

# Reepham Neighbourhood Plan

Site Assessment  
Final Report

April 2019

## Quality information

### Prepared by

Guillaume Rey  
Graduate Planner

### Checked by

Jesse Honey  
Associate Director

### Approved by

Jesse Honey  
Associate Director

## Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Position
V1	December 2018	Draft	Guillaume Rey	Graduate Planner
V2	January 2019	Technical Review	Jesse Honey	Associate Director
V3	February 2019	Group Review	Nigel Hewerdine	Project Manager
V4	February 2019	Locality Review		

© 2019 AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited (“AECOM”) for sole use of our client (the “Client”) in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

### Disclaimer

This document is intended to aid the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, and can be used to guide decision making and as evidence to support Plan policies, if the Qualifying Body (QB) so chooses. It is not a neighbourhood plan policy document. It is a ‘snapshot’ in time and may become superseded by more recent information. Reepham Neighbourhood Plan is not bound to accept its conclusions. If landowners or any other party can demonstrate that any of the evidence presented herein is inaccurate or out of date, such evidence can be presented to Reepham Neighbourhood Plan at the consultation stage. Where evidence from elsewhere conflicts with this report, the QB should decide what policy position to take in the Neighbourhood Plan and that judgement should be documented so that it can be defended at the Examination stage.

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction .....	7
1.1	Background .....	7
1.2	Planning Policy and Evidence Base .....	9
1.2.1	Relevant National Policy .....	9
1.2.2	West Lindsey Planning Framework .....	10
2.	Site Assessment Method.....	13
2.1	Task 1: Identify Sites to be included in Assessment .....	13
2.2	Task 2: Development of Site Appraisal Pro Forma .....	16
2.3	Task 3: Assessment of Sites .....	16
2.4	Task 4: Consolidation of Results .....	16
2.5	Indicative Housing Capacity .....	17
3.	Site Assessment .....	18
3.1	Desktop review of sites against national and local policy .....	18
3.2	Summary of Detailed Site Appraisals .....	22
4.	Conclusions .....	35
4.1	Site Assessment Conclusions .....	35
4.2	Next Steps .....	35
4.3	Viability .....	35
	Appendix A Completed Site Appraisal Pro Formas .....	37
A.1	Site 3 Assessment Pro forma .....	37
A.2	Site 4 Assessment Pro forma .....	42
A.3	Site 5 Assessment Pro forma .....	47
A.4	Site 6.1 Assessment Pro forma .....	52
A.5	Site 7 Assessment Pro forma .....	57
A.6	Site 8 Assessment Pro forma .....	62
A.7	Site 9.1 Assessment Pro forma .....	67
A.8	Site 9.2 Assessment Pro forma .....	72
A.9	Site 10 Assessment Pro forma .....	77
A.10	Site 12 Assessment Pro forma .....	82
A.11	Site 13.1 Assessment Pro forma .....	87
A.12	Site 14 Assessment Pro forma .....	92
A.13	Site 15.1 Assessment Pro forma .....	97
A.14	Site 16 Assessment Pro forma .....	102
A.15	Site CL3082 Assessment Pro forma .....	111
A.16	Site CL3084 Assessment Pro forma .....	116
A.17	Site CL1423 Assessment Pro forma .....	121

## Abbreviations

Abbreviation	
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CFS	Call for Sites
CLLP	Central Lincolnshire Local Plan
DPD	Development Plan Document
Dph	Dwellings per Hectare
Ha	Hectare
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
ONS	Office for National Statistics
PDL	Previously Developed Land
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance (MHCLG)
RPC	Reepham Parish Council
SHELAA	Central Lincolnshire Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment

## Executive Summary

AECOM was commissioned to undertake an independent site assessment for Reepham Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of the Reepham Parish Council (PRC). The work was agreed with RPC and the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) in September 2018.

The Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared in line with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan<sup>1</sup> (CLLP) adopted in April 2017.

The purpose of this report is to produce a clear assessment of the identified sites to advise which ones might be appropriate for allocation in the Plan, in particular whether they comply with National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance and the strategic policies of Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. This will help RPC to ensure that the Neighbourhood Planning site selection process is robust and transparent and will meet the Basic Conditions considered by the Independent Examiner, as well as any potential legal challenges by developers and other interested parties.

The approach to the site appraisal is based on the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), published in 2018. This guidance advises that evidence supporting neighbourhood plans should be proportionate. However, while a Neighbourhood Plan is at a smaller scale than a Local Plan, the criteria for assessing the suitability of sites for housing are still appropriate. This includes an assessment of whether a site is suitable, available and achievable.

The assessment included 35 sites, made up of:

- Twenty two sites identified through a Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites (CFS); and
- Thirteen additional sites identified through the SHELAA 2015. The suitability of these sites were not assessed in the SHELAA and were therefore considered as part of the overall assessment along with those sites identified in the Reepham Call for Sites.

Of these 35 sites, 16 were rejected during the desktop review of sites against national and local policy which purpose was to reduce the pool of site needing more detailed assessment.

Sites were assessed using AECOM's site assessment, desktop assessment and site visits. The desktop assessment involved a review of the conclusions of the existing evidence and using other sources including Google Maps, Google Streetview and Defra's MAGIC map<sup>2</sup>, in order to judge whether a site is suitable for the use proposed. The site visits allowed the team to consider aspects of the sites only apparent through visual inspection. They were also an opportunity to gain a better understanding of the context and nature of the neighbourhood plan area.

Following the site visit, the desktop assessment was revisited to finalise the assessment and compare the sites to judge which were the most suitable to meet the housing requirement.

A 'traffic light' rating of all sites has been given based on whether the site is an appropriate candidate to be considered for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The traffic light rating indicates 'green' for sites that show no constraints and are appropriate as site allocations, 'amber' for sites which are potentially suitable if issues can be resolved and 'red' for sites which are not currently suitable. The judgement on each site is based on the three 'tests' of whether a site is appropriate for allocation – i.e. that it is **suitable, available and achievable**. Table 3-2 is a summary of the assessment findings. Site Pro formas are provided in Appendix A.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?allId=54815>

<sup>2</sup> At [www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk)

The site assessment has found that of the 19 sites assessed (original 35) there are **14 sites** that would be appropriate for allocation in the neighbourhood plan, and which would meet Reepham's identified housing need (48 dwellings), with the potential between them to provide approximately 350 to 430 net new dwellings. These are:

- 15, High Street, LN3 4DP Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 5)
- 11 High St, LN3 4DP, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 10)
- Rose Cottage, 4, Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 12)
- Land adjacent Reepham and Cherry Willingham Village Hall (Site CL3082)
- Land adjacent Reepham Manor (Site CL3084)
- Land adjacent to Arkle House, 52 High Street, LN3 4DX, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 3)
- Land East of Kennel Lane (Site 8)
- 1-5 Moor Lane LN3 4EE, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 9.1)
- Land East of Fiskerton Road, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 9.2)
- Plot at side of 3 Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 13.1)
- 9 Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 16)
- Land adjacent Reepham and Cherry Willingham Village Hall (Site CL1423)
- Land to rear of 14 Church Lane (15.3)
- Land adjacent Reepham Manor/ Cricket Ground (CL3083)

Of the above list, four sites were given a 'green' rating for development (few or no constraints to allocation), and ten sites an 'amber' rating, meaning they are suitable for development provide some minor constraints are resolved.

The remaining **five sites** are considered unsuitable for development and not appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Of these five, **three** are not suitable as they are too far away from community services and facilities, **one** is not suitable because it has no possible access and **one** as it is not in conformity with national and Local Plan planning policy.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

1. AECOM was commissioned to undertake an independent site assessment for Reepham Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of Reepham Parish Council (RPC). The work was agreed with RPC and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) in September 2018.
2. The Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared in line with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan<sup>3</sup> (CLLP), adopted in April 2017. The CLLP provides land use planning policies for development and other areas designated for protection. It covers the administrative areas of North Kesteven District, the City of Lincoln and West Lindsey District<sup>4</sup> and replaces all previously adopted Development Plan Documents (DPD) for those districts.
3. The Local Plan sets out the long-term vision and objectives for Central Lincolnshire, and identifies the settlements of Lincoln, Sleaford and Gainsborough as those to which most new development will be directed. The Plan specifies the amount of new housing and employment land that will be provided in these areas up to 2036, with appropriate and sensitive development being permitted in villages to ensure they remain sustainable, thriving local communities.
4. Between 2012 and 2036, the Local Plan states that Central Lincolnshire will grow by **36,960 new homes**, meeting the housing needs of all communities. The level of growth for each settlement is established through a settlement hierarchy, whereby Reepham is identified as a 'Medium Village' and thus permitted to grow by 15% in terms of dwelling number over the plan period. This equates to a requirement for **48 dwellings** to be located within the parish of Reepham<sup>5</sup>. Figure 1-1 provides a map of the Reepham Neighbourhood Plan Area. It is the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to include allocations for housing to meet the identified housing requirement.


---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?allId=54815>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?allId=56797>

<sup>5</sup> West Lindsey District Council– Monitoring of Growth in Villages – 04/12/18

Figure 1-1: Reepham Parish map



Source: Reepham Parish Council



5. This report is an independent and objective assessment of the sites that have been identified as potential candidates for housing in the Neighbourhood Plan. Sites were identified by the NP Steering Group through a recent 'Call for Sites' undertaken by the Steering Group. There are a number of extant planning permissions where development has been implemented but sites have not yet been fully built out. These sites were excluded from assessment as they do not need to be allocated.
6. The purpose of this report is to produce a clear assessment of the identified sites to advise which ones might be appropriate for allocation in the Plan, in particular whether they comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan.
7. This will give RPC the confidence that the Neighbourhood Planning site selection process has been robust and transparent and will meet the Basic Conditions of neighbourhood planning considered by the Independent Examiner, as well as any potential legal challenges by developers and other interested parties.

## 1.2 Planning Policy and Evidence Base

8. The Neighbourhood Plan policies and allocations must be in accordance with national policy and the strategic policies and evidence base of the Local Plans, both emerging and adopted.

### 1.2.1 Relevant National Policy

9. National planning policy and guidance is contained in both the NPPF and the PPG. Only those policies considered particularly relevant to site allocation at Reepham are cited here, but this report has regard throughout to all aspects and elements of national planning policy as appropriate.

