

## Appendix 1

### Response to consultation on the assessment frameworks for SLAA and Sustainability Appraisal and Garden Settlements

#### **Summary of Responses to the consultation on the Site Assessment Framework for Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)**

As part of the process of developing the evidence to support the production of the Local Plan, the Council must carry out a Strategic Land Availability Assessment. In order to ensure a fair and comprehensive approach and to be clear in the process of developing the Plan, Colchester Borough Council consulted on the draft framework to be used in the assessment of sites being considered for allocation. The responses received and CBC comments / response are summarised in the table below;

Table 1

	Summary of comments	CBC Response
Gladman Developments	<p><b>Comments on the initial sieve;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is important when considering the issues relating to Flood Zone 3(b) that the potential for mitigation be considered when assessing sites this criteria should allow for mitigation to be provided, if necessary and practicable, to allow any site to proceed forward.</li><li>• with regard to the criteria regarding development boundaries we believe that this needs to be carefully assessed given the current proposals for potential new settlements, in as yet only very broad geographical locations</li></ul> <p><b>Comments on stage 2- Suitability and Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Difficulty in considering how some criteria will be assessed including; coalescence, AQMA.</li></ul>	<p>Flood zone 3b is functional floodplain and should be allowed to function as such. Development of these areas would be unsustainable. Unless a severe shortage of development land is identified, sites in flood zone 3b will automatically be discounted from consideration.</p> <p>The criterion is considered to be appropriate. It allows for the potential of garden settlements. It would be inappropriate and unsustainable for ad hoc development in the countryside to progress further through the assessment process.</p> <p>The assessment process involves using professional judgement. It should be evident where there is likely to be</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the punitive weighting given to brownfield over greenfield sites.</li> <li>• Weighting attributed to agricultural land classification should be carefully considered against the NPPF. Gladman consider this criteria is of limited value in assessing sites</li> <li>• With regard to Neighbourhood Plans Gladman strongly believe that this criteria should be removed entirely from the assessment process.</li> <li>• seek clarification and the broadening out of criteria on a number of points, including; distance to town / local centre to include small clusters of retail in smaller rural locations; clarification of what is meant by “supermarket”; and broaden sources of employment especially in rural areas.</li> <li>• With all the criteria in this stage, there should be the opportunity to consider mitigation options.</li> </ul>	<p>an impact and the comments box provides the option to highlight issues or potential concerns to explain more complex or less clear-cut scenarios.</p> <p>The NPPF encourages the use of brownfield sites. This is factual information that is important to know, it is not the key determining factor to a site’s outcome in the process.</p> <p>The assessment criteria are not weighted. It is factual information that is useful to have in considering sites. It in itself is not likely to be the determining factor in the outcome of the site assessment.</p> <p>This criteria does not inform the overall rating of a site – so it is agreed that it may be better to put the information in the planning history / background information box at the beginning of the assessment. A change to the framework is, therefore, proposed.</p> <p>The criterion relating to supermarkets has been deleted as there is a limited number, so it would be unlikely to give much to the consideration of sites. The comments box provides the opportunity to make reference to other circumstances, including the proximity of smaller employment areas or convenience stores. The measurement to larger facilities helps provide consistency.</p> <p>The assessment form already provides the opportunity to make reference to mitigation. A site is unlikely to be ruled out on an issue that could be mitigated. The assessment</p>
--	--	--

	<p><b>Stage 6- Outcome of Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to the overall assessment it is not clear from the proforma how the overall assessment will be arrived at. We would therefore consider that the proforma should be accompanied by a sheet explaining the Councils approach and the particular importance it puts on each particular criteria</li> </ul>	<p>just means that the facts relating to each site can be considered in determining its suitability/availability/achievability for development.</p> <p>The conclusions are reached through a professional judgement reached by considering all of the information available in the form. The assessment is quite crude in this sense, as sites are RAG rated; they are not given a specific score. Where the circumstances are largely favourable, a site will be attributed an overall green rating, where a site has potential but with some less favourable circumstances, or issues to be addressed, it will be attributed an amber rating, and where a site has clear and significant issues that are likely to prevent its development within the plan period, it will be attributed a red rating.</p>
Irvine Road Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The planning history should summarise the relevant current policies affecting that site.</li> <li>At no point is there any reference to representations made in relation to the site as part of the other Local Plan consultation processes. Surely these are material to the assessment in understanding the views of constituents? This applies to Irvine Road Orchard and representations regarding alternative uses for a community orchard suggesting designation as a Local Green Space</li> <li>Would suggest a site visit is required for the assessment of the Irvine Road site</li> </ul>	<p>It is not considered necessary or appropriate to do this. The thrust of national and local policy is captured within the criteria which the sites are assessed against.</p> <p>Local views are an important but separate consideration. The SLAAssessment is not the appropriate vehicle through which representations on sites should be considered.</p> <p>Site visits will be carried out to gather information on the physical attributes of the site and its surroundings where appropriate. It is not an opportunity for landowners or others to provide their views on a site's appropriateness, or otherwise, for development.</p>

Mersea Homes	<b>Stage 2 Suitability and Sustainability</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is too much focus on large self-contained or urban extension schemes. Villages will unavoidably score low on many of the criteria due to 'proximity' issues. This is obviously not helpful as the I&amp;O included villages in half of the options.</li> <li>What the SLAA tests do not deal with are all the reasons why there can be positive outcomes for village development which counterbalance the normal sustainability assessment criteria. For example addressing the ageing demographic, housing for young people so they can stay close to family, thresholds for community facilities, bolstering falling school roles etc.</li> <li>There need to be assessment criteria which take these matters into account i.e. what positives could come from the proposed development.</li> <li>The SHLAA assessment does refer village proposals back to a SA, in which case our points made on that consultation are also relevant i.e. comparing sites which are in close proximity and could all score the same on the 1-10 criteria.</li> </ul>	<p>The SLAA process does not rank sites. The location of a site outside of a garden settlement has no bearing on its assessment outcome. The form allows for the consideration of all sites, including those in or around villages.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal is the appropriate vehicle for considering the benefits or otherwise of a site's potential development. The SLAA process simply gathers the facts relating to the site. Both processes will be used in the process of proposing site allocations through the Plan making process.</p> <p>As above, the Sustainability Appraisal is considered to be the appropriate process for taking into account the potential impacts/outcomes of a site's development.</p> <p>See responses to the SA frameworks consultation, below.</p>
Office of Road and Rail	No Comment	N/A
Shaun Thomas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The section containing the planning history should summarise the relevant current policies that affect that site. This would seem to be critical in ensuring the site assessment is made within the wider planning context.</li> <li>At no point is there any reference made to representations made in relation to the site as part of</li> </ul>	<p>It is not considered necessary or appropriate to do this. The thrust of national and local policy is captured within the criteria which the sites are assessed against.</p> <p>Local views are an important but separate consideration. The Strategic Land Availability Assessment is not the</p>

