## **Site Assessment Spreadsheet**

			Major Planning Considerations			
						major ramming constactations
		Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Conservation Areas	European / National Wildlife Site / Protected Species	Flood Risk	Heritage Assets
Site Name	Green Belt?	The NPPF requires great weight to be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Development should seek to enhance the significance of Conservation Areas and make a positive contribution.	The NPPF affords significant protection to these important wildlife habitats including RAMSAR, NNR, SAC, SSSA, SSSI and Ancient Woodland. Development that causes harm to the geological and conservation interests on such sites will not be permitted. Particular species and their habitats are also protected by law (e.g. bats).	The NPPF sets out a sequential approach to development with the aim to steer development away from areas of highest risk (Zone 3). Surface water flooding could also act as a constraint on development. Information provided from the Environment Agency and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	The NPPF seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance Substantial harm or loss to Scheduled Monuments, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, and Listed Buildings should be exceptional or wholly exceptional.
		Significant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	Site at risk of surface water flooding = RED	Significant impact = RED
		Some impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Part of site at risk of flooding (e.g. Zone 2or 3) = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER
		Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Site not at risk of flooding = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN
Sunrise Cottage	YES	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN
The Old Nursery	YES	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN
Winter Oak	NO	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN

					Accessibility and Transport	
ocal Wildlife Site	Local Geological Site	Major Infrastructure	Minerals and Waste	Access to Site	Accessibility to Local Facilities	Public Transport
n additional to nationally important sites, Warwickshire County Council has identified iites of local wildlife value. Development should not significantly affect the plodiversity value of these sites.	The NPPF seeks to protect and enhance geological or geomorphological sites considered worthy of protection.  Development should not significantly affect the biodiversity value of these sites.	Is the site affected by major infrastructure (e.g. the route of High Speed 2, HSE Pipelines and pylons etc.)?	Development should not affect sites allocated or safeguarded for minerals extraction or waste management in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.	Is there satisfactory access to the site from the road network that is likely to meet highway standards?	Is the site within reasonable walking distance of local services and facilities (i.e. convenience shop, primary school, doctor's surgery, public house)?	Is the site accessible to public transport services i.e. (400m/5mins walk to bus or 800m/10mins walk to rail)?
ignificant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	No access to site = RED	No facilities reasonably accessible = RED	Accessible to neither bus or rail = RED
ome impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Major works required = AMBER	Some facilities reasonably accessible = AMBER	Accessible to bus or rail = AMBER
linor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor works required = GREEN	All facilities reasonably accessible = GREEN	Accessible to bus and rail = GREEN
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	RED	RED
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	AMBER	RED	RED
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	AMBER	GREEN

Suitability							
		Other Planning Considerations  Built Environment & Heritage					
Relationship to Highway Network	Public Rights of Way	Coalescence	Integration with Settlement	Neighbouring Amenity	Neighbouring Land Uses	Non-designated Heritage Asset	
Is the site well located in respect of the main road network and vehicle movements?	Does a Public Right of Way (PRoW) have a potential impact on the development of the site?	Does the site form an important contribution to defining and maintaining the separate identity of the settlement?	Does the site relate well to the existing built form / character of the settlement? NB: landscaping can help to mitigate impacts.	Would development of the site significantly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (e.g. overlooking etc.)?	Is the site affected by neighbouring uses (e.g. incompatible use)?	The NPPF seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, including non-designated features of historic and cultural importance.	
Poor = RED	PRoW crosses the site = RED	Significant contribution = RED	Sensitive site = RED	Significant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	
Improvements likely = AMBER	PRoW on site boundary = AMBER	Some contribution = AMBER	Mitigation achievable through good design=	Some impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	
Well related = GREEN	Site not affected by PRoW = GREEN	Minor / No contribution = GREEN	Site / development integrates well = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	
GREEN	AMBER	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	
GREEN	green	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	