#### 1.2.1.1 National policy on housing development in the countryside

10. The NPPF states (paragraph 79) that planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:
  - a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
  - b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
  - c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
  - d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; or
  - e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
    - is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
    - would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

#### 1.2.1.2 National policy on local character, history and sense of place

11. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments (*inter alia*):
  - are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); and
  - establish or maintain a strong sense of place.
12. Additionally, paragraph 170 of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to (*inter alia*) protect and enhance valued landscapes, and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

### 1.2.1.3 National policy on planning and flood risk

13. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future).

## 1.2.2 West Lindsey Planning Framework

14. The Neighbourhood Plan policies and allocations must be in accordance with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, both emerging and adopted.

15. The key documents within the Central Lincolnshire planning framework include:

- The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017);
- Central Lincolnshire Policies Map and Inset Maps<sup>6</sup>

### 1.2.2.1 Adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017)

16. The 2017 Local Plan sets out a range of policies governing development in Central Lincolnshire. Those of relevance to development in Reepham include:
17. **Policy LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy:** Identifies Reepham as a ‘Medium Village’ (Category 5) that is required in accordance with **Policy LP4 – Growth in Villages** to grow by 15% in the number of dwellings over the plan period. Medium Villages will accommodate limited amount of development (9 dwellings per site) in ‘appropriate locations’ which do not conflict with the Local Plan or applicable national policies. In addition, to qualify as an appropriate location, the site if developed, would:
  - *“retain the core shape and form of the settlement;*
  - *not significantly harm the settlement’s character and appearance; and*
  - *not significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside or the rural setting of the settlement.”*
18. These restrictions apply unless the site has been otherwise promoted via a neighbourhood plan or through the demonstration of clear local community support<sup>7</sup>.
19. A sequential test for development sites will be applied, in the following priority order:
  - *Brownfield land or infill sites, in appropriate locations, within the developed footprint of the settlement;*
  - *Brownfield sites at the edge of a settlement, in appropriate locations;*
  - *Greenfield sites at the edge of a settlement, in appropriate locations.*
20. Proposals for development of a site located lower in the priority order should include a clear explanation of why sites are not available or suitable for categories higher up the list. A proposal within or on the edge of a small village should be accompanied by demonstrable evidence of clear local community support for the scheme, also taking the following into account:
  - *other development built since April 2012;*
  - *any extant permissions; and*
  - *any allocated sites.*
21. The proposal may increase the number of dwellings in a village by more than 15%, if local communities wish, through Neighbourhood Plans or other means, to deliver additional growth over the levels proposed by this policy.
22. In accordance with Policy LP2 and LP4 the term ‘developed footprint’ of a settlement is defined as the continuous built form of the settlement and excludes:

---

<sup>6</sup> Policies map for Adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (April 2017), as viewed here: <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/centrallincolnshire/policies-map-and-interactive-map/>

<sup>7</sup> Where ‘demonstration of clear local community support’ means that at the point of submitting a planning application to the local planning authority, there should be clear evidence of local community support for the scheme, with such support generated via a thorough, but proportionate, pre-application community consultation exercise. If, despite a thorough, but proportionate, pre-application consultation exercise, demonstrable evidence of support or objection cannot be determined, then there will be a requirement for support from the applicable Parish or Town Council.

- individual buildings or groups of dispersed buildings which are clearly detached from the continuous built up area of the settlement;
  - gardens, paddocks and other undeveloped land within the curtilage of buildings on the edge of the settlement where land relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built up area of the settlement;
  - agricultural buildings and associated land on the edge of the settlement; and
  - outdoor sports and recreation facilities and other formal open spaces on the edge of the settlement.
23. Land outside the settlement hierarchy is regarded as Countryside for the purposes of planning policy and as such significant restrictions apply to new residential development proposals.
24. **LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views:** This policy aims to ensure that the intrinsic quality of the landscape is protected and enhanced. Development proposals “*should have particular regard to maintaining and responding positively to character and setting*”. ‘Setting’ refers to “*any natural and man-made features within the landscape and townscape which contributes to the character of the areas*”. It includes (non-exhaustive list): Historic buildings and monuments; other landmark buildings; topography; trees and woodland; hedgerows; walls; water features; field patterns; and intervisibility between rural historic settlements.
25. **LP22 – Green Wedges:** Planning permission “*will not be granted*” for any development within the Green Wedges and development adjacent to it “*will be expected to demonstrate*” they have no adverse impact of the function of the Green Wedge and have considered linkages and enhancements to it. There is one in Reepham, which separates the parish from Cherry Willingham.
26. **LP23 – Local Green Space and other Important Open Space:** Protects ‘Important Open Spaces’ that have been identified by the Central Lincolnshire Authorities as open spaces important to the settlement in which they are located. There are four such spaces in Reepham (Figure 1-2). Schemes “*should be designed to preserve or enhance key local views and vistas, and create new public views where possible*”. Views of significant buildings and open landscapes should be given particular consideration. Finally, the cumulative impacts of a proposal on landscape, townscape and views will be considered.

Figure 1-2: Local Green Space and Important Open Space in yellow (Policy LP23)



Source: Central Lincolnshire Local Plan - StatMap Aurora Online Mapping

27. **Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment:** Development within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting.
28. **Policy LP55 – Development in the Countryside:** Applications for new dwellings will only be acceptable where they are essential to the effective operation of rural operations listed in policy LP2. Proposals on the best and most versatile agricultural land will only be permitted if there is insufficient lower grade land available at that settlement and impacts are minimal on ongoing agricultural operations. The re-use and conversion of non-residential buildings for residential use and replacement of dwellings in the countryside will be supported, provided restrictive criteria is met.

1.2.2.2 Central Lincolnshire Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment Update July 2015

29. The Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) for Central Lincolnshire identifies potential sites that may be required to meet future housing and employment need. This document lists all sites with an estimated capacity of 25 dwellings or more. There are currently no such sites within the NP area<sup>8</sup>. Thirteen sites, however, were identified in the SHELAA within the parish with potential for lower capacities. While there has been no form of site selection process completed on any sites within Reepham, these sites were promoted as of 2015 by landowners as being available for development. They are identified in Figure 1-3.

**Figure 1-3: SHELAA sites (in blue) identified in Reepham parish**



Source: West Lindsey District Council

<sup>8</sup> The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 'LP48-LP54 Residential Allocations Evidence Report April 2016' states that it was decided that a threshold of 25 dwellings should be used for SHLAA sites as this would allow officers to focus on sites that would make a significant contribution to housing supply, and that smaller sites will normally be dealt with through planning applications alone without the need for an allocation; Report viewed here: <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/centrallincolnshire/planning-policy-library/>

## 2. Site Assessment Method

31. The approach to the site appraisal is based on the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)<sup>9</sup>. This guidance advises that evidence supporting neighbourhood plans should be proportionate. However, while a Neighbourhood Plan is at a smaller scale than a Local Plan, the Local Plan criteria for assessing the suitability of sites for housing remain appropriate. This includes an assessment of whether sites are suitable, available and achievable.
32. In this context, the methodology for carrying out the site appraisal is presented below.

### 2.1 Task 1: Identify Sites to be included in Assessment

33. The first task is to identify which sites should be considered as part of the assessment. This included:
  - Twenty two sites identified through a Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites (CFS); and
  - Thirteen additional sites identified through the SHELAA 2015. The suitability of these sites were not assessed in the SHELAA as the site capacities were less than the threshold set for assessment of strategic sites (25 dwellings). These sites are to be assessed and considered as part of the overall assessment along with those sites identified in the Reepham Call for Sites.
34. The resulting 35 sites that were included in the assessment are shown on Figure 2-1.

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment> and <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

Figure 2-1: Map of all sites to be assessed through this site assessment



Figure 2-2: Map of all sites to be assessed through this site assessment (zoom in Reepham village)



## 2.2 Task 2: Development of Site Appraisal Pro Forma

35. A site appraisal pro forma has been developed by AECOM to assess potential sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Only sites that have not already been assessed through the SHELAA were assessed using the pro forma, to avoid duplication of work. Here, none of the sites was assessed by the SHELAA, as the CLLP only allocates sites with a capacity for 25 or more dwellings.
36. The pro forma is based on the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance, the Site Assessment for Neighbourhood Plans: A Toolkit for Neighbourhood Planners (Locality, 2015) and professional judgement and experience. The pro forma contains the following criteria:
  - General information:
    - Site location and use;
    - Site context and planning history;
  - Context:
    - Type of site (greenfield, brownfield etc.);
    - Planning history.
  - Suitability:
    - Site characteristics;
    - Environmental considerations;
    - Heritage considerations;
    - Community facilities and services;
    - Other key considerations (e.g. flood risk, agricultural land, tree preservation orders); and
  - Availability.

## 2.3 Task 3: Assessment of Sites

37. Sites were also reviewed through a combination of desktop assessment and site visit. The desktop assessment involved a review of the existing evidence and other sources including Google Maps, Google Streetview and Defra's MAGIC map<sup>10</sup>, in order to judge whether a site is suitable for the use proposed. The site visit allowed the team to consider aspects of the sites only apparent through visual inspection. They were also an opportunity to gain a better understanding of the context and nature of the neighbourhood plan area.
38. One of the many criteria used for assessing the performance of each individual site was its distance from what we have called Reepham's 'centre of gravity' for services and facilities. We define the villages 'centre of gravity' as being the location closest on average to the full range of conveniences, including shops, pubs, employment sites, emergency services, schools and so on.
39. In the case of Reepham, it is considered that this point is the junction of Church Lane, Station Road and High Street, where the only shop in the village, the post office, is located.
40. The distance was measured, in metres, along existing and proposed routes, between the centre point of each site and this 'centre of gravity' to represent walking distances.

## 2.4 Task 4: Consolidation of Results

41. Following the site visit, the desktop assessment was revisited to finalise the assessment and compare the sites to judge which were the most suitable for meeting the housing requirement or for relevant other land uses as highlighted by the neighbourhood planners.
42. A 'traffic light' rating for each site sets out whether it is an appropriate candidate to be considered for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The traffic light rating indicates 'green' for sites that show no or few constraints and are therefore most appropriate as site allocations, 'amber' for sites which are potentially suitable if identified constraints can be resolved and 'red' for sites which are not currently suitable. The judgement on each site is based on the three 'tests' of whether a site is appropriate for allocation – i.e. that it is **suitable, available and achievable**.