	<p>the other Local Plan consultation processes. Surely these are material to the assessment in understanding the views of constituents. in the case of the case of Irvine Road Orchard, I am aware that a number of responses were made to the call for sites, identifying potential alternative uses such as a community orchard and indeed suggesting designation as Local Green Space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would suggest a site visit is required for the assessment of the Irvine Road site</li> </ul>	<p>appropriate vehicle through which representations on sites should be considered.</p> <p>Site visits will be carried out to gather information on the physical attributes of the site and its surroundings. It is not an opportunity for landowners or others to provide their views on a sites appropriateness, or otherwise, for development.</p>
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to heritage assets in the initial sieve at Stage 1 is welcomed as we assume that a red rating relating to a heritage asset would result in the site being considered unsuitable for development.</li> <li>• However, it is not clear what is meant by 'significant negative effect' and this may need defining.</li> <li>• Furthermore, reference to 'a site nationally or internationally designated' excludes conservation areas, which are locally designated but recognised by national policy as designated heritage assets.</li> <li>• Reference to heritage assets at the suitability test in Stage 2 is also welcomed. Identifying harm will need to be done on a case by case basis as the form suggests.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This will largely involve professional judgement. It is difficult to provide precise details as it depends on the asset, its surroundings and the nature of the site being assessed, together with its accompanying proposals.</p> <p>It is felt that it is more appropriate to deal with impacts on locally designated assets, including conservation areas, in stage 2 of the assessment. It is felt that it is likely in many cases that development could be designed to take account of a conservation area and its characteristics and that it would be inappropriate and unlikely for a site to be sieved out at stage one on this basis.</p> <p>Noted</p>

## Sustainability Appraisal Framework Garden Settlements- Consultation Responses

The consultation invited comments on the Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessment Pro-forma and the approach for the assessment of Garden Settlements. These were an addendum to the original Scoping Report. Consultees were invited to consider the following in their responses:

1. Is the range of site assessment criteria appropriate?
2. Are the sources of information used adequate to address all relevant sustainability issues?
3. Are there any additional criteria that would be appropriate to add, or that could or should replace any of the existing site assessment criteria?
4. Does the framework for the assessment of the Garden Settlements, with the inclusion of an additional sustainability objective, represent an appropriate way of assessing Garden Settlement sites?

Table 2

Respondent	Summary of comments	Response
CAUSE	<p><i>Is the range of site assessment criteria appropriate?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The criteria in the assessment is too detailed for this stage of the plan preparation;</li> <li>• The analysis will be fragmented rather than looking as potential area as a whole;</li> <li>• High level questions need to be asked first in relation to how best to make North Colchester a good place to live and deliver the right types of houses and jobs with delivery of appropriate infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><i>Are the sources of information used adequate to address all relevant sustainability issues?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the addition of 3 further documents;</li> <li>• The Campaign for Better Transport's 2014 Car Dependency Scorecard</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The level of detail is adequate for the stage in the process of plan preparation.</p> <p>As well as the assessment of specific sites, the sustainability appraisal will also be applied at a strategic level and consider the principles of the area as a whole</p> <p>The points made are understood, no change is necessary as the issues will be covered by the assessment of higher level elements of the emerging plan in particular the Spatial Strategy</p> <p>These documents will be scoped and added if appropriate.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freiburg: City of Vision</li> <li>• The Town and Country Planning Association's "Re-imagining garden cities for the 21st century: benefits and lessons in bringing forward comprehensively planned communities",</li> </ul> <p><i>Are there any additional criteria that would be appropriate to add, or that could or should replace any of the existing site assessment criteria?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall view is that too detailed at this stage but suggest some revisions as follows; Increase emphasis on regeneration and use of brownfield land and evidence that this has been exhausted;</li> <li>• Does the development meet local housing need?</li> <li>• does the development allow links with other employment areas or will it stand alone?</li> <li>• Will it provide high skilled jobs</li> <li>• Additional criteria suggested to assess deliverability to cover- can this development deliver what the town needs? and is there an appropriate delivery vehicle in place?</li> <li>• The definition of affordable housing should also include market housing to meet all needs to ensure needs are met in the right place with the right type of homes;</li> <li>• Transport criteria to be refined to place greater emphasis on connections from development to Colchester;</li> <li>• Reverse questions for criteria 11 and add further point –</li> </ul>	<p>Covered sufficiently by criteria (2) and assessment will respond to the current evidence.</p> <p>Covered sufficiently by criteria (1)</p> <p>Will be drawn out in the assessment and commentary</p> <p>Covered by existing criteria (3)</p> <p>Agreed- amendment to objective 2 and criteria shown as <u>underlined text</u> in appendix 3</p> <p>The Definition of affordable housing is nationally defined. The reference to market housing here will be covered under existing criteria (1) and assessment will be related to the OAN and SHMA</p> <p>Covered by existing criteria (4)</p> <p>Have interpreted "reverse the question" as suggest the</p>
--	--	--

