# Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment

## Appendix B (vi) Rural Area Residential Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAA ID</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Site location</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Arthingworth</td>
<td>Sunnybank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Arthingworth</td>
<td>Manor Farm</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Ashby St Ledgers</td>
<td>Ashby St Ledgers Farm</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Badby</td>
<td>Land at Bunkers Hill</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Badby</td>
<td>Land south of B4037</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Barby</td>
<td>Land off School Close</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Barby</td>
<td>Land at Brackendale Drive</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Barby</td>
<td>Land at Longdown Lane</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Barby</td>
<td>Land east of Daventry Road</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Barby</td>
<td>Land off Balding Close</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Land off Holly Lodge Drive</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Spring Close</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Adams Field</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Land at north of Boughton Park</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Land at South of Boughton Park</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Land south of Moulton Lane</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Land West of A5199</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Land north of Moulton Lane</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Buckton Fields East</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>Grange Farm</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>West View Farms</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Land adjacent Walton Road</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Land adjacent Ventnor Lodge</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Land adjacent Ventnor Lodge and Linacre House</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Land between Linacre House and Honeyhurst Farm</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Land off Mill Close</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Old Station Yard</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Land off Walton Road</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Land off Ashby Road</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
<td>Land off Maple Close</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Home Farm</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Land at Northampton Road</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Victors Barns</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Land north of Holcot Road</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Old Station Yard</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Land off Northampton Road</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Land off Station Road</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Land west of Scaldwell Road</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Land between Holcot Road and Scaldwell Road</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Land east of Northampton Road</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Vicors Barns</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Frog Hall</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Land at Woodford Road</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Land south of Woodford Road</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Land off Woodford Road</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Land at Boddington Road</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Marley Farm</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Boddington Road</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Manor Farm</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Boddington Road South</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>Westhorpe House Farm</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>The Twisle</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Chapel Brampton</td>
<td>Northampton Road</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Charwelton</td>
<td>Charwelton Station</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Clay Coton</td>
<td>Land at Clay Coton</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Clipston</td>
<td>Church Lane</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cold Ashby</td>
<td>Cedars Farm</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Cold Ashby</td>
<td>Land off Church Lane</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Cold Ashby</td>
<td>Land at Manor Farm</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Creaton</td>
<td>Land off Court House Close</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Creaton</td>
<td>Teeton Lane</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Creaton</td>
<td>Land off Welford Road</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land off Marsh Close</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land at Watford Road</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land at Deer Park</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Manor Farm</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Lauds Road</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land off Main Road</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land to the south west of Crick (A)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land to the south west of Crick (B)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land to the south west of Crick (C)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land off West Haddon Road</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land at Elms Farm</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Land south of Main Road</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Main Road</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Watford Road</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Marsons Drive</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Crick</td>
<td>Woolcombe Adams Farm</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>Farndon Fields Farm</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>Farndon Fields Farm</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>Farndon Close</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>Hopton Fields</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>Nursery Fields</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>Hopton Fields</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>North of Back Lane, East Farndon</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>South of Back Lane</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
<td>Land at Moyargot, Main Street, East Farndon</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>East Haddon</td>
<td>Church Lane</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Flore</td>
<td>Land fronting Nether Lane</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Flore</td>
<td>Land off Flore Hill</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Flore</td>
<td>Land adjacent High Street</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Flore</td>
<td>Land north of A45</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Flore</td>
<td>Land off Brockhall Road</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Flore</td>
<td>Land north of High Street</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Flore</td>
<td>Brockhall Road</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Great Brington</td>
<td>Land off Main Street</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Guilsborough</td>
<td>Land west of Coton Road</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Guilsborough</td>
<td>Coton Road</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Guilsborough</td>
<td>Land south of West Haddon Road</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Guilsborough</td>
<td>Upper Thorneycraft</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hannington</td>
<td>Land off Walgrave Road</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Hannington</td>
<td>Clarke’s Wood</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Hannington</td>
<td>Bridal Road Fields</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Harlestone</td>
<td>The Estate Yard</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Harlestone</td>
<td>Harlestone Road East</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Harlestone</td>
<td>Wykes Lodge</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Harlestone</td>
<td>Land south of Wykes Lodge</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Holcot</td>
<td>Poplar Farm</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Holcot</td>
<td>Land near Glebe Close</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Holcot</td>
<td>Land on South East side of Moulton Road</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Kilsby</td>
<td>Land off Rugby Road</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kilsby</td>
<td>Land at Barby Road</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Kilsby</td>