---

<sup>10</sup> At [www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk)



## 2.5 Indicative Housing Capacity

43. The Local Plan does not set residential densities *per se*, but states that residential allocations should make an assumption that net densities should '*be appropriate for the area in which the site is located*'. The Residential Allocations Evidence Report<sup>11</sup> that supports the Local Plan sets a density assumption of 30 dph for 'elsewhere in Central Lincolnshire' (including Reepham, i.e. outside Lincoln City and main settlements).
44. In considering appropriate densities, account should also be taken of the West Lindsey Landscape Character Assessment and any relevant Village Design Statement, Conservation Area Appraisal or character appraisal approved or adopted by the District Council.
45. Development proposals will be expected to deliver housing at densities that reflect the specific characteristics of the site and its surrounding area (in terms of both built form and landscape).
46. ONS Census data 2011 reveals that the average density for the built-up area of Reepham is 23.9 dph<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> LP48-LP54 Residential Allocations Evidence Report, Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036, April 2016. As viewed online: [https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/\\_resources/assets/attachment/full/0/17838.pdf](https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/_resources/assets/attachment/full/0/17838.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> ONS, Census 2001, KS401EW

## 3. Site Assessment

### 3.1 Desktop review of sites against national and local policy

1.1 The first step in the assessment was to perform a desktop assessment of all sites against relevant national and local policy. This had the effect of reducing the pool of sites needing more detailed assessment through the site pro formas and site visits.

1.2 Table 3-1 sets out the results of the desktop review of all sites.

**Table 3-1: Desktop review of sites against national and local policy**

Ref CFS	Ref SHL AA	Site Location	Gross area (Ha)	AECOM desktop assessment findings	Result of desktop assessment stage
1	n/a	Land to the rear of, 42, High Street, Reepham, Lincoln, LN3 4DP	0.1	The site already has outline planning permission granted in 2017 for 2 dwellings.	Site rejected (i.e. does not now require allocation) and therefore detailed assessment not required
2	n/a	5 Acres South of Moor Lane, LN3 4EE	2.2	Site is away from existing settlements and developing it would create isolated homes in the countryside, which is contrary to NPPF paragraph 79. Therefore the site is not suitable for development on the basis of national policy.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
3	n/a	High St, Reepham, Lincoln, (53.249316, - 0.448466)	0.11	No national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is therefore required	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
4	n/a	Land to the rear of Hawthorn Rd	1.67	The site is adjacent to an existing settlement and no absolute national or local policy constraints preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is required	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
5	n/a	15, High Street, Reepham, Lincoln, Lincolnshire, LN3 4DP	0.017	No national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is therefore required	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
6.1	n/a	Reepham Farm Yard Site (2.85) & Land to the East and North of the Farm Yard Site (8ha)	9.61	Whilst planning permission was refused for a development proposing the erection of 25 dwellings <sup>13</sup> , parts of this site could be allocated without national or local policy constraints and the reasons given for refusal could be mitigated, for example via development principles. A more detailed assessment is required to determine the extent to which this is possible.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis

<sup>13</sup> 138041; Application date: 05/07/2018; Refused on 09/10/18; Reason: Contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.

6.2	n/a	Land to the West of Kennel Lane & North of Hawthorn Road	44.3	The site, if developed, would more than double the size of the village, which is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 127 c) and d). It is also contrary to LP22 as part of it is located within or adjacent to the Green Wedge. Therefore, the site is not suitable for development based on national and local policy.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
7	n/a	Land off A158 at Sudbrooke but within Reepham Parish	0.38	The site is adjacent to an existing settlement and no absolute national or local policy constraints preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
8	n/a	Land East of Kennel Lane	0.97	The site is adjacent to an existing settlement and no absolute national or local policy constraints preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
9.1	n/a	1-5 Moor Lane LN3 4EE	1.62	The site is adjacent to an existing settlement and no absolute national or local policy constraints preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
9.2	n/a	Land East of Fiskerton Road,	4.28	The site is adjacent to an existing settlement and no absolute national or local policy constraints preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
10	n/a	11 High St, Lincoln LN3 4DP	0.1	No national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is therefore required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
11	n/a	Land to West of Fiskerton Road, Reepham, Lincoln	14	The site, if developed, would more than double the size of the village, which is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 127 c) and d). Therefore, the site is not suitable for development based on national and local policy.	Site rejected (i.e. does not now require allocation) and therefore detailed assessment not required
12	n/a	Rose Cottage, 4, Church Lane, Reepham, Lincs, Lincolnshire, LN3 4DQ	0.091	No national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is therefore required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
13.1	n/a	3 Church Lane, Reepham, LN3 4DQ	0.091	The development of this site might affect the setting of St Peter and St Paul's church. However, at this stage, no absolute national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation and more detailed analysis is required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
13.2	n/a	Chambers Yard, Fiskerton Road	0.54	Site is away from existing settlements and developing it would create isolated homes in the countryside, which is contrary to NPPF paragraph 79. Therefore, the site is not suitable for development based on national policy.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required

14	n/a	9 High Street, Reepham LN3 4DP	0.072	No national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is therefore required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
15.1	n/a	Land North East of Little Cherry, Hawthorn Road	2.82	The site is adjacent to an existing settlement and no absolute national or local policy constraints preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
15.2	n/a	Land to North of site 15.1	8.9	Site is away from existing settlements and developing it would create isolated homes in the countryside, which is contrary to NPPF paragraph 79. Therefore the site not suitable for development on the basis of national policy.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
15.3	n/a	Land to Rear of 14 Church Lane	0.27	Although the north part of the site is in Flood zone 3, no national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is therefore required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
16	n/a	9 Church Lane, Reepham, Lincoln, LN3 4DQ	0.11	No national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is therefore required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
17	n/a	Leigh Farm, Fiskerton Road, Reepham, LN3 4EB	1.27	This potential site could only be accessed off narrow private access with poor visibility at junction. The site is therefore not suitable for development as it is not accessible, with little potential for mitigation.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
n/a	CL30 83	Land adjacent Reepham Manor/ Cricket Ground	1.17	Whilst planning permission was refused for a development proposing the erection of 25 dwellings <sup>14</sup> , parts of this site could be allocated with fewer national or local policy constraints and the reasons given for refusal could be mitigated, for example via development principles. A more detailed assessment is required to determine the extent to which this is possible.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
n/a	CL30 82	Land adjacent Reepham and Cherry Willingham Village Hall	2.77	The site adjoins an existing urban area and no national or local policy constraints preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
n/a	CL30 82B	Received, named and numbered along with the above, identified as 'B' because it is separated from CL3082 by the hall	0.825	Development of the site would be contrary to LP22 as part of it is located within or adjacent to the Green Wedge. Therefore, the site is not suitable for development based on local policy.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
n/a	CL17 73	26 High Street	0.1	Aerial view on Google Maps and site visit revealed that the site was already built out; site therefore not appropriate for allocation in the NP	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
n/a	CL17 75	1 Mellows Close	0.041	Aerial view on Google Maps and site visit revealed that the site was already built out; site therefore not appropriate for allocation in the NP	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not

<sup>14</sup> 138041; Application date: 05/07/2018; Refused on 09/10/18; Reason: Contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.

					required
n/a	CL17 74	Off Chapel Close	0.183	Aerial view on Google Maps and site visit revealed that the site was already built out; site therefore not appropriate for allocation in the NP	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
n/a	CL17 72	28 Church Lane	0.269	The vast majority of the site is in Flood zone 3. NPPF paragraph 158 indicates it is therefore not suitable for development.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
n/a	CL30 84	Land adjacent Reepham Manor	1.19	Whilst planning permission was refused for a development proposing the erection of 25 dwellings <sup>15</sup> , parts of this site could be allocated with fewer national or local policy constraints and the reasons given for refusal could be mitigated, for example via development principles. A more detailed assessment is required to determine the extent to which this is possible.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
n/a	CL14 23	Land east of No.5 Moor Lane	0.259	No national or local policy constraints would preclude allocation; more detailed analysis is therefore required.	Site passes desktop assessment and will be subject to detailed analysis
n/a	CL17 71	58 Fiskerton Road	0.122	The site already has outline planning permission	Site rejected (i.e. does not now require allocation) and therefore detailed assessment not required
n/a	CL18 37	Barfield Farm, Wragby Road	0.403	Site is away from existing settlements and developing it would create isolated homes in the countryside, which is contrary to NPPF paragraph 79. Therefore the site is not suitable for development based on national policy.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required
n/a	CL19 05	Sudbrooke	0.102	The site already has outline planning permission to erect 2 dwellings	Site rejected a(i.e. does not now require allocation) and therefore detailed assessment not required
n/a	CL13 90	Land at North Greetwell and Hawthorn Road, Cherry Willingham	108	The site, if developed, would more than double the size of the village, which is contrary to NPPF paragraph 127 c) and d). The site is also away from existing settlements and developing it would create isolated homes in the countryside, which is contrary to NPPF paragraph 79. Therefore, the site is not suitable for development based on national policy.	Site rejected and therefore detailed assessment not required

48. One additional site is not covered by either SHLAA or CFS submissions. This is site 'Land rear of 39-51 Hawthorn Road' which benefits from planning application 138166<sup>16</sup>. It has planning permission for six residential units and therefore, its suitability, availability and achievability for development has already been established by the Council. Consequently, the assessment of suitability for development is not required.

<sup>15</sup> 138041; Application date: 05/07/2018; Refused on 09/10/18; Reason: Contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.

<sup>16</sup> Available at <https://planning.west-lindsey.gov.uk/planning/details.asp?id=138166&nb=1#content>

49. The following 16 sites are rejected: 1 and 2, 6.2, 11, 13.2, 15.2, 17, CL3082B, CL1772, CL1771, CL1773, CL1774, CL1775, CL1837, CL1390 and CL1905. This leaves 19 sites to be assessed

## 3.2 Summary of Detailed Site Appraisals

50. As shown in Table 3-1, a number of sites have been assessed in detail to determine whether they would be appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.
51. Table 3-2 sets out a summary of the site assessments and conclusions on the sites' developability. The final column is a 'traffic light' rating for each site, indicating whether the site is appropriate for allocation. Proformas for sites assessed in the greatest level of detail are provided in Appendix A.
52. Following the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites for Reepham, 22 sites were identified as available for development, while 13 sites were deemed as available through identification in the SHELAA. Sixteen of those sites were eliminated through the desktop review summarised in Table 3-1.
53. Table 3-2 shows that four sites (5, 10; CL3082 and CL1423), with a combined capacity of 76 to 93 dwellings, are considered appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan (Green).
54. Ten further sites (3; 8; 9.1; 9.2; 12, 13.1; 15.3; 16, CL3083CL3084) are considered to have potential for development if specific constraints identified can be resolved or mitigated (Amber). These have a combined capacity of 274 to 337 dwellings.
55. The remaining five sites were found to have significant constraints with little potential for mitigation or resolution and therefore found not appropriate for allocation at present (Red).

