

Plan
brought to you by

locality



Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment Template

Site Details

Detail	Assessment
Site Reference / Name	No reference/proposed site west of Copywell Cottages
[Insert site plan showing boundary of site]	
Site Address / Location	Orcop Hill – land west of Copywell Cottages (U71418)
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	Unknown
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	None
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Housing
Landowner estimate of development capacity (if known)	4 dwellings (semi detached)
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	Proposed at Regulation 14
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	None
Neighbouring uses	Pastoral

Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations: Ancient Woodland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Biosphere Reserve Local Nature Reserve (LNR) National Nature Reserve (NNR) National Park Ramsar Site Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Special Protection Area (SPA) Yes/ No/ Unknown Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England? Yes/ No/ Unknown	Yes - within hydrological catchment of River Wye SAC Yes - Natural England would be consulted regarding site being within River Wye SAC
Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations: Green Infrastructure Corridor Local Wildlife Site (LWS) Public Open Space Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) Nature Improvement Area Regionally Important Geological Site Other Yes/ No/ Unknown	No

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3? See guidance notes: Flood Zone 1: Low Risk Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk	Low Risk
Site is at risk of surface water flooding? See guidance notes: Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk	Medium Risk - Large area of field north of proposed site heavily waterlogged after recent rainfall. >15% of the site is affected by medium/high risk surface water flooding
Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a) Yes / No / Unknown	Yes
Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of: A wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity); wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or An area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation? Yes / No / Unknown	No - there are no environmental designations on the site
Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? Yes / No / Unknown	No

Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Is the site: Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping	Gently sloping north to south
Is there existing vehicle access to the site? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site? Pedestrian? Yes / No / Unknown Cycle? Yes / No / Unknown	No No
Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site? Yes / No / Unknown	Unknown
Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties? Significant trees? Yes, within / Yes, adjacent / No / Unknown Potentially veteran or ancient trees present? Yes, within / Yes, adjacent / No / Unknown Owned by third parties? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes - within Unknown Unknown
Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination? Yes / No / Unknown	No

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes - Power lines cross field north to south on eastern edge of proposed site. Also 1 transformer post and 1 support post.
Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value? Yes / No / Unknown	No

Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps :	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	<400m 400-1200m >1200m
Bus /Tram Stop	<400m 400-800m >800m
Train station	<400m 400-1200m >1200m
Primary School	<400m 400-1200m >1200m
Secondary School	<1600m 1600-3900m >3900m
Open Space / recreation facilities	<400m 400-800m >800m
Cycle Route	<400m 400-800m >800m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape? Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change. Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation. High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.	Medium sensitivity
Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity? Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views. Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views. High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.	Medium sensitivity:

Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting? Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible Some impact, and/or mitigation possible Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting? Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible Some impact, and/or mitigation possible Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation

Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Is the site in the Green Belt? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?	No
Is the site: Greenfield A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land?	Greenfield
Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area? Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)? Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?	The site is adjacent to the proposed settlement boundary for Orcop Hill.
Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement? Yes / No / Unknown	No

Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
Is the site available for development? Yes / No / Unknown.	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? Yes / No / Unknown.	Unknown
Is there a known time frame for availability? Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.	0-5 years

Viability

Indicators of Viability	Assessment
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? Yes / No / Unknown.	Unknown
What evidence is available to support this judgement?	

Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
-------------	------------

Conclusions	Assessment
Summary of key development constraints affecting the site	The site does not have vehicular access to adopted highway. Access is proposed by connection to the existing private access road to Copywell Cottages to the east. However, the site does not abut this access with intervening third party land which is part of the garden to 6 Copywell Cottages (see LPA ref P182200/FH). In addition, the availability and capacity of the private access road and suitability of its junction with Lyston Lane to accept additional traffic is unknown. Wastewater treatment is proposed via connection to the DCWW works to the south west. DCWW's reg 14 response states this plant is unlikely to have capacity to serve further development, so the feasibility of this arrangement is in doubt. The site has a medium sensitivity for landscape and visual amenity and would extend the built form of Orcop Hill in a linear fashion into open countryside.
What is the estimated development capacity of the site?	Unknown
What is the likely timeframe for development? (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable, available and achievable The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable	The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable

Conclusions	Assessment
Summary of justification for rating	The site does not have vehicular access to adopted highway. The neighbouring wastewater treatment works is unlikely to have capacity to serve the development, as proposed. The site would extend the built form of Orcop Hill in an intrusive, linear fashion into open countryside.



Neighbourhood Planning

brought to you by



Text