<td>Land at 54 Rugby Road</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Kilsby</td>
<td>Daventry Road</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lilbourne</td>
<td>Land off Station Road</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Lilbourne</td>
<td>Land off Station Road</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Lilbourne</td>
<td>Green Farm</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Little Brington</td>
<td>Blacksmiths Lane</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Land off Berryfield</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Land at Park Field</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Land off Brington Road</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Land off The Banks</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>East Street</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Land east of Station Road</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Land west of Station Road</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Land west of Hilgay, Harbridges Lane</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Station Road South</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>East of Station Road</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Floyers Farm</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Brington Road</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>East Street</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Grove Farm</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Stenhouse Close</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>West Street</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>Land off The Banks</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maidwell</td>
<td>Land adjoining A508</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Maidwell</td>
<td>Land adjoining Hall Farmhouse</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Maidwell</td>
<td>Draughton Road</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Maidwell</td>
<td>Land at Blueberry Lane</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Maidwell</td>
<td>The Banks</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land south of Boughton Road</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>New Manor Farm</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land west of Thorpeville</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land behind The Nest</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land west of Holcot Road</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Moulton Heights (2000 dwellings)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Moulton Heights Gateway</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Moulton Heights (1000 dwellings)</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land off Pitsford Road</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land north of Sandy Hill Lane</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land east of Northampton Lane</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land off Sandy Hill Lane</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Oakley Drive</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Cottingham Drive</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land west of The Grove</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Church Hill Farm</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land south of Church Hill Farm</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Warren Spinney</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Land South of Boughton Road, Moulton Park</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Naseby</td>
<td>Land off High Street</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Naseby</td>
<td>Land off Cottesbrooke Road</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Naseby</td>
<td>Land off High Street</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Naseby</td>
<td>Policeman's Field</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Naseby</td>
<td>Land off Cottesbrooke Farm</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>Weedon Lane</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Land off Lamport Road</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overstone</td>
<td>Land rear of Sywell Road</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Overstone</td>
<td>Sywell Road</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Overstone</td>
<td>Land south of Sywell Road</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Overstone</td>
<td>Overstone Leys</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Overstone</td>
<td>Billing Gate</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Overstone</td>
<td>South of The Avenue</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pitsford</td>
<td>The Oaks Field</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Pitsford</td>
<td>Land off Moulton Road</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Pitsford</td>
<td>Moulton College Grange Lane</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Pitsford</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Ravensthorpe</td>
<td>Hawtoft Farm</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Scaldwell</td>
<td>East End</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Spratton</td>
<td>Land off Welford Road</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Spratton</td>
<td>Land off Brixworth Road</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staverton</td>
<td>Land off Daventry Road</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Staverton</td>
<td>Land north of Daventry Road</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Staverton</td>
<td>Land west of Braunston Lane</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sulby</td>
<td>Land at Sulby Estate</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Walgrave</td>
<td>Land at Old Road</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Watford</td>
<td>Henley Court</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Cavalry Hill Industrial Estate</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Land at New Street</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Land at Bridge Street</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Land at Dodford Wharf Farm</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Land east of Ordnance Road</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Ordnance Road South</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Land off Croft Way</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Former Ace Café</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Land east of New Street</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Roseacres, Watling Street</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Weedon Depot</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
<td>Land north of A45 High Street</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Welford</td>
<td>Woodford Glebe</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Welford</td>
<td>Land south of Newlands Road</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Welton</td>
<td>Land at Old Manor Court</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Welton</td>
<td>Kiln Lane</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>Land at Watford Road</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>Land at Watford Road</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>Land off Guilsborough</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>Former Nursery Site</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>Land between Guilsborough Road and A428</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>The Banks</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>The Vicarage, West End</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>Yelvertoft Road</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
<td>2 Yelvertoft Road</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Whilton</td>
<td>Brington Lane</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Whilton</td>
<td>Land at Whilton</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Woodford Halse</td>
<td>Pool Farm Field</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Woodford Halse</td>
<td>Phipps Road</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Woodford Halse</td>
<td>Land adjacent Upton Close</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Woodford Halse</td>
<td>Grants Hill Way</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Woodford Halse</td>
<td>Farndon Road</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yelvertoft</td>
<td>Land off Lilbourne Road</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Yelvertoft</td>
<td>Land off Wards Lane</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Yelvertoft</td>
<td>Crick Road</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Yelvertoft</td>
<td>Land off High Street/West of Skew Bridge</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HELAA - Rural Area Residential Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAA Ref</th>
<th>Settlement Name</th>
<th>Arthingworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Sunnybank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Does site have current planning permission? | No |
| Does site have relevant planning history? | No |