Table 3-2: Site Assessment Summary Table

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
n/a	3	Land adjacent to Arkle House, 52 High Street, LN3 4DX, Reepham, Lincolnshire	0.115	Residential	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unused garden land, centrally located and in existing residential area.</li> <li>Site has existing suitable access, limited ecological value and development here would have limited impact on the landscape.</li> <li>Walking distance to Reepham's centre of gravity (400m) and directly opposite a bus stop.</li> <li>Site formerly had planning permission.</li> <li>It has, however, several minor constraints:</li> <li>There is a Tree Protection Order on the site and any development should retain the protected tree.</li> <li>The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and to the Green Wedges. However, redevelopment would not affect views into or out of the Conservation Area or the Green Wedges.</li> <li>Despite a few minor constraints, this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li> </ul>	

<sup>17</sup> Site area is the area of any sites that have been proposed for development, not the whole land parcel.

<sup>18</sup>The Residential Allocations Evidence Report that supports the Local Plan sets a density assumption of 30 dph for 'elsewhere in Central Lincolnshire' (including Reepham, i.e. outside Lincoln City and main settlements).

<sup>19</sup> Sites have been assessed using the AECOM site assessment Pro forma. Full details in Appendix A.

<sup>20</sup> Red = not appropriate for allocation in NP; Amber = potentially appropriate if issues can be resolved or mitigated; green = appropriate for allocation in NP. No colour = site has not been put forward for development

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
n/a	4	Land to the rear of Hawthorn Rd, Reepham, Lincolnshire	1.67	Housing & public space	40 to 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the land is technically suitable for residential development, it is located 2km away from Reepham's centre of gravity. Services and facilities are not at walking distance and developing there would encourage car travel.</li> <li>According to Policy LP2 and LP4, development in medium villages is limited to development in 'appropriate locations' and the 'developed footprint' of a settlement. This is defined as the continuous built form of the settlement and excludes "groups of dispersed buildings clearly detached from continuous built up area of settlement". Here, the site is adjacent to a group of buildings clearly detached from the continuous built up area of the Reepham's settlement and is therefore not suitable.</li> <li>Given existing alternatives for development in the Parish, this site is assessed as not being suitable.</li> </ul>	
n/a	5	15, High Street, LN3 4DP Reepham, Lincolnshire	0.017	Housing	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is currently a garden adjacent to existing property and due to its very small size is likely more suitable as a windfall site rather than an allocation. Potential access difficulty due to access coming from a private road.</li> <li>However, otherwise, this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li> </ul>	



SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
CL3084 & CL3083	6.1	Land at Good's Farm, Meadows Lane, Reepham, Lincolnshire	9.61	Housing	230 to 288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A planning application for the site was refused on 09/10/18 as it was contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.</li> <li>Our assessment revealed that the site is not appropriate for development as it has many constraints.</li> <li>The main reason to discount the site is that, if developed in its entirety, it would be large enough to significantly change the size and/or character of settlement (increase built-out area by 25%).</li> <li>However, a smaller site overlapping with this site was put forward during the SHLAA call for sites in 2015, CL3084, and that has potential to be more suitable (see assessment below)</li> </ul>	
n/a	7	Land off A158 at Sudbrooke but within Reepham Parish	0.38	Housing	6 to 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the land is technically suitable for residential development, it is located 4km away from Reepham's centre of gravity and 2km from Sudbrooke's. Services and facilities are not at walking distance and developing there would encourage car travel.</li> <li>It would also contribute to a perception of ribbon development along a road in the open countryside, thus having a greater landscape impact than suggested by its small size.</li> <li>Given existing alternatives for development in the Parish, this site is assessed as not being suitable.</li> </ul>	

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number homes <sup>18</sup> of	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
n/a	8	Land East of Kennel Lane	0.97	Housing	23 to 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a reasonably logical place to build, as there are houses along Kennel Lane and the site is within walking distance of the village centre.</li> <li>• However, the site is sensitive in terms of landscape, as it would form a spur of development out into the open countryside- it adjoins existing houses only on one of its shorter sides.</li> <li>• Houses should be set back from the main road to maximise the retention of attractive mature trees along the main road and the visual impact of development should be reduced through a soft, planted edge on its northern and eastern sides.</li> <li>• This site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development subject to suitable mitigation of visual impact.</li> </ul>	

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
CL1423	9.1	Land adjacent to 5 Moor Lane	1.62	Housing	38 to 49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In theory, the site is suitable for residential development:</li> <li>• It is located east of an existing residential location;</li> <li>• There is existing access from Moor Lane; and</li> <li>• We have not identified any major environmental or other policy constraints.</li> <li>• However,:</li> <li>• Despite its relatively small size, the site would have a disproportionate impact on visual amenity as it would form a spur of development out into the open countryside- it adjoins countryside on three of its four sides and adjoins development only on its shortest side</li> <li>• The presence of a power line on the site should be considered and development should be planned carefully.</li> <li>• The north of the site is adjacent to a railway; this could create disturbances which should be taken into account.</li> <li>• Although this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development, we recommend that a smaller portion of the site, such as CL1423 identified in the SHEELA, be considered for allocation rather than the whole site.</li> </ul>	

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
n/a	<b>9.2</b>	Land East of Fiskerton Road, Reepham, Lincolnshire	4.29	Housing	102 to 129	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In theory, the site is suitable for residential development;</li> <li>It is directly adjacent to an existing residential location;</li> <li>There is existing access from Moor Lane; and</li> <li>We have not identified any major environmental or other policy constraints.</li> <li>However, we have identified a few minor constraints:</li> <li>This is a large site, which would increase Reepham's built-out area by 11% if entirely developed, potentially creating issues of scale and impact on character.</li> <li>If developed, any potential to avoid a single long cul-de-sac (for example by creating an access to Fiskerton Road as well as to Moor Lane) would significantly improve the site's sustainability as it would increase accessibility by transport modes other than the private car</li> <li>This site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. However, we recommend that the northern portion of the site only is considered for allocation to mitigate the relative inaccessibility of the south of the site were it to form a long cul-de-sac.</li> </ul>	
n/a	<b>10</b>	11 High St, LN3 4DP, Reepham, Lincolnshire	0.1	Housing	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is currently a garden adjacent to existing property and due to its very small size is likely more suitable as a windfall site rather than an allocation. However, otherwise, this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li> </ul>	

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
n/a	12	Rose Cottage, 4, Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire	0.091	Housing	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site comprises open land with existing buildings within the existing urban area; Access from Church Lane;</li> <li>Despite being in a conservation area and adjacent to a Grade II Listed Building., the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development if developed sensitively. However, it would require demolishing the two existing constructions at the entrance of the site that appear to be garages.</li> <li>The site is very well located for access to the limited services and facilities in the village centre</li> <li>The site is currently a garden adjacent to existing property and due to its very small size is likely more suitable as a windfall site rather than an allocation.</li> </ul>	
n/a	13.1	Plot at side of 3 Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire	0.093	Unknown	2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In theory, this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The only constraint identified is that the site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of the Church of St Peter And St Paul, Grade II* listed building. Therefore, any development should be sensitive and seek to avoid negative impacts on these heritage assets and their settings.</li> <li>The site is currently a garden adjacent to existing property and due to its very small size is likely more suitable as a windfall site rather than an allocation.</li> </ul>	

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
n/a	14	9 High Street, LN3 4DP, Reepham, Lincolnshire	0.072	Housing	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is a back garden at the back of an existing property. There is access from the High Street; and the area is an existing residential location. The site is in a conservation area and within the setting of a Grade II Listed Building.</li> <li>In theory, the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. However, would require demolishing the existing house at the entrance of the site. There would be no access to the site and therefore, it is not appropriate for allocation.</li> </ul>	
n/a	15.1	Land North East of Little Cherry, Hawthorn Road, Reepham, Lincolnshire	2.83	Housing	85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site itself has few if any technical constraints to development, but it is located 2km away from Reepham's centre of gravity and 1.5km from Cherry Willingham's. Services and facilities are not at walking distance and developing there would encourage car travel. Therefore, this site is assessed as not being suitable for residential development.</li> </ul>	
n/a	15.3	15.3)	0.35	Housing	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are a few major constraints on this site:</li> <li>The north of the site is located in Flood Zone 3</li> <li>A footpath runs through the site</li> <li>The only current access is via the public footpath, which is not adequate for the proposed development.</li> <li>However, there is a potential access off Carpenters Close, which would make access from the southeast of the site possible. Alternatively, the footpath could also be diverted to allow for an access road, and unlock the whole site for development.</li> <li>Therefore, the site is in broad terms, suitable for residential development, available and achievable for residential development.</li> </ul>	

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
n/a	16	9 Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire	0.11	Housing	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site comprises open land within the existing urban area;</li> <li>Access from Church Lane; and</li> <li>The area is an existing residential location.</li> <li>The site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of Pemberton's Place, a Grade II listed building.</li> <li>Suitable, available and achievable for residential development subject to careful consideration of the setting of a Grade II historical asset. Suitable for the development of a single-storey building.</li> </ul>	
CL3082	n/a	Land adjacent Reepham and Cherry Willingham Village Hall	2.77	Housing	66 to 83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is suitable for residential development:</li> <li>Though in Reepham parish, it is directly adjacent to residential development in Cherry Willingham;</li> <li>There is existing access from Hawthorn Road;</li> <li>The site is within short walking distance to services in Cherry Willingham; and</li> <li>The site visit revealed the presence of a ditch between the site and the road, which would require minor levelling work or bridging the existing ditch prior to development.</li> <li>Apart from that, the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The assessment of applicable constraints suggests that CL3082 is more suitable than site 6.2 put forward in the CFS.</li> </ul>	

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
CL3083	6.1	Land adjacent Reepham Manor/ Cricket Ground	1.17	Housing	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is contained within a larger site (site 6.1) which was discounted during the Desktop assessment. The larger site was refused planning permission as it was contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.</li> <li>However, the reasons for refusal of the planning permission for the larger site can be easily mitigated for the smaller CL3083.</li> <li>Despite minor constraints – would extend development in the open countryside and beyond the core shape and form of the village - the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li> </ul>	



SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
CL3084	6.1	Land adjacent Reepham Manor	1.19	Housing	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is contained within a larger site (site 6.1) which was discounted during the Desktop assessment. The larger site was refused planning permission as it was contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.</li> <li>However, the reasons for refusal of the planning permission for the larger site can be easily mitigated for the smaller CL3084.</li> <li>This is a brownfield site, which consist of a barn and several warehouses. Policy LP2 gives priority to development on brownfield sites over Greenfield sites. Additionally, Policy LP55 supports the re-use and conversion of non-residential buildings for residential use.</li> <li>Despite minor constraints - part of the site is within the Reepham Conservation Area - the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li> </ul>	

SHELAA Site Ref	CFS Site Ref	Site Address	Site area (Ha) <sup>17</sup>	Proposed Use	Indicative Number of homes <sup>18</sup>	Site assessment findings <sup>19</sup>	Red/ Amber/ Green Rating <sup>20</sup>
CL1423	9.1	Land east of No.5 Moor Lane	0.259	Housing	8	<p>The site is, in broad terms, suitable for residential development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is located east of an existing residential location;</li> <li>• There is existing access from Moor Lane; and</li> <li>• There are no major environmental or other policy constraints.</li> </ul> <p>However, there are a few minor constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of a power line on the site should be considered and development should be planned carefully.</li> <li>• The north of the site is adjacent to a railway; this could create disturbances which should be taken into account.</li> </ul> <p>This site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The allocation of the site is recommended as preferable to that of the overlapping but larger site 9.1, which would have more significant landscape and visual amenity impacts.</p>	

## 4. Conclusions

### 4.1 Site Assessment Conclusions

56. The site assessment has found that of the nineteen sites assessed there are **twelve sites** that would be appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, and which would meet Reepham's identified housing need (48 dwellings over the next 20 years), with the potential between them to provide approximately 350 to 430 net new dwellings.
57. The figure of 430 calculates the number of dwellings that could be built on each site assuming a density of 30 dph, in line with the Residential Allocations Evidence Report.
58. The figure of 350 calculates the number of dwellings that could be built on each site assuming a density of 23.9 dph, which is the average density for the built-up area of Reepham.
59. These are:
- **15, High Street, LN3 4DP Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 5)**
  - **11 High St, LN3 4DP, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 10)**
  - **Land adjacent Reepham and Cherry Willingham Village Hall (Site CL3082)**
  - **Land East of No.5 Moor Lane (Site CL1423)**
  - **Land adjacent to Arkle House, 52 High Street, LN3 4DX, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 3)**
  - **Rose Cottage, 4, Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 12)**
  - **Land East of Kennel Lane (Site 8)**
  - **Land East of No.5 Moor Lane LN3 4EE, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 9.1)**
  - **Land East of Fiskerton Road,, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 9.2)**
  - **Plot at side of 3 Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 13.1)**
  - **9 Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire (Site 16)**
  - **Land adjacent Reepham Manor (Site CL3084)**
  - **Land to rear of 14 Church Lane (15.3)**
  - **Land adjacent Reepham Manor/ Cricket Ground (CL3083)**
60. There are **five sites** considered unsuitable for development and not appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Of these five, as per Table 3-2, **three** are not suitable as they are too far away from community services and facilities, **one** is not suitable because it has no possible access and **one** as detailed assessment indicates it is not in conformity with national and Local Plan planning policy.

### 4.2 Next Steps

This report can be used by RPC to guide decision making on site selection and to use as evidence to support site allocations in the NP if they choose to do so. It is strongly advised that RPC discuss potential site allocations with West Lindsey District Council in order to establish whether proposed site(s) would be acceptable.

RPC may also choose to apply for masterplanning technical support from Locality for site(s) proposed for development. This would ensure that the policies included in the NP as part of the site allocation would maximise opportunities for integrating the site with the village and minimising any negative impacts.

As the Neighbourhood Plan period covers several years and this report is only a snapshot in time, it is worth remembering that some sites assessed as not suitable or available for the purposes of this assessment may still have the potential to become suitable or available later in plan period or in the next plan period.

### 4.3 Viability

As part of the site selection process, it is recommended that the Steering Group discusses site viability with West Lindsey District Council. Viability appraisals for individual sites may already exist. If not, it is possible to use the

Council's existing viability evidence (such as an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment or Whole Plan Viability Study) to test the viability of sites proposed for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. This can be done by 'matching' site typologies used in existing reports with sites proposed by the Steering Group to give an indication of whether a site is viable for development and therefore likely to be delivered. In addition, any landowner or developer promoting a site for development should be contacted to request evidence of viability.

## Appendix A Completed Site Appraisal Pro Formas

### A.1 Site 3 Assessment Pro forma

#### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land adjacent to Arkle House, 52 High Street, LN3 4DX, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Garden land
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.115
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



#### Context

<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p>Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b></p> <p>Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	<p>The site formerly had outline planning permission for 2 additional dwellings but this was allowed to expire. The landowner wishes to reactivate this.</p>			

## Suitability

<b>Access and accessibility</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	There is existing access from High St and Kennel Ln.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	The site is located at a 5 minutes walking distance to Reepham's centre of gravity. Besides, it is directly opposite a bus and coach stop

<b>Environmental Considerations</b>		
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Assessment guidelines</b>	<b>Observations and comments</b>
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b></p> <p>Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Medium</b>	<p>The west of the site is surrounded by Green Wedges. According to Policy LP22, development proposals adjacent to the Green Wedges will be expected to demonstrate that they do not adversely impact on the function of the Green Wedge, taking into account scale, siting, design, materials and landscape treatment; and that they have considered linkages to and enhancements of the adjacent Green Wedge.</p> <p>This is a small site and new developments are unlikely to adversely impact on the Green Wedges. Furthermore, the site visit revealed that the Green Wedges are already screened by vegetation.</p>

		However, any development proposals will need to take Policy LP22 into account. To reflect this, we consider this site is medium sensitivity in terms of landscape.
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>No, as site within urban area</b>	

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b>	<p>The site is adjacent to the conservation area, but not contained within it. Redevelopment would not negatively affect views into it or out of it.</p>

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<b>Favourably located</b> <b>Is text / colour correct?</b>	5 min walk to Reepham's centre of gravity (400m).
--	---	---

**Other key considerations**

<b>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	There is a tree preservation order confirmed on 08/12/08. However, this tree is on the edge of the site and therefore is not a significant constraint to development.
<b>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	The site may have some ecological value due to some existing green spaces. A detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.
<b>Public Right of Way</b>	<b>None</b>	
<b>Existing social or community value (provide details)</b>	<b>No</b>	The site is private land and thus existing social or community value will be limited.

<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Characteristics</b>			
<b>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</b>		<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient		<b>Flat</b>	
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.		<b>No</b>	
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement		<b>No</b>	

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<i>Availability</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is, therefore, available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None that AECOM has been made aware of
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary



Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	2 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unused garden land, centrally located and in existing residential area.</li> <li>• Site has existing suitable access, limited ecological value and development here would have limited impact on the landscape.</li> <li>• Walking distance to Reepham's centre of gravity (400m) and directly opposite a bus stop.</li> <li>• Site formerly had planning permission.</li> <li>• It has, however, several minor constraints:</li> <li>• There is a Tree Protection Order on the site and any development should retain the protected tree.</li> <li>• The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and to the Green Wedges. However redevelopment would not affect views into or out of the Conservation Area or the Green Wedges.</li> <li>• Despite a few minor constraints, this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li> </ul>

## A.2 Site 4 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land to the rear of Hawthorn Rd, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Mixture, but mainly agricultural greenfield land.
<b>Proposed use</b>	Housing; Public open space as recreational and natural asset.
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	1.67
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	No relevant planning permissions in last 10 years.			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<p><b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b></p>	<p>No access to the site at present and building access road would imply demolishing existing dwellings. However, there is potential to create access roads running along the western and eastern boundaries of the site.</p>

<p><b>Is the site accessible?</b></p> <p>Provide details of site's connectivity</p>	<p>The site appears to be accessible for pedestrians via footpaths going through the middle and along the western and eastern boundaries of the site.</p> <p>However, the site is almost 2 miles away from Reepham's centre of gravity; this would encourage car use. The location is unsustainable according to the NPPF.</p>
---	--

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Potential because part of the site is in the middle of a field and located in open countryside. Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p>Most of the site is agricultural land located at the back of an existing development. The site is also located in open countryside, and any developments could potentially disrupt the existing landscape setting and the openness of the countryside.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p><b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b></p>	<p>Natural England's Agricultural Land Classification map shows the land as Grade 3, but does not specify whether or not the Grade 3 is Grade 3a (high quality) or Grade 3b (other). As such, it is recommended that samples are taken before any development.</p>

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	<p>There are no heritage assets within or adjacent to the site.</p>

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p>Poorly located</p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>The site is located 2km away from Reepham's centre of gravity. Services and facilities are not at walking distance and developing there would encourage car travel.</p>
--	-----------------------	--

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.	
Public Right of Way	Yes	Footpath linking the site to North Greetwell running through the middle of the site.	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	The site will have a degree of visual amenity as open, undeveloped land'	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Flat
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	Maybe

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is, therefore, available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None that AECOM has been made aware of.
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>	<p>The proposed use of this site by the landowner is not only residential but also open space.</p> <p>Although we believe the site is not suitable for housing development, it could be opened to the public for recreational use as there is already a footpath running through the middle of the site.</p>		

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	n/a
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the land is technically suitable for residential development, it is located 2km away from Reepham's centre of gravity. Services and facilities are not at walking distance and developing there would encourage car travel.</li> <li>• According to Policy LP2 and LP4, development in medium villages is limited to development in 'appropriate locations' and the 'developed footprint' of a settlement. This is defined as the continuous built form of the settlement and excludes "groups of dispersed buildings clearly detached from continuous built up area of settlement". Here, the site is adjacent to a group of buildings clearly detached from the continuous built up area of the Reepham's settlement and is therefore not suitable.</li> <li>• Given existing alternatives for development in the Parish, this site is assessed as not being suitable.</li> </ul>

### A.3 Site 5 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	5
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	15, High Street, LN3 4DP Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Greenfield (back garden)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.017
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



### Context

<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	<p>3 applications in 2005/2006 to form a Sun Room extension. Granted with time limit + conditions.</p>			

### Suitability

#### Suitability

<p><b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b></p>	<p>There is potential for access from a private side street.</p>
--	--

<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Accessible from the high street via the private road. Site is centrally located, on main route, and as such highly accessible and connected to rest of town.
--	--

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.
<b>Landscape</b>  <b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b>  Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained  Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character  High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible	<b>Urban site- low landscape sensitivity to development</b>	
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>No, as site within urban area</b>	

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	Site is within Reepham Conservation Area. Any new development would need to be particularly sensitive.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locally listed building</li> </ul>			
<b>Community facilities and services</b>			
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>Employment location</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>School(s)</li> <li>Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>Health facilities</li> <li>Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>280m to Reepham's centre of gravity.</p>	
<b>Other key considerations</b>			
<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>Trees in a conservation area that are not protected by a TPO are protected by provisions in section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the local planning authority is notified of certain work on such trees using a section 211 notice, six weeks before the work is carried out. This gives the local planning authority time to consider whether to make a TPO on the tree.<sup>21</sup></p>	
<p>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.</p>	
<p>Public Right of Way</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>		
<p>Existing social or community value (provide details)</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>The site is private land and thus existing social or community value will be limited.</p>	
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Ground Contamination</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Characteristics</b>			
<p><b>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</b></p>		<p><b>Comments</b></p>	
<p><b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient</p>		<p><b>Flat</b></p>	

<sup>21</sup> Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is, therefore, available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None that AECOM has been made aware of
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	1 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is currently a garden adjacent to existing property and due to its very small size is likely more suitable as a windfall site rather than an allocation. Potential access difficulty due to access coming from a private road.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• However, otherwise, this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li></ul>
--	--

## A.4 Site 6.1 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	6.1
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land at Good's Farm, Meadows Lane, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	4 farm buildings, associated agricultural land, cricket pitch and the grounds of Reepham Manor
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	9.61
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	CL3084 & CL3083
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



### Context

<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p>Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b></p> <p>Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	<p>138041; Application date: 05/07/2018; Refused on 09/10/18; Reason: Contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.</p>			

### Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access</b>	Access is gained via The Green to the south.