	Land & Landscape		Site Characteristics					
Landscape Sensitivity	Agricultural Land Classification	Contaminated Land	Tree Preservation Orders (TPO)	Natural Features	Pollution	Site Assembly	Site Topography and shape	
The Sensitivity of the landscape is its ability to accommodate a certain type of change or development	is the site classified as being the best and most versatile agricultural land? (1 = excellent; 2 = very good; 3a = good; 3b = moderate; 4 = poor; 5 = very poor)	Is the site likely to be affected by contaminated land (e.g., petrol filling stations, industrial land etc.) Detailed site assessment may be required to establish whether actual contamination exists irrespective of this analysis.	Trees provide amenity value and are an important feature of the townscape and landscape and should be retained.	Are there natural features to the site that may have ecological value or may affect the design and layout? E.g. Watercourses, ponds, hedgerows etc.		Could the site form part of a larger site that is suitable for development? Would development of this site restrain other development?	Do the topography/levels of the site or its shape constrain development?	
High & high-medium sensitivity = RED	Grade 1 or 2 = RED	Contamination previously identified = RED	Significant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	Significant impact = RED	Prevent development = RED	Significant impact = RED	
Medium & Medium-Low sensitivity = AMBER		Potentially contaminative = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	Mitigated by design= AMBER	Some impact = AMBER	
Low sensitivity = GREEN	Grade 3b, 4 or 5 / not relevant = GREEN	Less likely to be contaminated = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	Minor / No impact = GREEN	No = Green	Minor / No impact = GREEN	
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	AMBER	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	AMBER	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	

	Avail	Suitability and availability			
Current Use	Intentions	Legal	Ownership		Site History
Is the site currently in use? Is the whole of the site in use? Would any existing users / tenants need to be relocated? Occupied sites may affect the likelihood or the timescales of development particularly in the short-term.		Are there any outstanding legal issues (e.g. multiple land ownerships, ransom strips) that may affect the site coming forward for development in the short-term?	Has the landowner been identified?	Suitable and available?	Does the planning history provide any information as to the likely development of the site? (NB: the presence of planning permission does not automatically mean site will be developed)
In active use / occupied = RED	No intention to develop / intentions unknown = RED	Yes = RED	Unknown = RED		Permission refused = RED
Agricultural use / Vacant / Under-used = AMBER	Site promoted = AMBER	Unknown = AMBER	Known but no contact = AMBER		No permission / Expired = AMBER
Derelict / Undeveloped = GREEN	Developer in place = GREEN	No = GREEN	Known = GREEN		Extant permission = GREEN
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	YES	GREEN
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	YES	GREEN
GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	YES	GREEN

	Site size and pitch potential				
Suitability Conclusion	Availability Conclusion	Achievability Conclusion	Suitable, Available and Achievable?	Site size	Pitch Potential
				Gross Site Area (Ha)	
No major planning considerations that would prohibit the site as being suitable. However, the site is poorly connected to sustainable transport options and is within the Green Belt. Its location will have to be balanced against other matters such as need.	Nothing before Council to believe that there is an issue with availability.	No concerns that proposed development in unachievable.	YES	0.3	3
No major planning considerations that would prohibit the site as being suitable although quite significant works would be needed on the access to make it safe but this is feasible and would not prevent the site from being made acceptable. A public right of way runs to the north of the site and any development needs not to impinge on the use of this. Boundary hedges exist at the site and would need to be retained and protected. There is a listed building to the north in relatively close proximity to the site but there are no indications that this would be a matter for concern. However, the site is poorly connected to sustainable transport options and is within the Green Belt. Its location will have to be balanced against other matters such as need.	Nothing before Council to believe that there is an issue with availability.	Planning permission 037168 requires the site to be split by a fence and hedgerow so the southern access would be cut-off from the rest of the site. The southern access is the safer and thus the preferred choice for egress and ingress. Some rearrangement of the site layout would need to take place to accommodate an appropriate access but there appears to be the space within the land in the owner's control to allow this to take place.	YES	0.5	5 to 6
No major planning considerations that would prohibit the site as being suitable. Site has access to walking, cycling, and bus transport options and is better located to some services than the other sites. Boundary h	Nothing before Council to believe that there is an issue with availability.	No concerns that proposed development in unachievable.	YES	0.4	6