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**

Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**

No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**

Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**

Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**

No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**

None indicated via desktop assessment

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**

Yes

Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Arthingworth

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**

Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**

Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**

No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**

No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**

No

**Summary - residential**

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?**

Not Suitable
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Vacant

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? None declared

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Not specified

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest? N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Not stated

Promoter - how many years to complete? 2

Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint? It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.39

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 12

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Manor Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Currently occupied by agricultural buildings therefore could result in environmental improvements, but it has not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes for vehicular access but poor pedestrian access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is peripheral to the village and no direct pedestrian access to its limited services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary although it is currently occupied by agricultural buildings. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of a village, located outside the confines. It is a greenfield site however its development could potentially be regarded as an environmental improvement. The site is peripheral to the limited services and facilities in the village with poor pedestrian access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 August 2018
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**: Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?** Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?** Unknown

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?** No

**Promoter - how many years to complete?** 1

**Achievability summary**: There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?** Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?** Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**: It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)** 1.08

**Density applied (dph)** 30

**Development ratio applied (%)** 80

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio** 26
**Settlement Name**
Ashby St Ledgers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Ashby St Ledgers Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Currently occupied by agricultural buildings therefore could result in environmental improvements, but it has not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Ashby St Ledgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary although it is currently occupied by agricultural buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential**
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of a village, located outside the confines. It is a greenfield site however its development could potentially be regarded as an environmental improvement. The site is peripheral to the limited services and facilities in the village with poor pedestrian access.

**Is the site suitable?**
Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No/Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any other owners/agents of the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants that affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Badby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Bunkers Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village and location is detached from the village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes for vehicular access but poor pedestrian access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to garden centre however unknown if this would have impact on potential future occupiers</td>
<td>Adjacent to garden centre however unknown if this would have impact on potential future occupiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential**

The greenfield site is detached from the village, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Site has potential impacts on landscape, is remote from the village and therefore access to its services and facilities would be limited from sustainable modes.
Is the site suitable?  
Not Suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site?  
Yes

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?  
Yes

Does landowner/developer have control over access?  
Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?  
No

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?  
No

Occupied or vacant?  
Vacant

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?  
No

When does promoter expect site to be available?  
0-5 years

Availability summary  
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available?  
Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use?  
Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest?  
Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?  
No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?  
2016/2017

Promoter - how many years to complete?  
1

Promoter - how many developers involved?  
1

Achievability summary  
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable?  
Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?  
Not Developable

How to overcome constraint  
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)  
0.16

Density applied (dph)  
30

Development ratio applied (%)  
100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio  
5

Notes  
14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref.</strong></th>
<th>149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Badby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land south of B4037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>Pre Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village and location is detached from the village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, the southern section of site which could affect developable area of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site has poor pedestrian access to services and facilities in Barby due to its relatively remote location.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is detached from the village, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Site has potential impacts on landscape, is remote from the village and therefore access to its services and facilities would be limited from sustainable modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present. Based on the information available, the site is not considered to be available and its achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Settlement Name**: Barby

**Land Use Proposed**: Residential

**Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2006/1161 - Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>This greenfield site would be consistent with the neighbourhood plan by virtue of it being within the village confines therefore it could accord with policy R1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site is situated within the village confines and therefore accords with policy BO-H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - accessible to services and facilities in village in particular the school, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes - direct access onto Daventry Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is considered to be relatively enclosed by existing development and hedgerows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site is adjacent to mobile phone mast and water tower however suitable layout could mitigate the impact of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public right of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential**: The greenfield site is situated within the confines of the village as set out in the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. It is also considered to have sufficient access to the services and facilities within Barby.

**Is the site suitable?**: Suitable - Residential
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability Summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAA Ref</th>
<th>Settlement Name</th>
<th>Source of site</th>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barby</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Land at Brackendale Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Does site have current planning permission?

No

### Does site have relevant planning history?

No

### Does site support the delivery of the JCS?

Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

### Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?

Majority of the site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy BO-H1.

### Is the site consistent with National policy?

Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - accessible to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

### Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?

Access from Brakendale Drive would be reliant on demolition of existing dwelling - could also

### Is the site within a flood risk zone?

No

### Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?

None indicated via desktop assessment

### Accessible to existing services and facilities?

Demolition of dwelling on Brackendale drive could provide suitable pedestrian access to services and facilities

### Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?

Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Land falls away to south which could lead to greater intrusion into local landscape.

### Impact on environmental or other open space designations?

Not on any formal designations

### Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

### Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?

No

### Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?

The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

### Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?

Grade 3

### Summary - residential

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, outside the village confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. It is also contrary to the adopted Neighbourhood plan and could have potential access issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS can be overcome at present. It would also be important to establish if access could be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
Residential

Land at Longdown Lane

2016 Call for Sites

No

No

Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy BO-H1.

Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - accessible to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

Promoter has indicated that direct access would be onto Longdown Lane but this would

No

No

None indicated via desktop assessment

The site is considered to be in walking distance of the school providing that pedestrian access can be achieved to connect the site via the existing bridleway and the existing footpath.

Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.

Not on any formal designations

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

No

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?

No

Grade 3

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?