	<p>will this development support Colchester and its growth</p> <p><i>Does the framework for the assessment of the Garden Settlements, with the inclusion of an additional sustainability objective, represent an appropriate way of assessing Garden Settlement sites?</i></p> <p>Too detailed for assessment at this stage of the process</p>	<p>question to be worded positively in line with other questions to make the assessment scoring consistent. Point re supporting Colchester. Agreed and amendment to criteria for objective 11 shown as <u>underlined text</u> in appendix 3.</p> <p>The assessment is appropriate for the stage of plan preparation process and compliant with legislative requirements for the SA</p>
Wivenhoe Society	<p>The Wivenhoe Society is concerned that the assessment criteria do not specifically consider the impacts on the existing road networks and that a criterion should be included to take account of the likely effects on road congestion of large scale developments of the garden settlement type. To assess such effects the Borough needs an adequate data base detailing existing traffic flows and destinations and data on the potential for improvements to the road network and traffic management.</p>	<p>The evidence base required to adequately consider the traffic impacts and mitigation requirements of any proposed development is being prepared and will be used as appropriate in the SA assessment. Comments noted.</p>
Mersea Homes	<p>Concerns expressed as follows;</p> <p>In most instances the sites will be very close to each other and scheduled for the same amount of development, the Site Assessment Framework's objectives do not separate out the choices. If you actually try to apply the 10 objectives to sites in many cases the scoring will come out too similar to give useful results.</p> <p>Consider that a much finer grain of assessment is needed and we would think relevant objectives and assessment criteria should also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Visual impact on settlement and or surrounding countryside</li> </ul>	<p>The concern is noted. The Site Assessment Framework is considered suitable to explore the significant effects of sites promoted within or as extensions to key villages and small towns in the Borough. The Sustainability Appraisal is a strategic undertaking, and should focus on the environmental, economic and social impacts that are likely to be significant. It does not need to be done in any more detail, or using more resources, than is considered to be appropriate for the content and level of detail in the Local Plan.</p> <p>This is in part captured by Objective 8) with information taken from the Landscape Character Assessment. An additional criterion regarding the visual prominence and inter-visibility of more detailed areas is proposed for inclusion in the appraisal framework (see below in</p>



	<p>b. Ability to fit within existing settlement pattern context</p> <p>c. Location in relation to delivery of community facilities [for urban sites / larger villages].</p> <p>d. Offers safe access to existing community centre / facilities</p> <p>e. Scale of visual impact when compared with existing settlement.</p> <p>f. On balance which option would generate the least harm and deliver the greatest benefits.</p> <p>In contrast our general thoughts on the outcome for the 10 questions in the proposed document would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not helpful to distinguish which option for each settlement is the most appropriate choice.</li> <li>2. In most cases option sites would all score the same</li> <li>3. Ditto</li> <li>4. Ditto</li> <li>5. Ditto with exception of delivering open space</li> <li>6. Ditto</li> <li>7. Depends on appropriate design, so would be the same for all options</li> <li>8. Important judgement criteria</li> <li>9. Relevant</li> <li>10. In most cases option sites would all score the same</li> </ol>	<p>appendix 3 proposed amendment <u>underlined</u>).</p> <p>This criterion has been added to the framework (see below in appendix 3 proposed amendment <u>underlined text</u>).</p> <p>This criterion has been added to the framework (see below in appendix 3 proposed amendment <u>underlined text</u>).</p> <p>This requested criterion is currently covered by a range of existing criteria within the framework.</p> <p>Addressed in response to a).</p> <p>This will be summarised once site appraisal work has been undertaken in the forthcoming Environmental Report for consultation.</p> <p>Noted. In response, the narrative element of appraisals will focus on addressing these concerns in turn for site options relevant to their place in the settlement hierarchy. In addition, proposals will have to also have to adhere to the planning policy elements of the Local Plan. The sustainability appraisal of these and their alternatives will focus on specific sustainability concerns relevant to each policy theme</p>
Office of		Noted

Road and Rail	No Comments	
Shaun Thomas	<p>Supports the Sustainability appraisal framework with the following exception;</p> <p>The assessment criteria in respect of open space are quite clear - "Will existing open spaces be protected &amp; new open spaces be created?" and "Would the site see a loss of open space?". These tests are consistent with ensuring the Plan is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework, para 74</p> <p>However, the Sustainability Framework then introduces the concept of "publically" accessible open space that has no significance nor reference in either National or Local Planning Policy. I strongly suggest that the Framework is revised to use those terms that are consistent with Planning Policy ie simply "open space" or "private and public open space."</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The impact of the loss of open space without public access is uncertain and will very much depend upon the site itself, the extent to which is serves and amenity value/ Green Infrastructure / biodiversity function which will vary site by site.. To provide clarity on this point reference to the need for further investigation in such cases is proposed <u>underlined text</u> in appendix 3 (criteria 5).</p>
Irvine Road Residents Association	<p>Supports the main criteria to be used, but we are concerned to know why the completely irrelevant category of 'Publicly Accessible Open Space' has been added to The Sustainability Framework.</p> <p>This concept is not valid in Local or Nation Planning policy and should be removed.</p>	<p>The impact of the loss of open space without public access is uncertain and will very much depend upon the site itself, the extent to which is serves and amenity value/ Green Infrastructure / biodiversity function which will vary site by site.. To provide clarity on this point reference to the need for further investigation in such cases is proposed <u>underlined text</u> in appendix 3(criteria 5).</p>
Historic England	<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Addendum: Site Assessment Framework</b></p> <p>We welcome the first criterion (against objective 7)in terms of assessing designated heritage assets on site and within the vicinity and the consideration of assets 'at risk', although it should be noted that registered parks &amp; gardens and conservation areas can be at risk too (there are three conservation areas at risk within the borough).</p> <p>We also welcome the other two criteria relating to archaeology and locally listed heritage assets.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Changes have been made to all relevant SA Frameworks. Appendix 3</p>

	<p>We have some concerns with the ‘type of impact’ associated with the first criterion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation areas are missing from the list of designated heritage assets and should be included.</li> <li>• A ‘significant positive impact’ is not one where there are no designated heritage assets and no impact (this should belong under the ‘no impact’ column), but where a proposal results in the enhancement of a heritage asset and, where applicable, its positive removal from being ‘at risk’</li> <li>• Reference to enabling development under a ‘positive impact’ should be deleted, as it is not advisable to consider specific enabling development proposals through the Local Plan. Enabling development is defined in paragraph 140 of the NPPF as ‘development which would otherwise conflict with planning policies’. It has to be assessed at a planning application stage based on current economic conditions, rather than allocated in a plan that could cover different economic cycles and would no longer conflict with planning policy.</li> <li>• There should be text under the ‘negative impact’ column, using</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Changes have been made to all relevant SA Frameworks. Appendix 3</p> <p>For the purposes of being able to broadly compare a large amount of site options against known constraints, particularly at the early stages of the plan-making process, assessing the presence of designated heritage assets on site is considered a suitable first step. It should be noted that it would not be known, based on the level of information available for each site at this stage, whether any would enhance a heritage asset to the extent of its removal from being ‘at risk’. Recording significant positive impacts at this stage allows a greater degree of comparison between sites, and is consistent with the approach for other criteria that sees less constrained sites ‘scored’ more positively than those that are not. The response is noted however, and any forthcoming proposal’s potential to remove a designated heritage asset’s ‘at risk’ status will be incorporated into relevant site and/or other policies against which planning applications will be determined</p> <p>Noted. Reference to enabling development has been removed. Appendix 3</p> <p>Noted. The amendment has been made. Appendix 3</p>
--	--	---