<b>to be provided?</b>	
<b>Is the site accessible?</b> Provide details of site's connectivity	Access is gained via The Green to the south.

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	Flood Zones 2 and 3 overlapping with the western boundary of the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Possible</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character;</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Medium sensitivity to development</b>	Much of the site is located in or adjacent to open countryside, and any developments could potentially disrupt the existing landscape setting and the openness of the countryside.
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Natural England's Agricultural Land Classification map shows the land as Grade 3, but does not specify whether or not the Grade 3 is Grade 3a (high quality) or Grade 3b (other). As such, it is recommended that samples are taken before any development.

<b>Heritage considerations</b>			
<b>Question</b>	<b>Assessment guidelines</b>	<b>Comments</b>	
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	Part of this site is within the Reepham Conservation Area. Any new development would need to be particularly sensitive.	
<b>Community facilities and services</b>			
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<b>Favourably located</b>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>239m to Reepham's centre of gravity.</p>	
<b>Other key considerations</b>			
<b>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<p>Several TPOs in the Cricket Ground, some around the edges with potential to be retained in redevelopment.</p> <p>Trees in a conservation area that are not protected by a TPO are protected by provisions in section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the local planning authority is notified of certain work on such trees using a section 211 notice, six weeks before the work is carried out. This gives the local planning authority time to consider whether to make a TPO on the tree.<sup>22</sup></p>	
<b>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application	
<b>Public Right of Way</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Site is crossed by two public footpaths, one within the site on its southern edge and one along the site's northern edge	
<b>Existing social or community value (provide details)</b>	<b>Some</b>	Site will have visual amenity value as open (semi)-rural land as viewed from neighbouring footpaths.	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>

<sup>22</sup> Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

<i>any of the following?</i>			
<b>Ground Contamination</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown; but as ex-farming site, assessment recommended as part of any planning application.
<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presence of power lines crossing the site.

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>If all developed, yes</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is, therefore, available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	230 (based on 23.9dph) to 288 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A planning application for the site was refused on 09/10/18 as it was contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.</li> <li>• Our assessment revealed that the site is not appropriate for development as it has many constraints.</li> <li>• The main reason to discount the site is that, if developed in its entirety, it would be large enough to significantly change the size and/or character of settlement (increase built-out area by 25%).</li> <li>• However, a smaller site overlapping with this site was put forward during the SHLAA call for sites in 2015, CL3084, and that has potential to be more suitable.</li> </ul>



## A.5 Site 7 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	7
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land off A158 at Sudbrooke but within Reepham Parish
<b>Current use</b>	Greenfield
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.38
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Land Agent/Planning Consultant



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access</b>	Yes the site is currently accessible from Wragby Rd.

<b>to be provided?</b>	
<b>Is the site accessible?</b> Provide details of site's connectivity	Difficult to access for pedestrians, as it is remote from the village centre and along a busy main road; mainly car access.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<b>None</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character;</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Medium sensitivity</b>	Possible impact on landscape, particularly as the site would form a spur of development out into the open countryside- it adjoins existing development on only one of its shorter sides.
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land <sup>23</sup> , but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

### Heritage considerations

<sup>23</sup> Natural England Agricultural Land Quality mapping for North West, available at <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/144015?category=5954148537204736>, used as the only publicly available mapping- however, note caveat that mapping is not sufficiently accurate for use in assessment of individual sites; as such, on-site sampling would be recommended ahead of any development proposal.

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p>Poorly located</p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>The site is 4km to Reepham's centre of gravity. Though closer to the village shop at the centre of Sudbrooke, it is still over 2km in distance..</p>
--	-----------------------	---

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Will have a degree of visual amenity value as open rural land, but not accessible to public. Farmland.	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<b>Characteristics</b>	
<b>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No, but would contribute to the perception of ribbon development along a main road in the countryside</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is, therefore, available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None that AECOM has been made aware of
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p><b>Potential housing development capacity:</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the land is technically suitable for residential development, it is located 4km away from Reepham's centre of gravity and 2km from Sudbrooke's. Services and facilities are not at walking distance and developing there would encourage car travel.</li> <li>• It would also contribute to a perception of ribbon development along a road in the open countryside, thus having a greater landscape impact than suggested by its small size.</li> <li>• Given existing alternatives for development in the Parish, this site is assessed as not being suitable.</li> </ul>

## A.6 Site 8 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	8
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land East of Kennel Lane
<b>Current use</b>	Greenfield
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.97
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Promoted by The Church Commissioners in the Call for Sites



<b>Context</b>				
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p>Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b></p> <p>Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	None			

### Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Access from Kennel Lane
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Walking distance to the centre of the village and close to a bus stop.

<b>Environmental Considerations</b>
-------------------------------------

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>None</b>	
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application. Potential for impact because it is a field in open countryside.
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character;</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>High</b>	Possible impact on landscape, particularly as the site would form a spur of development out into the open countryside- it adjoins existing development on only one of its shorter sides. Degree of visual amenity value as open rural land, but not accessible to public. Farmland.
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land , but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	

**Community facilities and services**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p>Moderately located</p>	<p>Observations and comments</p> <p>729m to Reepham's centre of gravity.</p>

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	Some visual/amenity value as attractive open land	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	



### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Flat
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	No

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is, therefore, available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None that AECOM has been made aware of
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p><b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Potential housing development capacity:</b></p>	<p>23 (based on 23.9dph) to 29 (based on 30dph)</p>
<p><b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a reasonably logical place to build, as there are houses along Kennel Lane and the site is within walking distance of the village centre.</li> <li>• However, the site is sensitive in terms of landscape, as it would form a spur of development out into the open countryside- it adjoins existing houses only on one of its shorter sides.</li> <li>• Houses should be set back from the main road to maximise the retention of attractive mature trees along the main road and the visual impact of development should be reduced through a soft, planted edge on its northern and eastern sides.</li> <li>• This site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development subject to suitable mitigation of visual impact.</li> </ul>

## A.7 Site 9.1 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	9.1
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Should read land adjacent to no.5 Moor Lane
<b>Current use</b>	Greenfield
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	1.62
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	CL1423
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Access from Moor Lane

<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Access from Moor Lane. Walking distance to centre of the village.
--	---

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>None</b>	
<b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application. Potential for ecological impact because it is a field in open countryside.
<b>Landscape</b>  <b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b>  Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained  Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character  High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible	<b>Medium</b>	Medium impact on landscape, because visibility of site is enhanced by adjoining open countryside on three of its four sides, with only the shortest side adjoining existing development. Degree of visual amenity value as open rural land, but not accessible to public.
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land, but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Moderately located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>560m to Reepham's centre of gravity.</p>
--	----------------------------------	---

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Farmland, but visual amenity value enhanced given the perception of open countryside	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Power lines crossing the site. Rail north of the site.

**Characteristics**

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
---	----------

<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is, therefore, available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None that AECOM has been made aware of
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	38 (based on 23.9dph) to 49 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to</b>	In theory, the site is suitable for residential

**accept or discount site.**

development:

- It is located east of an existing residential location;
- There is existing access from Moor Lane; and
- We have not identified any major environmental or other policy constraints.

However,:

- Despite its relatively small size, the site would have a disproportionate impact on visual amenity as it would form a spur of development out into the open countryside- it adjoins countryside on three of its four sides and adjoins development only on its shortest side
- The presence of a power line on the site should be considered and development should be planned carefully.
- The north of the site is adjacent to a railway; this could create disturbances which should be taken into account.

Although this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development, we recommend that a smaller portion of the site, such as CL1423 identified in the SHEELA, be considered for allocation rather than the whole site.

## A.8 Site 9.2 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>9.2</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land East of Fiskerton Road,
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	4.29
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Site can be accessed from Moor Lane only and as such would form long, relatively less accessible cul-de-sac..



<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Site is on the edge of Reepham but is reasonably accessible and well connected to rest of the village. 560m to centre of gravity.
--	---

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<b>None</b>	
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character;</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Medium</b>	Possible impact on landscape. Degree of visual amenity value as open rural land, but not accessible to public
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land, but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p>Moderately located</p>	<p>Observations and comments</p> <p>560m along walking and cycling route to 'centre of gravity' for services and facilities.</p>
--	---------------------------	--

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Site appears to be inaccessible to public; following site visit, seems unlikely it would have significant visual amenity value as green/undeveloped land.	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>

<b>Ground Contamination</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>Some impact</b>

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is therefore available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None that AECOM has been made aware of
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

### Conclusions

<p><b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>This site has minor constraints</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>The site has significant constraints</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Potential housing development capacity:</b></p>	<p>102 (based on 23.9dph) to 129 (based on 30dph)</p>
<p><b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b></p>	<p>In theory, the site is suitable for residential development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is directly adjacent to an existing residential location;</li> <li>• There is existing access from Moor Lane; and</li> <li>• We have not identified any major environmental or other policy constraints.</li> </ul> <p>However, we have identified a few minor constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a large site, which would increase Reepham’s built-out area by 11% if entirely developed, potentially creating issues of scale and impact on character.</li> <li>• If developed, any potential to avoid a single long cul-de-sac (for example by creating an access to Fiskerton Road as well as to Moor Lane) would significantly improve the site’s sustainability as it would increase accessibility by transport modes other than the private car</li> </ul> <p>This site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. However, we recommend that the northern portion of the site only is considered for allocation to mitigate the relative inaccessibility of the south of the site were it to form a long cul-de-sac.</p>

## A.9 Site 10 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	11 High St, LN3 4DP, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Housing
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential. Proposal to build a bungalow in the garden adjacent to existing property.
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.1
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Site can be accessed from the High Street.