The greenfield site is situated remotely from the village in open countryside, outside the village confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. It is also contrary to the adopted Neighbourhood plan and could have potential access issues and it is considered to have an impact on the form and character of the village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present. It would also be important to establish if access could be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land east of Daventry Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2014/0796 Refused and Dismissed at Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy BO-H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Greenfield Site that is situated in close proximity to the school. However it is outside the village confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. It is also contrary to the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners/support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>No specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the landowner/developer need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process however a recent application for planning permission would suggest the site is currently available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, however a recent application for planning permission would suggest the site is currently available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Balding Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Y - DA/2014/0611 - Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Y - DA/2014/0611 - Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 August 2018  Page 19 of 472
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Settlement Name: Boughton

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land off Holly Lodge Drive

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? Outline application for 110 dwellings DA/2015/1185 withdrawn DA/2016/1144 Outline application for 75 dwellings refused 06/03/17. Appeal lodged.

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Boughton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None indicated via desktop assessment

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes Site is accessible to services and facilities of Northampton

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the South by the edge of Northampton.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential: The greenfield site is situated remotely from the village and adjacent to the urban area of Northampton. It is outside the existing confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
**Settlement Name**: Boughton  
**Land Use Proposed**: Residential  
**Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2005/0625 refused and decision taken to appeal but withdrawn APP/Y2810/A/06/2008958/WF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. The site is open land of particular significance to the form and character of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site and in conservation area. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Boughton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is in the centre of the Boughton Conservation Area and is in close proximity to the grade 2 listed church and any development would need to have regard to its significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated within the village confines. Development of the site is unlikely to result in environmental improvements. It is open land that is important to the form and character of the village, it is in close proximity to a grade 2 listed building and is part of the Boughton Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the site suitable? Not Suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site? Yes

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Yes

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Vacant

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Not stated

Promoter - how many years to complete? Not stated

Promoter - how many developers involved? Not stated

Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.83

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 20

Notes
**Settlement Name**: Boughton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Adams Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Does site have current planning permission? | No |
| Does site have relevant planning history? | DA/2015/0451 - Refused 30/09/2015 |

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**

Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

| Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? | No adopted Neighbourhood Plan |
| Is the site consistent with National policy? | Environmental-greenfield site, Social—Can access limited services and facilities in Boughton village. Economic—Some additional use of services and facilities in the village |

| Does the site have suitable access? | Yes |
| Is the site within a flood risk zone? | No |

| Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? | None indicated via desktop assessment |
| Accessible to existing services and facilities? | Yes |

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**

Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the West and South by existing residential development and Boughton Primary School

| Impact on environmental or other open space designations? | Not on any formal designations |

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

| Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? | No |

| Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? | No |
| Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? | Grade 3 |

**Summary - residential**

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

<p>| Is the site suitable? | Not Suitable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer has control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

14 August 2018
**Settlement Name**: Boughton

**Land Use Proposed**: Residential

**Site Location**: Land at North of Boughton Park

**Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Boughton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>Very Northern edge of flood zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the South by existing residential development. Site is a registered historic park and garden of Boughton Hall and is in the Boughton conservation area. There is potential to impact on the significance of these assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designs?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated outside the existing village confines and within the Boughton conservation area and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. The site is also a registered park and garden and careful consideration would be required to mitigate any impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation or vacant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Yes - Clawback clause but this is inter-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present. The site is also a registered park and garden and within the Boughton conservation area, therefore careful consideration would be required to mitigate any impacts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Boughton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land at South of Boughton Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Boughton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the East by existing residential development and to the South by Existing development in Northampton Borough. Site is situated within the Boughton Conservation Area and in close proximity to the grade 2 listed Boughton Hall. There is potential that development could impact on the significance of both assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines and within the Boughton Conservation Area. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary:**
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary:**
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAA Ref</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Boughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land south of Moulton Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site have relevant planning history?** | Small part of the site had outline application for 110 dwellings DA/2015/1185 withdrawn DA/2016/1144 Outline application for 75 dwellings refused 06/03/17. Appeal lodged. |

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. |

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | No adopted Neighbourhood Plan |

**Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Can access services and facilities in Northampton. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities on the edge of Northampton. |

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
| **Is the site within a flood risk zone?** | No |

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | None indicated via desktop assessment |
| **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Yes |

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the South and West by existing residential development in Northampton and some residential development to the North in Boughton village. Development of the site would result in coalescence of Boughton and Northampton. |

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Not on any formal designations |

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout. |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation. |

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 3 |

**Summary - residential** | The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and adjacent to the urban area of Northampton. |
Northampton. The site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

### Is the site suitable?
- Not Suitable

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?
- No

### Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
- N/A

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?
- Yes

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
- No

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
- No

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
- No

### When does promoter expect site to be available?
- 0-5 years

### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?
- Available

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?
- No

### If yes, how long and level of interest
- N/A

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF
- Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Consideration of the location within the Boughton conservation area would also be required.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
- 51.89