	<p>the wording from the 'significant negative' column (albeit with replacing 'or' with 'an' after the word 'applicable')</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of text for the 'significant negative impact' column, this could refer to an assessed significant negative impact.</li> </ul> <p>We also have some concerns with the 'types of impact' associated with the second criterion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 'significant positive impact' is not necessary previously developed land (PDL) or previously investigated deposits. PDL may retain archaeological interest where new development may negatively impact on that interest. Similarly, previously investigated deposits could be very important and best preserved in-situ. Again, development may negative impact on such deposits.</li> <li>• 'No known deposits on site' is not necessarily a 'positive impact', but rather an uncertain impact. Sites where it can be demonstrated there is little or no archaeological deposits could score positively.</li> </ul> <p>Finally, we have some concerns with the 'types of impact' associated with the third criterion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 'significant positive impact' could be an enhancement of a locally listed heritage asset</li> <li>• A 'positive impact' could be proposals that will not see harm to any locally listed heritage assets, as well as no loss.</li> <li>• A 'negative impact' could be proposals that cause harm, while a 'significant negative impact' could be proposals that result in loss.</li> </ul> <p>We note the strategic selection criteria that could be applied to garden settlements including cross-boundary options. We assume that the overall SA site assessment framework will be applied to garden settlement sites before the strategic selection</p>	<p>Noted. The amendment has been made. Appendix 3</p> <p>.</p> <p>Noted. Significant positive impacts will be for sites with no archaeological deposits. Positive impacts will be recorded for sites with little / small archaeological deposits.</p> <p>Noted. The amendment has been made. Appendix 3</p> <p>Noted. The amendment has been made. Appendix 3</p> <p>Noted. The amendment has been made. Appendix 3</p> <p>Noted this will all be part of the iterative process</p>
--	---	---

	<p>criteria are applied, as this would ensure consistency of assessment.</p> <p>Criterion 2 relating to impacts refers to acceptable impacts on various topics including heritage assets. While this is helpful, it is not clear what is meant by 'acceptable impacts' and this may need defining. Furthermore, there are a broad range of topics covered by Criterion 2, which may make it difficult to score accurately (for example, if the only unacceptable impact related to heritage assets, but everything else was acceptable, would the overall score be acceptable?). Table 2 suggests that topics will be separated out into individual SA objectives, including one relating to the historic environment, and we assume that there will be detailed assessment based on the overall SA framework.</p>	<p>There will be a consistent approach followed in respect of the assessment of impacts and the detailed consideration of the range of topics in order to complete the assessment based on the overall SA framework</p>
--	--	---

## Appendix 2

### Draft Strategic Land Availability Assessment Framework - Housing July 2015

Site name	
Reference number	
Settlement	
Size <a href="#">Site area available here</a>	ha (developable area - ....ha)
Proposed use/s	

Planning history / context
This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including <u>the</u> relationship <del>to</del> <u>and information relating to a neighbourhood plan</u> , where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site. <a href="#">C-Maps</a>

#### Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

Assessment criterion	RAG Rating	Comments (Information from desk-top survey and site visit)
Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Source – Call for Sites pro-forma & <a href="#">EA Mapping</a>	G	
Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha? Source – Call for Sites pro-forma & GIS	A	
Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary and is it outside of the vicinity of potential areas for growth, as identified in the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Paper? Source – Call for Sites pro-forma & Proposals Map	R	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance? Source – GIS, Proposals Map & Call for Sites pro-forma		
Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway? Source - mapping		

**Stage 1B: Second sieve**

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

Assessment criterion	Yes / No	Comments (Information from desk-top survey and site visit)
Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?		
Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?		
Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?		



## Stage 2: Suitability and sustainability

Assessment criterion	RAG rating	Comments (Information from desk-top survey and site visit)	Mitigation measures
<b>Physical constraints</b>			
Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)? Source – Proposals Map and Issues and Options Paper			
Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements? Source – Proposals Map & site visit			
What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints? Source – Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC			
Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities? Source – Call for Sites pro-forma & information from discussions with infrastructure providers			

<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma, GIS &amp; site visit</p>			
<p>Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield?</p> <p>G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus)</p> <p>A – part brownfield, part greenfield</p> <p>R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping &amp; site visit</p>			
<p>What is the agricultural land classification?</p> <p>G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more)</p> <p>A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories)</p> <p>R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)</p> <p>Source – C-Maps</p>			
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping &amp; site visit</p>			
<p>Is the site within or close to an AQMA?</p> <p>Source – GIS &amp; <a href="#">AQMA Map</a></p>			

<p>Is the site within a neighbourhood plan area?</p> <p><b>G— No</b></p> <p><b>A—</b> Is within a NP area, but the NP is not seeking to allocate sites, or there is a likelihood that the Parish Council will seek to become a Neighbourhood Plan Area in the near future.</p> <p><b>R—</b> Yes and the NP is looking at making allocations</p> <p>Source— NP designations and info from relevant planning officer</p>			
<b>Environmental constraints</b>			
<p>Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to the AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma, GIS, <a href="#">Open Countryside report</a>, <a href="#">Landscape Character Assessment</a>, <a href="#">Urban Fringe Report</a>, Proposals Map &amp; site visit</p>			
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Source – Call for Sites pro-forma, GIS, Proposals Map &amp; site visit</p>			

<p>Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting? Source – Call for Sites pro-forma, GIS, Proposals Map &amp; <a href="#">Historic Environment Characterisation Report</a></p>			
<p>Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PROW, or a bridleway? Source – Call for Site pro-forma, Proposals Map, <a href="#">Urban Fringe Report</a> &amp; <a href="#">C-Maps</a> (turn on PROW on key &amp; turn off other info)</p>			
<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk (including Critical Drainage Areas)? Source – Call for Sites pro-forma, <a href="#">EA flood mapping</a> (change drop-down box to get surface water flooding), <a href="#">Surface Water Management Plan</a> &amp; Proposals Map</p>			
<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere? Source – Information provided by Anglian Water, Call for Sites pro-forma, EA, GIS &amp; SFRA</p>			