<p><b>Is the site accessible?</b></p> <p>Provide details of site's connectivity</p>	<p>Site is centrally located, accessible and well connected to rest of the village.</p>
---	---

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b>                  Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character ;</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>Urban site- low landscape sensitivity to development</b></p>	
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b>                  Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p><b>No, as site is within urban area</b></p>	

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments	
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p><b>Some heritage constraints</b></p>	<p>The site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of the Old Manor House and Lawris Cottage, a Grade II listed building. Any development would need to be sensitive to these heritage assets and seek to avoid negative impacts on them.</p>	
<p><b>Community facilities and services</b></p>			
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>200m along walking and cycling route to centre of 'centre of gravity' for services and facilities.</p>	
<p><b>Other key considerations</b></p>			
<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>Trees in a conservation area that are not protected by a TPO are protected by provisions in section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the local planning authority is notified of certain work on such trees using a section 211 notice, six weeks before the work is carried out. This gives the local planning authority time to consider whether to make a TPO on the tree.<sup>24</sup></p>	
<p>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application</p>	
<p>Public Right of Way</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>		
<p>Existing social or community value (provide details)</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>The site is private land and thus existing social or community value will be limited.</p>	
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Ground Contamination</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Significant infrastructure crossing</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<sup>24</sup> Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

<b>the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>			
--	--	--	--

**Characteristics**

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>

**Availability**

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

**Availability**

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is therefore available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

**Summary**

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

**Conclusions**

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>



<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	1 proposed by applicant
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	The site is currently a garden adjacent to existing property and due to its very small size is likely more suitable as a windfall site rather than an allocation. However, otherwise, this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.

## A.10 Site 12 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Rose Cottage, 4, Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Greenfield (back garden)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.091
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Site can be accessed from Church Lane.

<p><b>Is the site accessible?</b> Provide details of site's connectivity</p>	<p>Site is centrally located, accessible and well connected to rest of the village.</p>
--	---

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Some value</b></p>	<p>There may be some ecological value on site due to some existing green spaces, but this will be limited due to the small size of the site. Any application would need to be accompanied by an ecological assessment</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>Urban site- low landscape sensitivity to development</b></p>	
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p><b>No, as site is within urban area</b></p>	

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p>	<p><b>Some heritage constraints</b></p>	<p>The site is located within the Conservation area, adjacent to the cemetery and a Grade II Listed Building,</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>		<p>Rose Cottage<sup>25</sup>. Design would need to be sensitive to minimise any negative impacts on these heritage assets or their setting.</p>
--	--	---

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>Located directly adjacent to 'centre of gravity' for services and facilities.</p>
--	----------------------------------	--

**Other key considerations**

<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>Trees in a conservation area that are not protected by a TPO are protected by provisions in section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the local planning authority is notified of certain work on such trees using a section 211 notice, six weeks before the work is carried out. This gives the local planning authority time to consider whether to make a TPO on the tree.<sup>26</sup></p>	
<p>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application</p>	
<p>Public Right of Way</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>		
<p>Existing social or community value (provide details)</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>The site is private land and thus existing social or community value will be limited.</p>	
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Ground Contamination</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	

<sup>25</sup> <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1359506>

<sup>26</sup> Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

installations			
---------------	--	--	--

**Characteristics**

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Flat
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	No

**3.0. Availability**

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

**Availability**

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is therefore available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

**4.0. Summary**

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

**Conclusions**

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p><b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Potential housing development capacity:</b></p>	<p>1 dwelling proposed</p>
<p><b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site comprises open land with existing buildings within the existing urban area; Access from Church Lane;</li> <li>• Despite being in a conservation area and adjacent to a Grade II Listed Building., the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development if developed sensitively. However, it would require demolishing the two existing constructions at the entrance of the site that appear to be garages.</li> <li>• The site is very well located for access to the limited services and facilities in the village centre</li> <li>• The site is currently a garden adjacent to existing property and due to its very small size is likely more suitable as a windfall site rather than an allocation.</li> </ul>

## A.11 Site 13.1 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>13.1</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Plot at side of 3 Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Garden and house
<b>Proposed use</b>	Unknown
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.093
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Site accessible via Church Lane.

<b>Is the site accessible?</b>	Site is centrally located, accessible and well connected to rest of the village.
Provide details of site's connectivity	

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Unknown</b>	
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Urban site- low landscape sensitivity to development</b>	
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>No, as site is within urban area</b>	

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> </ul>	<b>Heritage consideration</b>	The site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of the Church of St Peter And St Paul, a Grade II* listed building. Any development would need to be sensitive to these heritage assets and seek to avoid negative impacts on them.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>Located directly adjacent to 'centre of gravity' for services and facilities.</p>
--	----------------------------------	--

**Other key considerations**

<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>Trees in a conservation area that are not protected by a TPO are protected by provisions in section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the local planning authority is notified of certain work on such trees using a section 211 notice, six weeks before the work is carried out. This gives the local planning authority time to consider whether to make a TPO on the tree.<sup>27</sup></p>	
<p>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application</p>	
<p>Public Right of Way</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>Footpath at the back of the site</p>	
<p>Existing social or community value (provide details)</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>The site is private land and thus existing social or community value will be limited.</p>	
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Ground Contamination</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Characteristics**

<sup>27</sup> Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability			
	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is therefore available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	2-3 (based on 30dph)

**Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.**

- In theory, this site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The only constraint identified is that the site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of the Church of St Peter And St Paul, Grade II\* listed building. Therefore, any development should be sensitive and seek to avoid negative impacts on these heritage assets and their settings.
- The site is currently a garden adjacent to existing property and due to its very small size is likely more suitable as a windfall site rather than an allocation.

## A.12 Site 14 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	9 High Street, LN3 4DP, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Back garden
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.072
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	123167 28/10/2008 Planning application for alterations and extension to dwelling. Granted time limit +conditions			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<p><b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b></p>	<p>Site accessible via High Street. However, the site available for development is a long rear garden at the back of a house and there would be no access without demolition of the existing dwelling</p>

<b>Is the site accessible?</b>	Site is centrally located, accessible and well connected to rest of the village.
Provide details of site's connectivity	

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Urban site- low landscape sensitivity to development</b>	
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>No, as site within urban area</b>	

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Conservation area</b></li> <li>• <b>Scheduled monument</b></li> </ul>	<b>Some heritage constraints</b>	The site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of a Grade II listed building, the Old Manor House and Lawris Cottage <sup>28</sup> . Any development would need to be sensitive to these heritage assets and seek to avoid

<sup>28</sup> <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1147840>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>Registered Battlefield</li> <li>Listed building</li> <li>Known archaeology</li> <li>Locally listed building</li> </ul>		negative impacts on them.
---	--	---------------------------

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>Employment location</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>School(s)</li> <li>Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>Health facilities</li> <li>Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>200m along walking and cycling route to 'centre of gravity' for services and facilities.</p>
--	----------------------------------	---

**Other key considerations**

<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>Trees in a conservation area that are not protected by a TPO are protected by provisions in section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the local planning authority is notified of certain work on such trees using a section 211 notice, six weeks before the work is carried out. This gives the local planning authority time to consider whether to make a TPO on the tree.<sup>29</sup></p>	
<p>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.</p>	
<p>Public Right of Way</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>		
<p>Existing social or community value (provide details)</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>The site is private land and thus existing social or community value will be limited.</p>	
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Ground Contamination</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Characteristics**

<sup>29</sup> Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability			
	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is therefore available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	n/a

---

**Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.**

- The site is a back garden at the back of an existing property. There is access from the High Street; and the area is an existing residential location. The site is in a conservation area and within the setting of a Grade II Listed Building.
  - In theory, the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. However, would require demolishing the existing house at the entrance of the site. There would be no access to the site and therefore, it is not appropriate for allocation.
-



## A.13 Site 15.1 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>15.1</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land North East of Little Cherry, Hawthorn Road, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	2.83
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Site accessible from Hawthorn Road and Westfield Lane.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>	Although adjoining the small settlement called 'Little

Provide details of site's connectivity	Cherry', the site is very far from community services and facilities. It is only accessible by car.
--	---

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Some value</b>	There may be some ecological value on site due to some existing green spaces, but this will be limited due to the small size of the site. Any new construction would need to take into account potential protected species.
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Medium</b>	Possible impact on landscape. Degree of visual amenity value as open rural land, but not accessible to public
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land, but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	

**Community facilities and services**

Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):		Observations and comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p>Poorly located</p>	<p>The site is 2km from Reepham's centre of gravity. Cherry Willingham is the nearest settlement with a greater range of facilities but this is still at least 1.5 km from the site by the nearest walking and cycling route.</p>

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
Public Right of Way	None	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	The site will have a degree of visual amenity as open, undeveloped land'.

Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?	Yes	No	Comments
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

installations			
---------------	--	--	--

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Flat
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	No

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is therefore available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p><b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Potential housing development capacity:</b></p>	<p>85 (based on 30dph)</p>
<p><b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site itself has few if any technical constraints to development, but it is located 2km away from Reepham's centre of gravity and 1.5km from Cherry Willingham's. Services and facilities are not at walking distance and developing there would encourage car travel. Therefore, this site is assessed as not being suitable for residential development.</li> </ul>

## A.14 Site 15.3 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>15.3</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land to rear of 14 Church Lane
<b>Current use</b>	Agricultural (Untidy field – Currently used for keeping and exercising horses)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.35
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<p><b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b></p>	<p>The only current access to the site is via a footpath coming from Church Lane. This is not an adequate access for the proposed development. There is, however, a potential access off Carpenters Close.</p>

<b>Is the site accessible?</b>	The site is located at a walking distance to centre of the village.
Provide details of site's connectivity	

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	North of the site in Flood Zone 3
<p><b>Ecological value?</b>            Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Some value</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Medium</b>	The site is located in open countryside, and any developments could have a visual impact on the existing landscape and the openness of the countryside.
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b>            Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land, but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b>	

<b>Community facilities and services</b>		
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Moderately located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>560m to Reepham's centre of gravity</p>

<b>Other key considerations</b>			
Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.	
Public Right of Way	Yes	Footpath Reep/128/2 is going through the site.	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	The site will have a degree of visual amenity as open, undeveloped land, with a footpath going through the site.	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<b>Characteristics</b>	
Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<p><b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient</p>	Flat
<p><b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</p>	No
<p><b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</p>	No

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.