### Density applied (dph)
- 30

### Development ratio applied (%)
- 60

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
- 934

### Notes
- 2.4Ha subtracted from total site area to account for overlap with LAA site 034.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAA Ref</th>
<th>Settlement Name</th>
<th>Source of site</th>
<th>Pre Call for Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>Does site have current planning permission?</th>
<th>Does site have relevant planning history?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Land West of A5199</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DA/2015/0650 - Outline application for 41 dwellings withdrawn 30/11/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</th>
<th>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</th>
<th>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site consistent with National policy?</th>
<th>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Boughton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</th>
<th>None indicated via desktop assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</th>
<th>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the South by residential development and will be bounded to the East by the North of Whitehills SUE allocation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</th>
<th>Not on any formal designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</th>
<th>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</th>
<th>Yes. Public footpath crosses the site connecting the Northampton fringe with the open countryside.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary - residential</th>
<th>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. It is adjacent to the urban area of Northampton and will be adjacent to the North of Whitehills SUE. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not Currently Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present. Based on the information available, the site is not considered to be available and its achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of site</th>
<th>2012 SHLAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land north of Moulton Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Boughton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Northern boundary of the site is flood zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the South West by existing residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Availability summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS can be overcome at present. Based on the information available, the site is not considered to be available and its achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 38.92 |
| Density applied (dph)                                   | 30    |
| Development ratio applied (%)                           | 60    |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio          | 701   |

Notes

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Boughton

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Buckton Fields East

Source of site: 2012 SHLAA - Site has

Does site have current planning permission?
DA/2013/0994 - Approved - Reserved matters for 376 dwellings pursuant to outline application D/2008/0500

Does site have relevant planning history?
N/A

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site consistent with National policy?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site within a flood risk zone?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Accessible to existing services and facilities?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Neighbouring land use which could impact on future occupiers?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Summary - residential
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site suitable?
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Is the site achievable? Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 15.97
Density applied (dph) 30
Development ratio applied (%) 60
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Boughton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Grange Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social- Limited services and facilities in Boughton village would be difficult to access on foot. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to access the heart of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Unknown

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Unknown

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Unknown

Occupied or vacant? Unknown

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Unknown

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? Unknown

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Unknown

When does promoter expect site to be available? Unknown

Is the site available? Not Currently Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint? It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 15.28

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 275

Notes

Availability summary

Is the site available? Not Currently Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Achievability summary

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint? It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

Notes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref:</strong></th>
<th>254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name:</strong></td>
<td>Boughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed:</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location:</strong></td>
<td>West View Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site:</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2011/0666 (Southern field only) - Not yet determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site (Southern field only) is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N8 (Northampton North of Whitehills) North field - Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>North field - Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Can access services and facilities in North of Whitehills SUE, Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities IN North of Whitehills SUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>North field only - Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the South by the North of Whitehills SUE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>North field - The greenfield site is situated in the open countryside outside the village confines but adjacent to the North of Whitehills SUE. The site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Availability Summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

### Is the Site Available?

Not Currently Available

### Has Site Been Marketed for Proposed Use?

Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest

Unknown

### Promoter Consider Any Factors the Could Restrict Delivery?

Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Unknown

### Promoter - How Many Years to Complete?

Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Unknown

### Achievability Summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

### Is the Site Achievable?

Not Currently Achievable

### Is the Site Deliverable as Defined by NPPF?

Not Developable

### How to Overcome Constraint

The Southern field is allocated in the JCS. For the North field It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

### Total Site Area Available for Development from GIS (Ha)

58.8

### Density Applied (dpd)

30

### Development ratio applied (%)

60

### Estimated Number of Dwellings Using Devt Ratio

1058
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land adjacent Walton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has a TPO group which could affect access onto Walton Road however site also adjoins Dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the open countryside beyond its boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has a TPO group which could affect access onto Walton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes/No/Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability Summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present. Access arrangements would also need to be overcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land adjacent Ventnor Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the open countryside beyond its boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land adjacent Ventnor Lodge and Linacre House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated by desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the open countryside beyond its boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site available?</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site achievable?</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 0.27 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 100 |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 8 |

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Braunston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land between Linacre House and Honeyhurst Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does site have current planning permission?**
- No

**Does site have relevant planning history?**
- No

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**
- Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**
- The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy A.