Views – are there any key views to or from the site? Source – Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit			
<b>Access to services</b>			
Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m Source – Mapping, GIS & bus timetables			
Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m Source – mapping & station timetables			
Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m Source – <a href="#">Mapping</a> , <a href="#">GIS</a>			

<p>Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development)</p> <p>G – up to 1,200m</p> <p>A – 1,201m – 2,000m</p> <p>R – over 2,000m</p> <p>Source – <a href="#">Mapping, GIS</a></p>			
<p>Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?)</p> <p>G – up to 400m</p> <p>A – 401m – 800m</p> <p>R – over 800m</p> <p>Source – <a href="#">Map provided by the health service</a>, GIS</p>			
<p>Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?)</p> <p>G – up to 800m</p> <p>A – 801m – 1,200m</p> <p>R – over 1,200m</p> <p>Source – mapping, GIS</p>			

<p>Distance to Strategic Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?)</p> <p>G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m</p> <p>Source - GIS</p>			
<p>Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?)</p> <p>G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m</p> <p>Source – GIS</p>			
<p>Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?)</p> <p>G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m</p> <p>Source - GIS</p>			

### Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

### Stage 3: Availability

Assessment criterion	Rag rating	Comment (Information from desk-top survey and site visit)	Mitigation measures
<p>Has the site been promoted for development?</p> <p>G – Yes it's been promoted</p> <p>A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process</p> <p>R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma</p>			
<p>Site ownership</p> <p>G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership</p> <p>A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known</p> <p>R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma / any land ownership information the Council has obtained from the Land Registry</p>			



<p>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?</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma &amp; site visit</p>			
--	--	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's availability

#### Stage 4: Achievability

Assessment criterion	Rag rating	Comment (Information from desk-top survey and site visit)	Mitigation measures
<p>Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?</p> <p>Source - Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / land owner</p>			

<p>Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma &amp; mapping</p>			
<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Source – Proposals Map/GIS</p>			
<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Source – Local Plan evidence base, e.g. Employment Land Needs Assessment</p>			
<p>Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?</p> <p>Source - Call for Sites pro-forma &amp; Contamination Register</p>			
<p>Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma &amp; Local Plan evidence base</p>			

<p>Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Source – Information supplied by NHS England – <a href="#">Capacity info</a></p>			
<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Source – <a href="#">Commissioning School Places in Essex 2014-19</a> (type in name of school or see list on p51)</p>			
<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Source – <a href="#">Commissioning School Places in Essex 2014-19</a> &amp; any information received from head teachers</p>			

<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions</p> <p>A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions</p> <p>R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p> <p>Source – Call for Sites pro-forma &amp; <a href="#">C-Maps</a> (turn on info for all years)</p>			
<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>			

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

**Stage 5: Site visit**

Notes and observations from site visit

**Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment**

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Outcome	
G – suitable/achievable/available A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so	

<b>Site capacity</b>	
----------------------	--

Estimated timescale for delivery				
Immediately	Up to 5 years	5-10 years	10-15 years	15 years +

### Appendix 3

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
1. To provide a sufficient level of housing to meet the objectively assessed needs of the Borough to enable people to live in a decent, safe home which meets their needs at a price they can afford	Will it deliver the number of houses needed to support the existing and growing population?	Is the site proposed for residential development?	N/A	Yes and in conformity with the Spatial Strategy and what can be considered suitable and proportionate growth for the area / settlement.	Yes, however not in conformity with the Spatial Strategy and what can be considered suitable and proportionate growth for the area / settlement.	N/A	Proposals for other uses (inc. those for RSL sites, care homes and Gypsy and Traveller accommodation)	Where applicable

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
	Will it provide more affordable homes across the Borough?	Assume 20% from Core Strategy Policy H4 Potential yield for site – from developable site area (call-for-sites) and SHLAA (see below)	Proposal is solely for affordable housing.	Potential yield is for more than 10 dwellings in Colchester, Stanway, Tiptree, Wivenhoe, Marks Tey, West Bergholt and West Mersea, OR Potential yield is for more than 5 dwellings in the other villages OR Site is for rural exception housing	Potential yield is for more than 10 dwellings in Colchester Stanway, Tiptree, Wivenhoe, Marks Tey, West Bergholt and West Mersea, OR Potential yield is for more than 5 dwellings in the other villages	N/A	Proposals for other uses	Where applicable
	Will it deliver a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs of the Borough?	Accommodation type if known	Site is for a care home, Gypsy and Traveller site	N/A	N/A	N/A	All other proposals	Where applicable



Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
2. To ensure that development is located sustainably and makes efficient use of land	Will it promote regeneration?	Is the site is located within or adjacent to an area that could benefit from regeneration?	N/A	The site is located within or adjacent to an area that could benefit from regeneration.	N/A	N/A	Sites not located within or adjacent that could benefit from regeneration.  (Gypsy and Traveller proposals)	Where applicable
	Will it reduce the need for development on greenfield land?	Is the site PDL or Greenfield? (As per SLAA).	100% brownfield	Brownfield (approx. 75% plus)	Greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	100% Greenfield	N/A	Approximately 50% brownfield / greenfield  Where applicable
	Will it provide good accessibility by a range of modes of transport?	Distances to town / local centres with a range of existing facilities.	Within Town / Local Centre boundary	Up to 400m from boundary	Over 800m from boundary	N/A	N/A	401m-800m from boundary  Where applicable  (Gypsy and Traveller sites over 401m from boundary)
	Will densities make efficient use of land?	Likely density, to be determined by site location	N/A	Conforms to density requirements for specific area (as per Policy H2)	Does not conform to density requirements for specific area (as per Policy H2)	N/A	Non-residential proposal	Where applicable

