



MEDBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Referendum Version - May 2018

Appendix 3

Housing Site Assessment

hyperlinked from main document
Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan

[CLICK HERE TO RETURN](#)

MEDBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

SITE SELECTION FRAMEWORK

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Neighbourhood Plan for Medbourne Parish Council has been prepared by the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee on behalf of the Parish Council. One of the most important objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan is to say where new houses should be built within the Parish to contribute towards the housing need across the district as identified through the evidence provided as part of the proposed submission Local Plan (September 2017).
- 1.2 This Framework sets out how the Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee (MNPAC), identified sustainable sites for the allocation of land for housing development. The recommendations made by the MNPAC were informed by evidence collected and assessed by a Housing Theme Group, supported by an independent consultant.
- 1.3 The Neighbourhood Plan supports the provision of sustainable housing in the Parish and has embraced the desire to meet the District-wide housing provision targets by identifying potential housing sites within the Parish to meet, and exceed, these minimum requirements within locations that are deliverable, developable and most acceptable to the local community.
- 1.4 The sites in question are all within the village of Medbourne which is classified within the draft Local Plan as a "Selected Rural Village" with a requirement to take a specific amount of new housing development over the Plan period.

2. Where did the site suggestions come from?

- 2.1 Harborough District Council has prepared a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which forms a key component of its evidence base for the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The 2015 SHLAA was updated in 2016 specifically for Selected Rural Villages. The SHLAA contains 5 potential development sites suggested by landowners and developers in Medbourne that were considered to be available and deliverable. Only suitable, available and achievable sites with development potential for 10 or more dwellings were included in the SHLAA.
- 2.2 In addition to the SHLAA sites, a total of 33 Landowners were identified and written to with the aim of determining whether they wanted their land to be considered for development. Despite extensive research no owner could be identified for one small area of land within the Parish Boundary. This communication with Landowners resulted in a total of 15 sites being proposed for possible development. These included 4 of the identified SHLAA sites with the 5th SHLAA site (Land to the West

of Uppingham Road) being withdrawn by the Landowner. This process ensured that all landowners were given the opportunity to put their land forward and that the process was both comprehensive and up to date.

2.3 These 15 were:

- Expansion Site including Station House Livery Yard (SHLAA SITE)
- Land off Main Street (SHLAA SITE)
- Manor Farm Hallaton Road (SHLAA SITE)
- Drayton Road South
- Land between Hallaton Road and Paynes Lane (SHLAA SITE)
- Slawston Road/Paynes Lane expansion site
- Hallaton Road Camping Site
- Expansion site of Ashley Road
- Expansion Site behind Brook Terrace
- Land to the rear of 7 Ashley Road
- Land off Uppingham Road adjoining the Blaston Track
- Rear of property Main Street
- Little Acorns Uppingham Road
- Landlocked Site between Waterfall Way and Paynes Lane
- Innarla Caravan Site

2.4 In addition to these sites a small number of Landowners approached the MNPAC with sites that would accommodate 3 or less properties. It was explained to these Landowners that sites of this size would be considered under the “windfall” policy within the Neighbourhood Plan and the policy on limits to development which describes the approach to development within and outside the revised limits to development.

2.5 Following this declaration of interest in development each Landowner was offered a meeting with the MNPAC Chair together with the Chair of the Housing Theme Group. Membership of the Housing Theme Group included a Parish Councillor, 2 other members of the MNPAC and 4 individuals from the village who had expressed an interest in assisting this work during an Open Event held in the Village Hall and a Consultant from YourLocale.

- 2.6 These meetings enabled clarification of the intentions of each landowner in respect of the size and specific location of development and confirmed a clear desire to develop. This resulted in some sites, notably 3 of the SHLAA sites being reduced in size.
- 2.7 At this time the Local Plan for Harborough District Council was still in draft format with different options for Housing Development. The final Local Plan for consultation was finalised prior to completion of the Housing Theme Groups work and this identified a minimum target of 30 properties for Medbourne. In addition to this number it was deemed necessary to build in some “future proofing” to cover any policy changes. Following the assessment of all sites a figure of 39 properties was agreed.

3 Site Selection Criteria

- 3.1 The initial site assessments were undertaken by the Consultant from YourLocale to ensure objectivity and consistency in scoring. These results were then considered by the Housing Theme Group members including the Consultant to ensure that all local factors had been considered. In addition, although some sites were large, including some of the SHLAA sites there had been a clear indication from some Landowners as to which part of the site they wished to develop and what housing density they were considering. This led to some amendments agreed by all members of the Housing Theme Group and it was then possible to rank each site in order of sustainability.

4 The Criteria and the RAG Scoring System

- 4.1 26 criteria relevant to the selection and allocation of sites for new dwellings were identified using evidence from: the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012 (the twelve core planning principles); the methodology jointly agreed between the Local Planning Authorities of Leicester and Leicestershire.
- 4.2 A scoring system, based on Red, Amber, Green (RAG) was applied to criterion 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 wider scale of scoring to give varying weights to different criteria was considered but rejected, as it would be more complicated, less transparent and more subjective.
- 4.3 The following site assessment framework was used to compare each site.