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**
- Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**
- Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**
- No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**
- None indicated by desktop assessment

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**
- Yes

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**
- Site is situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the open countryside beyond its boundary

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**
- Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**
- None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**
- No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**
- No

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**
- Grade 3

**Summary - residential**
- The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?**
- Not Suitable
Are there other owners/agents of the site? No
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No
Occupied or vacant? Vacant
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No
Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? N/A
Does landowner/developer have control over access? Unknown
Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No
Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No
When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available
Has site been marketed for proposed use? Not stated
If yes, how long and level of interest Not stated
Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Not stated
Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Not stated
Promoter - how many years to complete? Not stated
Promoter - how many developers involved? Not stated

Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable
Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable
How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.09
Density applied (dph) 30
Development ratio applied (%) 100
Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 3

Notes
Residential

Land off Mill Close

2016 Call for Sites

No

No

Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy A.

Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

Yes

No

None indicated via desktop assessment

Yes

Not on any formal designations

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

No

Grade 3

Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Land falls away to North which could result in harm to the local landscape. Site is considered to form part of the setting to the All Saints Church (Grade II) (which includes a footpath running through the site) and is adjacent to the Braunston Conservation Area. Development should have regard to the significance and setting of these assets.

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. Due to the topography, development of the site could result in harm to the local landscape. The site would also impact on the setting of the listed building.
However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does any other owner support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS or the impact on the setting of the listed building can be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Settlement Name**: Braunston

**Site Location**: Old Station Yard

**Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

**Land Use Proposed**: Mixed

---

**Does site have current planning permission?**: No

**Does site have relevant planning history?**: DA/2003/0447 & APP/Y2810/A/03/1119472 - Refused

---

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**: Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

---

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**: The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy A.

---

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**: Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

---

**Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?**: Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**: No

---

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**: None indicated via desktop assessment

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**: Yes

---

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**: Site consists of woodland and therefore the removal would have a significant impact on the character of the landscape. Site is also adjacent to the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area which could affect design of the site

---

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**: Site is a designated Local Wildlife site

---

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**: No

---

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**: The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

---

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**: Grade 3

---

**Summary - residential**: The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. Due to the topography, development of the site could result in harm to the local landscape. The site is currently woodland and is a local wildlife site. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.
### Is the site suitable?

- **Not Suitable**

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?

- **No**

### Are any other owners support the proposal for the site?

- **N/A**

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?

- **Yes**

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

- **No**

### Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

- **No**

### Occupied or vacant?

- **Vacant**

### Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

- **N/A**

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

- **No**

### Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop site?

- **No**

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

- **No**

### When does promoter expect site to be available?

- **0-5 years**

### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?

- **Available**

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?

- **Unknown**

### If yes, how long and level of interest?

- **Unknown**

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

- **Unknown**

### Promoter estimated first year of delivery?

- **2017/2018**

### Promoter - how many years to complete?

- **2**

### Promoter - how many developers involved?

- **1**

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?

- **Achievable**

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

- **Not Developable**

### How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present, in particular the designation as a Local Wildlife site.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

- **2.48**

### Density applied (dph)

- **30**

### Development ratio applied (%) applied

- **60**

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

- **45**

### Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Walton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Land falls away to South which could result in harm to local landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has TPO group at its northern boundary although this would not preclude access to Walton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. Due to the topography, development of the site could result in harm to the local landscape. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Occupied

Are any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? No

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? 

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

 Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

 Is the site available? Available

 Is the site achievable? Achievable

 Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

 How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 2.31

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 42

Notes 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Braunston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Ashby Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Call for Sites</td>
<td>Source of site Pre Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Land falls away to North which could lead to greater harm to local landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has TPO group at its south western boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside outside the village confines. Due to the topography, development of the site could result in harm to the local landscape. However the site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not Currently Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Braunston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Maple Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>Planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2015/0700 - Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Occupied or vacant?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Availability summary

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Achievability summary

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site achievable?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF: Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.36

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes
Settlement Name: Brixworth

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Home Farm

Does site have current planning permission?: No

Does site have relevant planning history?: No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?:
Site is partially greenfield and partially brownfield and both within and outside the village confines (as defined by the Neighbourhood Plan). Some potential for environmental improvement based on current uses on part of the site. Not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: Site is partly within the confines and partly in the open countryside, northern part within SLA and an area of high landscape sensitivity as defined in the neighbourhood plan. Proposed housing use outside the confines would be contrary to Policy 2 because

Is the site consistent with National policy?: Environmental - Greenfield site and Brownfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

Is the site suitable/accessible? Can it be provided?: Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone?: No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: Previous use may require decontamination.