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
	Will a mix of uses be provided?	Proposal by / discussions with landowner (if known)	N/A	Proposal is for mixed-use	N/A	N/A	Proposal is not for mixed-use	Where applicable
	Will it see a loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	ALC Map	Urban or non-agricultural use	Grades 4 or 5	Grades 2	Grade1	N/A	Where applicable OR Grade3
3. To achieve a prosperous and sustainable economy that improves opportunities for local businesses to thrive, creates new jobs and improves the vitality of centres	Will it improve the delivery of a range of employment opportunities to support the growing population?	Is the site for employment use?	Proposal is for employment use	Proposal is for mixed-use incorporating employment opportunities	Proposal sees a loss of previously employment land	Proposal is on land protected for employment use	Non-employment proposals	Where applicable
	Will it maintain an appropriate balance between different types of retail uses and other activities in the Borough's centres?	Proposal in context of town / local centres hierarchy	Proposal is for retail/town centre uses and is located within Colchester Town Centre	OR Proposal is for, or includes, retail, office or leisure within defined centres	Proposal is for, or includes, retail, office or leisure outside defined centres	N/A	Residential proposals	Where applicable

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
	Will it help sustain the rural economy?	<p>Employment proposal - location within village (development) boundaries and conformity to Core Strategy Policy?</p> <p>Rural - not including Rural District Centres.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy ENV2 – Rural Communities (revised July 2014): Outside village boundaries, the Council will favourably consider sustainable rural business, leisure and tourism schemes that are of an appropriate scale and which help meet local employment needs, minimise negative environmental impacts, and harmonise with the local character and surrounding natural environment. Development outside but contiguous to village settlement boundaries may be supported, primarily where it constitutes an exception to meet identified local affordable housing needs.</p>	Employment proposals (business, leisure, tourism) in rural areas (as defined) within or adjacent to existing development boundaries	Employment proposals (business, leisure, tourism) in rural areas (as defined) physically separated from existing development boundaries	N/A	N/A	Non-employment proposals	Where applicable
4. To achieve more sustainable travel behaviour, reduce the need	Will it reduce the need to travel?	Is site well located in relation to town centre / facilities and services and public transport?	SLAA – Green rating	N/A	N/A	SLAA – Red rating	N/A	Where applicable  SHLAA – Amber rating

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
to travel and reduce congestion	Will the levels of sustainable travel increase?	(Walking) distance to a public transport mode - adapted from SLAA	< or = to 400m to a bus stop or train station	> 400-800m to a bus stop or train station	>1km from train station or bus stop	>1.2km from train station and bus stop	N/A	Where applicable  > 800-1km to a bus stop or train station
	Will it improve sustainable transport infrastructure and linkages?	Scale based	Likely to improve sustainable transport infrastructure and linkages	Potential to improve sustainable transport infrastructure and linkages	Could impede the delivery of future transport related infrastructure projects (SLAA rating: AMBER)	Would impede the delivery of future transport related infrastructure projects (SLAA rating: RED)	N/A	Where applicable  Uncertain at this point.
5. To build stronger, more resilient sustainable communities with better education and social outcomes	Will it provide equitable access to education, recreation and community facilities?	Distances to primary school – adapted from SLAA	< or = to 400m	> 400-800m	>1km	>1.2km	N/A	Where applicable  > 800-1km
		Distances to secondary school – adapted from SLAA	< or = to 400m	> 400-800m	>1km	>1.2km	N/A	Where applicable  > 800-1km

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
	Will it place pressure on school places, including early years?	<p>School Organisation Plan – capacities and forecast pupil numbers for each school.</p> <p>Primary threshold - 0.3 additional pupils per new house and 0.15 additional pupils per new flat (1-bed exempt)</p> <p>Secondary threshold - 0.2 additional pupils per new house and 0.1 additional pupils per new flat (1-bed exempt).</p> <p>Sixth Form – 0.04 additional pupils per new house and 0.02 additional pupils per new flat (1-bed exempt).</p> <p>New Early Years threshold – FOR INFO ONLY (no set criteria) Development of over than 250 dwellings or generating more than 500 jobs could support a bespoke facility.</p> <p>NOTE: impacts are for single site assessments only. Cumulative impacts in an area are likely to be more reflective of capacity issues.</p>	Potential dwelling yield of site can be accommodated by nearest primary (or those in catchment) and secondary school.	Potential yield of site can be accommodated by nearest primary school (or those in catchment)	Potential yield of site can not be accommodated by either one of nearest primary school (or those in catchment) or secondary school.	Potential yield of site can not be accommodated by both the nearest primary school (or those in catchment) and secondary school.	Site is not proposed for housing, or is an exemption as defined in the ECC Developer's Guide to Infrastructure Contributions .	Where applicable

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
	Will existing open spaces be protected & new open spaces be created?	Would the site see a loss of open space?	N/A	No loss of publically accessible open space (as designated in LP)	Loss of publically accessible open space (as designated in LP)	N/A	N/A	Where applicable  Loss of open space that is not publically accessible (as designated in LP) ( <u>sites in this category may require further investigation to confirm + / - impact</u> ))
	Will it improve the skills of the Borough's population?	Access to further education	Walking distance from further or higher education, and /or training opportunities.	Good transport links to further or higher education, and /or training opportunities	Car only accessibility to further or higher education, and /or training opportunities	N/A	N/A	Where applicable
	<u>Will there be an increase in community facilities?</u>	<u>Will the proposal see an increase in community facilities?</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Proposal is for or includes the provision of a community facility(s)</u>	<u>Proposal would see a loss of community facility(s)</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Proposal is for a different use.</u>	<u>Where applicable</u>
6. To improve and reduce inequalities in health and wellbeing and	Will it provide equitable access to employment opportunities?	Distance to Strategic Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) adapted from SLAA	< or = to 400m	> 400-800m	>1km	>1.2km	N/A	Where applicable  > 800-1km

