.	Red – site is wholly within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. Mineral could be sterilised as a result of the non-mineral proposal.  Amber – site is within a Minerals Consultation Area and/or a Waste Consultation Area.  Green – not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area, Minerals Consultation Area or Waste Consultation Area.
34.	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use within the	Land may be protected for a number of different	Red – site is protected for an alternative use and there is no

#	Assessment Criterion	Justification	Assessment
	Development Plan inc. a Neighbourhood Plan?	uses irrespective of the land ownership.	<p>evidence to suggest that the site should be released for an alternative use.</p> <p>Amber – site is protected for an alternative use but there is evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use.</p> <p>Green – site is not protected for any alternative use.</p>

## Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Assessment Criteria

- 2.18 A Call for Sites for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites was launched on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2024 until 28<sup>th</sup> June 2024. At this time, no sites were submitted to the Councils.
- 2.19 The Councils will need to give consideration to the assessment of sites for Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. The SHLAA is the starting point for assessing all new potential Joint Local Plan Part 2 allocations. The SHLAA approach has been adapted to include criteria specific to the needs of Gypsy and Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople communities including access, landscaping, mitigations, and proximity to the main road network. A RAG rating ('red', 'amber', 'green') rating is to be given for each site for each criterion, accompanied by a commentary and a conclusion. The assessments are informed by information from mapping, the considerations of a broad range of professionals.
- 2.20 The proposed methodology for assessing sites is set out below:

### *Gypsy and Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Site Assessment Criteria*

#	Assessment Criterion	Assessment
35.	<b>Access to the site</b> The site should have suitable access allowing for the manoeuvring of trailers and caravans.	Red – access is unsuitable.  Amber – access would be suitable subject to engineering and design works, e.g. provision of access point with suitable visibility splay.  Green – no access constraints.
36.	<b>Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities</b> The site should be accessible to schools, services and shops by the best available sustainable travel methods (preferably foot, cycle or public transport) to reduce transport impacts. sustainable travel methods	Red – Poor accessibility by both sustainable travel and private vehicle.  Amber – Poor accessibility by sustainable travel, but a reasonable travel time by private vehicle.  Green – Good accessibility by sustainable travel methods.
37.	<b>Accessibility to roads</b> The site should have access to the main 'A' and 'B' class road network.	Red – restricted access along unsuitable roads.  Amber – access via adjoining roads.  Green – direct access onto A and B road networks.
38.	<b>Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Open Space</b> The site should avoid or potentially mitigate adverse impact on locally, nationally and	Red – site mainly located within a designated area.

#	Assessment Criterion	Assessment
	<p>internationally designated sites*<sup>1</sup> and defined green spaces.</p> <p><i>*1 nationally designated sites include: Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); Special Area of Conservation (SAC); Special Protection Area (SPA); Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM); Ancient Woodlands; RAMSAR.</i></p>	<p>Amber – site partially within or adjoining a designated area.</p> <p>Green – site outside and not adjoining any designated area.</p>
39.	<p><b>Contamination and Ground Stability</b></p> <p>The site should be reasonably level and have no constraints from activities such as historic mineral working, landfill, quarrying or tunnelling that cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>Red – unsuitable topography, contamination or ground instability.</p> <p>Amber – some issues identified but potential to be effectively mitigated.</p> <p>Green – no topographical or ground issues.</p>
40.	<p><b>Flood Risk</b></p> <p>The site should be substantially in Flood Zone 1. Any parts of the site susceptible to flood risk (including flood risk Zones 2, 3 and 1% surface water flood risk zone) should be minimal and should not be required for the standing of caravans, dayrooms, or utility blocks.</p>	<p>Red – site wholly within area at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Amber – site partially within area at risk of flooding but the potential for suitable mitigation.</p> <p>Green – site with no identified risk of flooding.</p>
41.	<p><b>Landscapes, Townscape and Heritage Assets</b></p> <p>The position of the site should minimise any adverse impact on protected and sensitive landscapes, townscapes and heritage assets.</p> <p><i>Designations include National Landscapes (formerly AoNBs, Grade 1, Grade 2 Grade 2* Listed Building, Scheduled Ancient Monument, (SAM) Registered Parks and Gardens, Conservation Areas, adopted Neighbourhood Plan identified Locally Listed Heritage Asset, archaeological assets.</i></p>	<p>Red – Site is wholly located within a designated area.</p> <p>Amber – Site is partially within or adjoining a designation.</p> <p>Green – site outside and not adjoining any designated area.</p>
42.	<p><b>Market Attractiveness</b></p> <p>a) There should be a willing landowner prepared to bring forward the site;</p> <p>b) The site should be an attractive location for the travelling community to live in;</p>	<p>Red – site is not available or not considered attractive to the travelling community.</p> <p>Amber – there are constraints which can be addressed and or mitigated.</p> <p>Green – site is available and considered attractive to the community.</p>

#	Assessment Criterion	Assessment
	<p>c) The site should contribute to an overall mix of sites that offers choice.</p>	
<p>43.</p>	<p><b>Site Size and Scale</b>                      The scale of the site should be in keeping with its surroundings, suitable to enable the provision of providing at least 1 pitch and up to approximately 15 pitches.</p> <p>It should also be large enough to allow for on-site landscaping and screening (such as acoustic fencing if required), pitches, ancillary buildings and open space to be provided.</p>	<p>Red – site too small without space for effective mitigation.</p> <p>Amber – site partially constrained but with potential for mitigation.</p> <p>Green – suitable size.</p>
<p>44.</p>	<p><b>Amenity considerations of neighbouring uses and communities</b>                      Any impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) that the site would be likely to be negatively impacted by, or cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas. The site should not be adjoining any land uses that would be detrimental to the sites future occupants and it should also minimise the impact on neighbouring communities.</p>	<p>Red – there is a strong possibility development would be significantly affected by neighbouring use issues.</p> <p>Amber – there is a possibility development would result in some neighbouring use issues.</p> <p>Green – there are no neighbouring use issues.</p>
<p>45.</p>	<p><b>Utilities</b>                      Connections to the electricity and water supply should be available and there should be no impact from utilities infrastructure passing through the site which cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>Red – significant issues with utility provision which are likely to affect the site’s deliverability.</p> <p>Amber – some issues with utility provision.</p> <p>Green – no known issues with utility provision.</p>