Accessible to existing services and facilities?: Site is accessible to services and facilities in Brixworth and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Northampton and Market Harborough.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?: Potential impact on setting of All Saints Church which is Grade I listed building. Home Farmhouse is Grade II listed and contained within the site area, therefore development would have to have regard to the significance and setting of both listed buildings. Site is also partly within the Brixworth Conservation Area and development would need to consider how it could enhance it and its setting.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?: Grade 3

Summary - residential: Part of the site is within the village confines and its development could represent an environmental improvement to part of the site, however, presence of Home Farmhouse
within the site, close proximity to two listed buildings and partial coverage by the conservation area are key constraints that require further consideration. The Northern part of the site that is outside the village confines does not meet the requirements of the JCS or Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the: proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>For the Northern part of the site, it is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJC could be overcome at present. Further consideration of the impact on the significance and setting of both listed buildings (Home Farmhouse and the Church) as well as the conservation area is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)                  | 1.7      |
| Density applied (dph)                                                    | 30       |
| Development ratio applied (%)                                            | 80       |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio                           | 41       |

**Notes**

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Brixworth

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land at Northampton Road

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Yes

Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with the adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No

The site would not accord with Policy 1 as it is outside the village confines. It would not accord with policy 2 as it would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an

Is the site consistent with National policy? Yes

Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None indicated by desktop assessment

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations.

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 2

Summary - residential

The site is greenfield, located outside the village confines in the open countryside and does not meet the requirements of the JCS or Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
### Availability Summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAA Ref</strong></td>
<td>045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Victors Barns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site has DA/2013/0510 outline approved for continuing care retirement community (60 bed nursing home) &amp; up to 7 close care cottages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site would not accord with Policy 1 as it is outside the village confines. It would not accord with policy 2 as it would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated by desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities in Brixworth and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Northampton and Market Harborough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations, however, site is allocated as Local Green Space in Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site is greenfield, located outside the village confines in the open countryside. Part of the site is designated as Local Green Space and it does not meet the requirements of the JCS or Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

### Is the site suitable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land north of Holcot Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site would not accord with Policy 1 as it is outside the village confines. It would not accord with policy 2 as it would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - Brixworth contains range of services and facilities, however, site is not well related to these or existing residential development, being separated from Brixworth by a recycling centre and A508. Economic - some additional use of services and facilities but not well related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is not well related to existing services and facilities although there is a footpath on the north side of Scaldwell Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Recycling centre to the west and employment area to the north of Scaldwell Road (Mercedes AMG) could have an impact on prospective occupiers, but could be mitigated through the layout/design of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greenfield site is located outside the village confines in the open countryside and does not meet the requirements of the JCS or the Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Not stated, although Redrow has an option to purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Duplicate site - capacity counted in LAA site 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAA Ref</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Use Proposed**: Residential

**Site Location**: Old Station Yard

**Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

**Does site have current planning permission?**
- DA/2013/0066 - Approved for mixed use scheme, B1 units with 9 dwellings

**Does site have relevant planning history?**
- N/A

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**
- Brownfield site located in an isolated location outside the village confines. Its development may result in environmental improvements however it has not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**
- The site would not accord with Policy 2. It is outside the defined confines, would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an isolated dwelling that accords with parag

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**
- Environmental - Brownfield site, Social - Brixworth contains a range of services and facilities, however, site is not well related to these or existing residential development. Economic - some additional use of services and facilities but not well related.

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**
- Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**
- No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**
- None indicated via desktop assessment

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**
- Site is not well related to existing services and facilities and footpath upgrade would be required to access services and facilities in Brixworth.

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**
- Site situated in open countryside, although brownfield nature of site and existing buildings mean that its character is different to the countryside beyond its boundary.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**
- Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**
- None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**
- Sewage farm to the south west of the site could have an impact on prospective occupiers, but could be mitigated through layout/design of the site.

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**
- The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**
- Grade 3
The site is brownfield, located outside the village confines in the open countryside and does not meet the requirements of the JCS or Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

### Is the site suitable?

Not Suitable

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?

No

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

No

### Occupied or vacant?

Vacant

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

None declared

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

No

### When does promoter expect site to be available?

0-5 years

### Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?

Available

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?

No

### If yes, how long and level of interest?

N/A

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

No

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

2016/2017

### Promoter - how many years to complete?

2

### Promoter - how many developers involved?

Not stated

### There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?

Achievable

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Not Deliverable

### Site has an extant permission for mixed B1 and residential (9 units), however, it is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present for the development of the whole site for residential.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

2.77

### Density applied (dph)

30

### Development ratio applied (%)

60

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

50

Notes

| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. |
| **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | The site would not accord with Policy 1 as it is outside the village confines. It would not accord with policy 2 as it would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an |
| **Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village |
| **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
| **Is the site within a flood risk zone?** | No |
| **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | No |
| **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Site is accessible to services and facilities in Brixworth and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Northampton and Market Harborough. |
| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. |
| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Not on any formal designations |
| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout. |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |
| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | No |
| **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 2 |

**Summary - residential**
The site is greenfield, located outside the village confines in the open countryside and does not meet the requirements of the JCS or Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

**Is the site suitable?**
Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint:</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>22.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential

Land off Station Road

2016 Call for Sites

No

No

Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

The site would not accord with Policy 1 as it is outside the village confines. It would not accord with policy 2 as it would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an

Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

Yes

No

Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Eastern boundary adjacent to conservation area.