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
tackle crime issues by keeping our communities safe and promoting community cohesion	Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?	<p>Does the site conform to Natural England ANGSt (numerous criteria, all or some applicable)?</p> <p>ANGSt recommends that everyone, wherever they live, should have an accessible natural greenspace:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- of at least 2 hectares in size, no more than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home;</li> <li>- at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home;</li> <li>- one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home; and</li> <li>- one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home;</li> </ul>	Site conforms to 4/4 of the ANGSt criteria	Site conforms to 3/4 of the ANGSt criteria	Site conforms to 1/4 of the ANGSt criteria	Site conforms to none of the ANGSt criteria	Non-residential allocations	<p>Where applicable</p> <p>Site conforms to 2/4 of the ANGSt criteria</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
7. To conserve and enhance the townscape character, and the heritage and cultural assets of the Borough	Will it protect and enhance the heritage and cultural assets of the Borough?	Are there any of the following (including their settings) on site (?) and will there be any impacts within the vicinity (in-house assessment)?:  - Listed buildings (and at risk) - Scheduled Monuments (and at risk) - Registered Parks and Gardens - Conservation Areas <u>(and at risk)</u>	The proposal has no listed buildings, scheduled monuments, <u>conservation areas</u> , registered parks and gardens on site (or is within their settings where applicable) and will have no assessed impact.	The proposal has a listed building, scheduled <u>conservation areas</u> , monument or registered park or garden on site (or is within their setting where applicable) <u>But will have no assessed impact but is required as part of enabling development to secure the future of the asset, and there will be no additional impact.</u>	The proposal has a listed building, scheduled monument, <u>conservation areas</u> , registered park or garden on site or is within their setting where applicable will have an assessed negative impact.	The proposal has a listed building, scheduled monument, <u>conservation areas</u> , registered park or garden on site or is within their setting where applicable or will have an assessed <u>significant</u> negative impact.	N/A	Where applicable
		Are there any known archaeological deposits on the site? (In-house archaeological assessment)	PDL or deposits previously investigated	<u>No assessed impacts on any known deposits</u>	Known deposits on site	Significant known deposits on site	N/A	Potential deposits on site (significance unknown)



Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
		Are there any locally listed heritage assets (and at risk) on the site?	N/A or <u>could be an enhancement of a locally listed heritage asset</u>	The proposal will not see the loss of any locally listed buildings. <u>or proposals that will not see harm to any locally listed heritage assets</u>	The proposal <u>will cause harm</u> to one or more locally listed buildings.	<u>The proposal will see the loss of one or more locally listed buildings.</u>	N/A	Where applicable
8. To value, conserve and enhance the natural environment, natural resources and the biodiversity of the Borough	Will it maintain and enhance the landscape character of the borough?	Is it in the AONB?  Is it in an area of high sensitivity to change from the Landscape Character Assessment? Can be done as a desktop exercise, or involve the input from Borough Landscape and Arboriculture advisors/planners	Site is in an area of low sensitivity to change	Site is in an area of low to moderate sensitivity to change	Site is within an area of high or moderate to high sensitivity to change from LCA	Site is within the AONB.	N/A	Where applicable  Site is in an area of moderate sensitivity to change

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
	<u>Will there be a visual impact on the settlement / surrounding countryside?</u>	<u>The visual prominence and intervisibility of relevant Landscape Character Areas? (Townscape Character Assessment of Colchester, Tiptree, West Mersea and Wivenhoe, 2006)</u>	<u>Site is in an area of LOW visual prominence and LOW intervisibility</u>	<u>Site is in an area of LOW visual prominence and MODERTAE intervisibility or vice versa.</u>	<u>Site is in an area with either HIGH visual prominence and MODERATE intervisibility or vice versa</u>	<u>Site is in an area of HIGH visual prominence and HIGH intervisibility</u>	<u>Brownfield development.</u>	<u>Site is in an area of MODERATE visual prominence and MODERATE intervisibility.</u>  <u>OR</u> <u>Area not covered by the Townscape Character Assessment.</u>
	<u>Will there be any adverse impacts on the distinctive setting of the settlement?</u>	<u>The contribution to distinctive settlement setting of relevant Landscape Character Areas? (Townscape Character Assessment of Colchester, Tiptree, West Mersea and Wivenhoe, 2006)</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Site is in an area that makes a 'very limited' contribution to the distinctive setting of the settlement.</u>	<u>Site is in an area that makes a 'very important' contribution to the distinctive setting of the settlement.</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Site is in area that makes a 'partial' contribution to the distinctive setting of the settlement.</u>
	<u>Will it protect and enhance designated areas of the countryside and coastal environment?</u>	<u>Is the site within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone?</u>	<u>Site is not within a SSSI IRZ</u>	<u>Site is within a SSSI IRZ but is for a use that would not require consultation with Natural England</u>	<u>Site is adjacent to a SSSI.</u>	<u>Site is within a SSSI.</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Where applicable</u>  <u>Site is within a SSSI IRZ and would require consultation with Natural England</u>

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
		Is the site within the Coastal Protection Belt?	N/A	Site is not within the CPB.	Site is within the CPB.	N/A	N/A	Where applicable  Site is partly within the CPB
	Will it protect and improve biodiversity?	Is the site within / on / adjacent to: - NNR - LNR - LoWS - SINC sites (inc. cSINC sites)  Findings of HRA in regards to proximity of sites (and likelihood of significant effects) to: - SPAs - SACs - Ramsars	N/A	Site will not affect a SPA, SAC, Ramsar, NNR, LNR, LoWS, SINC, cSINC	Site is within or partly within, or adjacent to a NNR, LNR, LoWS, SINC, cSINC	Site is within or partly within, or adjacent to a SPA, SAC, Ramsar,	N/A	Where applicable
		Is the site within / on / adjacent to: • Ancient Woodland • TPO(s)	N/A	Site will not affect Ancient Woodland, a Protected Lane / Special Verge, TPO.	Site is within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. OR Site access is via a Protected Lane / Special Verge OR Site would see the loss of a TPO, or group.	N/A	N/A	Where applicable

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
	Will it improve environmental quality in terms of water, air and soil quality?	Is the site in a groundwater source protection zone (zone 1, 2, 3 etc)?	N/A	Not in GPZ	Within outer zone (Zone 2, Zone 2c)	Within inner zone (Zone 1, Zone 1c)	N/A	Where applicable  Within total catchment (Zone 3)
		Proximity to AQMA(s)	N/A	Site is >200m from an AQMA	Site is < or = to 200m of an AQMA	N/A	N/A	Where applicable
		Is the site contaminated land?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A  (For Gypsy and Traveller Site Provision – site is on contaminated land)	Site is not on contaminated land	Site is on contaminated land / suspected contaminated (for information only)
9. To make efficient use of energy and reduce, reuse or recycle waste	Will it reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions?	Is the use adjacent to sensitive receptors (a hospital / school)?	N/A	Use not adjacent to sensitive receptor	Use adjacent to sensitive receptor	N/A	N/A	Where applicable
	Will it help to reduce, reuse and recycle resources and minimise waste	Information on build materials, and waste reuse and recycling measures, if known.	Detailed information on process for significant waste reduction	Information showing details of measures to ensure waste reduction	Information to suggest development would generate a level of waste over and above what would typically be expected from a development of this kind	N/A	N/A	Where applicable

Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Policy based)		Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Local Plan Sites [not strategic DPD sites – subject to independent criteria])	Type of impact					
			Significant positive	Positive	Negative	Significant negative	No impact	Uncertain
Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Assessment Criteria	++	+	-	--	0	?
10. To reduce climate change impacts, support mitigation, encourage adaptation and protect water quality	Will it reduce the risk of flooding?	Would development on the site be located within Flood Zones 2, 3(a&b)?	FZ1  (For Gypsy and Traveller pitches – FZ1)	<50% FZ2  (For Gypsy and Traveller pitches – <50% FZ2)	<50% FZ3  (For Gypsy and Traveller pitches – 1-14% FZ3)	50% or over FZ3  (For Gypsy and Traveller pitches –15-20% FZ3 and/or site is in a Critical Drainage Area)	N/A	Where applicable  50% or over FZ2  (For Gypsy and Traveller pitches – 50% or over FZ2)
		Would the site be located in an area of high / medium / low / very low risk of flooding from surface water? (EA Maps)	Very low	Low	High  (For Gypsy and Traveller pitches – site is in an area of Medium risk)	N/A  (For Gypsy and Traveller pitches – site is in an area of High risk)	N/A	Where applicable  Medium (does not apply to Gypsy and Traveller pitches [see negative impacts])
	Will it affect the amount of water available for extraction?	Infrastructure concerns as evidenced by consultation with Anglian Water.	N/A	No capacity issues as identified in Water Cycle Study	Capacity issues as identified in Water Cycle Study	N/A	N/A	Where applicable
	Will it improve water quality?	Are there water bodies on or adjacent to the site?  As requested by the EA in I&O Consultation of the SA Scoping Report	N/A	No water bodies on or adjacent to the site.	Site is adjacent to water bodies.	Water bodies are on site.	N/A	Where applicable

## Sustainability Appraisal Framework for Garden Settlement Site options

Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Preferred Option	Preferred Option	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Commentary regarding compatibility with Garden City Principles and the Proposed Strategic Selection Criteria	Advisory comments/ mitigation
1. To provide a sufficient level of housing to meet the objectively assessed needs of the Borough to enable people to live in a decent, safe home which meets their needs at a price they can afford	Will it deliver the number of houses needed to support the existing and growing population?						
	Will it provide more affordable homes across the Borough?						
	Will it deliver a range of housing types to meet the diverse needs of the Borough?						
	Will it deliver well designed and sustainable housing?						
2. To ensure that development is located sustainably and makes efficient use of land and <u>able to deliver a sustainable community</u>	Will it promote regeneration?						
	Will it reduce the need for development on greenfield land?						
	Will it provide good accessibility by a range of modes of transport?						
	Will densities make efficient use of land?						
	Will a mix of uses be provided?						
	<u>Will it be able to deliver the development and infrastructure required ?</u>						
	<u>Is there a delivery vehicle in place?</u>						
3. To achieve a prosperous and sustainable economy that improves opportunities for local businesses to thrive, creates new jobs and improves the vitality of	Will it improve the delivery of a range of employment opportunities to support the growing population?						
	Will it maintain an appropriate balance between different types of retail uses and other activities in the Borough's centres?						

Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Preferred Option	Preferred Option	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Commentary regarding compatibility with Garden City Principles and the Proposed Strategic Selection Criteria	Advisory comments/ mitigation
centres	Will it support business innovation, diversification, entrepreneurship and changing economies?						
	Will it support tourism, heritage and the arts?						
	Will it help sustain the rural economy?						
4. To achieve more sustainable travel behaviour, reduce the need to travel and reduce congestion	Will it reduce the need to travel?						
	Will the levels of sustainable travel increase?						
	Will it improve sustainable transport infrastructure and linkages?						
5. To build stronger, more resilient sustainable communities with better education and social outcomes	Will it provide equitable access to education, recreation and community facilities?						
	Will it place pressure on school places, including early years?						
	Will existing open spaces be protected & new open spaces be created?						
	Will it improve the skills of the Borough's population?						
6. To improve and reduce inequalities in health and wellbeing and tackle crime issues by keeping our communities safe and promoting community cohesion	Will it reduce actual crime and fear of crime?						
	Will it provide equitable access to employment opportunities?						
	Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?						
7. To conserve and enhance the townscape character, and the heritage and cultural assets of	Will it protect and enhance the heritage and cultural assets of the Borough?						
	Will it create a high quality and coherent public realm linking the town's assets						

Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Preferred Option	Preferred Option	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Commentary regarding compatibility with Garden City Principles and the Proposed Strategic Selection Criteria	Advisory comments/ mitigation
the Borough	and spaces; connecting the heritage and contemporary?						
	Will it protect and enhance the historic character of the Town Centre?						
8. To value, conserve and enhance the natural environment, natural resources and the biodiversity of the Borough	Will it maintain and enhance the landscape character of the borough?						
	Will it protect and enhance designated areas of the countryside and coastal environment?						
	Will it protect and improve biodiversity?						
	Will it improve environmental quality in terms of water, air and soil quality?						
9. To make efficient use of energy and reduce, reuse or recycle waste	Will it reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions?						
	Will it support the delivery of renewable energy schemes?						
	Will it help to reduce, reuse and recycle resources and minimise waste?						
10. To reduce climate change impacts, support mitigation and encourage adaptation	Will it reduce the risk of flooding?						
	Will it deliver effective SUDS and improve drainage?						
	Will it affect the amount of water available for extraction?						
	Will it promote water efficiency and reduce water usage levels per household?						
	Will it improve water quality?						



Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Preferred Option	Preferred Option	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Commentary regarding compatibility with Garden City Principles and the Proposed Strategic Selection Criteria	Advisory comments/ mitigation
11. To minimise environmental and amenity impacts on neighbouring properties and areas  <b>(SPECIFIC NEW OBJECTIVE FOR ASSESSING GARDEN SETTLEMENT OPTIONS)</b>	Will it <del>have an unacceptable safeguard</del> the relationship with <del>and impact</del> on occupants of existing neighbouring areas / towns <del>and not have any unacceptable impacts on them?</del>						
	Is adequate separation maintained between the proposed and existing neighbouring properties?						
	Is adequate separation maintained between the proposed and existing neighbouring areas / towns?						