<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is therefore available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	8 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<p>There are a few major constraints on this site:                      The north of the site is located in Flood Zone 3                      A footpath runs through the site                      The only current access is via the public footpath, which is not adequate for the proposed development.</p> <p>However, there is a potential access off Carpenters Close, which would make access from the southeast of the site possible. Alternatively, the footpath could also be diverted to allow for an access road, and unlock the whole site for development.</p> <p>The site is, in broad terms, suitable for residential development, available and achievable for residential development.</p>

## A.15 Site 16 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	9 Church Lane, LN3 4DQ, Reepham, Lincolnshire
<b>Current use</b>	Garden land
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.11
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Site accessible via Church Lane.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>	Site is centrally located, accessible and well connected to

Provide details of site's connectivity	rest of the village.
--	----------------------

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Low sensitivity</b>	
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>No, as site within urban area</b>	

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	The site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of Pembertons Place, a Grade II listed building. Any development would need to be sensitive to these heritage assets and seek to avoid negative impacts on them.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locally listed building</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>Employment location</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>School(s)</li> <li>Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>Health facilities</li> <li>Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>198m to Reepham's centre of gravity.</p>
--	----------------------------------	---

**Other key considerations**

<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Trees in a conservation area that are not protected by a TPO are protected by provisions in section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the local planning authority is notified of certain work on such trees using a section 211 notice, six weeks before the work is carried out. This gives the local planning authority time to consider whether to make a TPO on the tree.<sup>30</sup></p>	
<p>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.</p>	
<p>Public Right of Way</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>Unmade road</p>	
<p>Existing social or community value (provide details)</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>The site is private land and thus existing social or community value will be limited.</p>	
<p><b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Ground Contamination</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Characteristics**

<p>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</p>	<p>Comments</p>
--	-----------------

<sup>30</sup> Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The site was submitted by the landowner during the call for sites submission in July/August 2018 and is therefore available.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	1 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site comprises open land within the existing urban</li> </ul>

<p><b>accept or discount site.</b></p>	<p>area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Access from Church Lane; and</li><li>• The area is an existing residential location.</li></ul> <p>The site is within a Conservation Area and within the setting of Pembertons Place, a Grade II listed building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Suitable, available and achievable for residential development subject to careful consideration of the setting of a Grade II historical asset. Suitable for the development of a single-storey building.</li></ul>
--	--

## A.16 Site CL3082 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>CL3082</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land adjacent to Reepham and Cherry Willingham Village Hall
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	2.77
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	CL3082
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	There is existing access from Hawthorn Lane.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>	The site is within short walking distance to community services and facilities in Cherry Willingham.

Provide details of site's connectivity	
--	--

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Medium</b>	Possible impact on landscape. Degree of visual amenity value as open rural land, but not accessible to public, and village hall creates existing landscape precedent for development
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land, but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> </ul>	<b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b>	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Listed building</li> <li>Known archaeology</li> <li>Locally listed building</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>Employment location</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>School(s)</li> <li>Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>Health facilities</li> <li>Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>1km to Reepham's centre of gravity, but about 200m to Cherry Willingham's centre of gravity.</p>
--	----------------------------------	---

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	No		
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	The site will have a degree of visual amenity as open, undeveloped land'.	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Characteristics**

<b>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient</p>	Flat
<p><b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</p>	No

<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site was submitted to 2015 SHELAA, which is strong evidence of availability
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	66 to 83 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is suitable for residential development;</li> <li>• Though in Reepham parish, it is directly adjacent to residential development in Cherry Willingham;</li> <li>• There is existing access from Hawthorn Lane;</li> <li>• The site is within short walking distance to services in Cherry Willingham; and</li> <li>• The site visit revealed the presence of a ditch between the site and the road, which would require minor levelling work or bridging the existing ditch prior to development.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Apart from that, the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The assessment of applicable constraints suggests that CL3082 is more suitable than site 6.2 put forward in the CFS.</li></ul>
--	---

## A.17 Site CL3084 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>CL3084</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land adjacent to Reepham Manor
<b>Current use</b>	Farm buildings
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	1.19
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	SHELAA



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>  <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Brownfield</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Mixture</b>  <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unknown</b>  <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	138041; Application date: 05/07/2018; Refused on 09/10/18; Reason: Contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Access is gained via The Green to the south.

<b>Is the site accessible?</b> Provide details of site's connectivity	Access is gained via The Green to the south.
--	--

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?	<b>Unknown</b>	
<b>Landscape</b>  <b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b>  Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained  Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character  High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible	<b>Medium</b>	Development will have moderate impact on landscape as open (semi)-rural land as viewed from neighbouring footpaths.
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>No, as site within urban area</b>	

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	Part of the site is within the Reepham Conservation Area. Any new development would need to be particularly sensitive to this heritage asset and its setting.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locally listed building</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>Employment location</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>School(s)</li> <li>Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>Health facilities</li> <li>Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>239m to Reepham's centre of gravity</p>
--	----------------------------------	--

**Other key considerations**

<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>Trees in a conservation area that are not protected by a TPO are protected by provisions in section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This requires that the local planning authority is notified of certain work on such trees using a section 211 notice, six weeks before the work is carried out. This gives the local planning authority time to consider whether to make a TPO on the tree.<sup>31</sup></p>	
<p>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</p>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application</p>	
<p>Public Right of Way</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>		
<p>Existing social or community value (provide details)</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Site will have some visual landscape value as open (semi)-rural land as viewed from neighbouring footpaths</p>	
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Ground Contamination</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Unknown; but as ex-farming site, assessment recommended as part of any planning application.</p>
<p>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Characteristics**

<p>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</p>	<p>Comments</p>
--	-----------------

<sup>31</sup> Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>

### Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site was submitted to 2015 SHELAA, which is strong evidence of availability
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	36 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is contained within a larger site (site 6.1) which was discounted during the Desktop assessment. The larger site was refused planning permission as it was contrary to policies LP2 – The</li> </ul>

---

	<p>Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• However, the reasons for refusal of the planning permission for the larger site can be easily mitigated for the smaller CL3084.</li><li>• This is a brownfield site, which consist of a barn and several warehouses. Policy LP2 gives priority to development on brownfield sites over Greenfield sites. Additionally, Policy LP55 supports the re-use and conversion of non-residential buildings for residential use.</li><li>• Despite minor constraints - part of the site is within the Reepham Conservation Area - the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li></ul>
--	---

---



## A.18 Site CL1423 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>CL1423</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land east of No.5 Moor Lane
<b>Current use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.259
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	n/a
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Access from Moor Lane
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>	Access from Moor Lane. Walking distance to centre of the village.

Provide details of site's connectivity

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	No environmental policy or designations within or adjacent to the site.
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Some value</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>Medium</b>	The site is located in open countryside, and any developments could have a visual impact on the existing landscape and the openness of the countryside (though to a significantly lesser extent than the overlapping, larger, Site 9.1)
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land, but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>		
--	--	--

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Moderately located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>560m to Reepham's centre of gravity</p>
--	----------------------------------	--

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	The site will have a degree of visual amenity as open, undeveloped land	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Characteristics**

<b>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient</p>	Flat
<p><b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</p>	No

<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site was submitted to 2015 SHELAA, which is strong evidence of availability
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	8 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<p>The site is, in broad terms, suitable for residential development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is located east of an existing residential location;</li> <li>• There is existing access from Moor Lane; and</li> <li>• There are no major environmental or other policy constraints.</li> </ul> <p>However, there are a few minor constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of a power line on the site should be considered and development should be planned carefully.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The north of the site is adjacent to a railway; this could create disturbances which should be taken into account.</li></ul> <p>This site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The allocation of the site is recommended as preferable to that of the overlapping but larger site 9.1, which would have more significant landscape and visual amenity impacts.</p>
--	--

## A.19 Site CL3083 Assessment Pro forma

<b>General information</b>	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	<b>CL3083</b>
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land adjacent Reepham Manor/ Cricket Ground
<b>Current use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	1.17
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	CL3083
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Landowner



<b>Context</b>				
<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p>Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b></p> <p>Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	<p>138041; Application date: 05/07/2018; Refused on 09/10/18; Reason: Contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.</p>			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<p><b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b></p>	<p>The only current access to the site is via Meadows Lane.</p>

<b>Is the site accessible?</b>	The site is located at a walking distance to centre of the village.
Provide details of site's connectivity	

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?	<b>Unknown</b>	Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application
<b>Landscape</b>  <b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b>  Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained  Medium sensitivity: Development would have only moderate impact on landscape character  High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible	<b>Medium</b>	The site is located in open countryside, and any developments could have a visual impact on the existing landscape and the openness of the countryside.
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b>	Agricultural land quality mapping suggests the site is Grade 3 agricultural land, but does not specify if Grade 3a or 3b.

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b>	

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourably located</b> &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Moderately located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>992m to Reepham's centre of gravity</p>
--	----------------------------------	--

**Other key considerations**

<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p>None</p>		
<p>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</p>	<p>Unknown</p>	<p>Detailed ecological survey recommended as part of any planning application.</p>	
<p>Public Right of Way</p>	<p>None</p>		
<p>Existing social or community value (provide details)</p>	<p>Some</p>	<p>The site will have a degree of visual amenity as open, undeveloped land</p>	
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Ground Contamination</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Unknown; but as ex-farming site, assessment recommended as part of any planning application.</p>
<p>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Characteristics**

<p><b>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p><b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient</p>	<p>Flat</p>
<p><b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</p>	<p>The proposed development would detract from the character and significance of the area, extending the development into the open countryside and in a location beyond the core shape and form of the village.</p>



### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site was submitted to 2015 SHELAA, which is strong evidence of availability
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is not appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	35 (based on 30dph)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is contained within a larger site (site 6.1) which was discounted during the Desktop assessment. The larger site was refused planning permission as it was contrary to policies LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, LP4 – Growth in Villages, LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views, Policy LP25 – The Historic Environment and LP26 – Design and Amenity.</li> <li>However, the reasons for refusal of the planning permission for the larger site can be easily mitigated for the smaller CL3083.</li> <li>Despite minor constraints – would extend development in the open countryside and beyond the core shape and form of the village - the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development.</li> </ul>