Table 1 – Sustainability - housing land site assessment framework for Medbourne

Issue	Green	Amber	Red
1. Site capacity	Capacity up to 11 dwellings alone or in conjunction with another site Small site	Capacity of between 12-29 dwellings and cannot be sub-divided Medium/extension sites	Capacity of more than 30 dwellings and cannot be sub-divided Large/village expansion site
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 (by the 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 and clear desire to develop	Multiple ownership with desire to develop	Multiple or single ownership with one or more unwilling partners
8. Landscape Quality, Visual Impact Assessment (VIA)	Already modified and/or low quality.	Moderately modified and/or medium quality.	Traditional landscape and/or high quality, or Statutorily protected
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 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	Small to medium impact but with potential to mitigate	Statutory protected species in place
12. Listed Building or important built assets and their setting	No harm to existing building	Mitigation is necessary to prevent harm	A listed or important building would be severely compromised or demolished
13. Impact on the Conservation Area or its setting	Outside conservation area and no impact	Within or outside conservation area with mitigation needed to prevent harm	Harm to conservation area which cannot be mitigated
14. Safe pedestrian access to and from the site	Existing footpath	No footpath but can be created	No potential for footpath
15. Safe vehicular access 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)	Walking distance of 200m or less	Walking distance of 201 – 450m	Walking distance of greater than 451m
18. Distance to designated village centre with community facilities, i.e the pub/village hall.	Walking distance of 200m or less	Walking distance of 201 – 450m	Walking distance of greater than 451m

19. Current existing informal/formal recreational opportunities on site	No recreational uses on site	Informal recreational uses on site	Formal recreational uses on site
20. Ancient monuments or archaeological remains	No impact on ancient monument	Mitigation measures required	Potential for permanent harm
21. 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
22. Gas, oil, pipelines and networks & electricity transmission network	Site unaffected	Re-siting may be necessary	Re-siting may not be possible
23. Any noise issues	No noise issues	Mitigation may be necessary	Noise issues will be an ongoing concern
24. Any contamination issues	No contamination issues	Minor mitigation required	Major mitigation required
25. Any known flooding issues	Site in flood zone 1 No flooding for more than 25 years	Site in flood zone 2 Flooded once in last 25 years	Site in flood zone 3 Flooded more than once in last 25 years
26. Any drainage issues	No drainage issues identified	Need for mitigation	Development would cause 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 Housing Theme Group during 2017 and a joint meeting with The Environment and Heritage Theme Group to share emerging information on the sites, to and to identify any potential conflicts. This led to a reassessment of some sites by the YourLocale Consultant with amendments subsequently agreed by the Housing Theme Group to ensure an objective and transparent approach prior to the assessments being finalised on 30 June 2017. The outcome of these assessments was shared with Harborough District

Council who broadly supported the assessment and made some contributions which were accepted and incorporated into the assessments.

5.2 The identified sites (without an indication of the assessment outcome) were shared at an Open Event in the Village Hall in June 2017 where Residents of the Village were asked to indicate which sites they preferred for development

5.3 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. The final approved sites are highlighted in Green:

Table 2 – Site assessment outcomes

Site Name	Red	Amber	Green	Score	RAG RATING
Livery Yard Only	1	9	16	15	Very High Positive
Land off Main Street	1	11	14	13	High Positive
Manor Farm Hallaton Road	0	11	15	15	Very High Positive
Drayton Road South	6	9	11	5	Medium Positive
Linear Site Hallaton Road	3	11	12	9	High Positive
Slawston Road/Paynes Lane	8	9	9	1	Marginal Site
Hallaton Road Camping site	7	9	10	3	Low Positive
Expansion Site of Ashley Road	13	5	8	-5	Negative scoring
Expansion Site behind Brook Terrace	11	8	7	-4	Negative scoring
Site behind 7 Ashley Road	2	12	12	10	High Positive
Uppingham Road/Blaston Track site	11	8	7	-4	Negative scoring
Rear of Property off Main Street	6	12	8	2	Low Positive
Little Acorns	6	11	9	3	Low Positive
Land between Waterfall Way and Paynes Lane	5	11	10	5	Medium positive
Innarla Caravan Park	9	7	10	1	Marginal Site

6 Summary

- 6.1 The top five sites which have emerged both through the site assessment process and the community consultation yield a total of 39 new dwellings which equates to the minimum housing target established for Medbourne by Harborough District Council through the latest evidence available through the preparation of the Local Plan plus around 30%, which demonstrates the positive approach that has been undertaken towards residential development through the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and allows for any slippage in delivery of identified sites and for an upward reassessment of housing need should this be necessary during the lifetime of the Local Plan, ensuring that the Neighbourhood Plan will continue to shape development over the Plan period.

**Medbourne Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee
November 2017**