Not on any formal designations

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Grade 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land west of Scaldwell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site situated outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site would not accord with Policy 1 as it is outside the village confines. It would not accord with policy 2 as it would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - Brixworth contains a range of services and facilities, however, site is not well related to these or existing residential development. Separated by an employment area and would require crossing a major road. Economic - some additional use of services and facilities but not well related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Employment area to the north of Scaldwell Road (Mercedes AMG) could have an impact on prospective occupiers, but could be mitigated through the layout/design of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any public right of way and would enjoyment be affected?

The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Summary - residential

The site is greenfield, located outside the village confines in the open countryside and not well related to existing residential development. It does not meet the requirements of the JCS or the Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

Is the site suitable?

Not Suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site?

No

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

N/A

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

No

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

No

Occupied or vacant?

Vacant

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

No

When does promoter expect site to be available?

0-5 years

Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available?

Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

No

If yes, how long and level of interest

N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

2017/2018

Promoter - how many years to complete?

8

Promoter - how many developers involved?

1 to 2

Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable?

Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Not Developable

How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 1.18

Density applied (dph) 30

Development % ratio applied (%) 60
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land between Holcot Road and Scaldwell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site would not accord with Policy 1 as it is outside the village confines. It would not accord with policy 2 as it would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an amenity park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - Brixworth contains range of services and facilities, however, physically separate from Brixworth to east of A508. Economic - some additional use of services and facilities but not well related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes, although occupants would have to go through an employment area and cross the A508 to reach village centre. There is an existing footpath on the north side of Scaldwell Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Recyling centre to the west to the north could have an impact on prospective occupiers, but could be mitigated through the layout/design of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?                     | Grade 3
The site is greenfield, located outside the village confines in the open countryside. It is not well connected to the centre of the village by virtue of the A508 and does not meet the requirements of the JCS or Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

**Summary - residential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| How to overcome constraint                    | It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAA Ref</th>
<th>171</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land east of Northampton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>Planning permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Y - DA/2014/0360 - Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Site has Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Site has Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Site has Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF**

- **Deliverable**

**How to overcome constraint**

- **Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**: 7.28
- **Density applied (dph)**: 30
- **Development ratio applied (%)**: 60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

**Notes**

14 August 2018  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Victors Barns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>Planning permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Yes - DA/2014/0117 - Approved for conversion of barns (previously B1 offices) to 7 residential units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has site been marketed for proposed use? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many years to complete? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many developers involved? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Achievability summary Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site achievable? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.55

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Brixworth

Site Location: Frog Hall

Source of site: 2012 SHLAA

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? The site would not accord with Policy 1 as it is outside the village confines. It would not accord with policy 2 as it would not contribute to the rural economy, is not for the re-use or extension of an existing building, for sport or recreation or for an

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None indicated via desktop assessment

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Site is accessible to services and facilities in Brixworth and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Northampton and Market Harborough.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site situated in open countryside, area beyond existing buildings shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. South west corner of site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Site is bounded by the conservation area along its northern and eastern boundaries. Development would need to consider how it would not harm it and its setting.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Tree cover over northern part of the site which are protected by a TPO.

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The greenfield site is located outside the village confines in the open countryside and does not meet the requirements of the JCS or the Brixworth Neighbourhood Plan at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? Not currently available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF Not Developable

How to overcome constraint It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 1.12

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 27

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Woodford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

- **Is the site available?** Available
- **Has site been marketed for proposed use?** No
- **If yes, how long and level of interest** N/A
- **Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?** No
- **Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?** 2017/18
- **Promoter - how many years to complete?** 2
- **Promoter - how many developers involved?** 1

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

- **Is the site achievable?** Achievable
- **Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?** Not Developable
- **How to overcome constraint** It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

- **Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)** 3.15
- **Density applied (dph)** 30
- **Development ratio applied (%)** 60
- **Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio** 57

Notes: 14 August 2018
Site Location: Land south of Woodford Road

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements however the site may be able to support retention of local services through provision of a medical centre.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None indicated via desktop assessment

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Any development would need to have regard to the grade II listed building south of the site.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupants? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 2 and 3

Summary - residential The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. The site may be able to provide a medical centre for the village.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site. The housing privided on the site would prpvide the funding for a new medical centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS could be overcome at present. However the provision of a medical centre in this location may provide justification for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</th>
<th>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Boddington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via a desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated on the edge of village and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes/No/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Byfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Marley Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Does site have current planning permission?** No
- **Does site have relevant planning history?** No
- **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.
- **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** No adopted Neighbourhood Plan
- **Is the site consistent with National policy?** Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature
- **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** Yes
- **Is the site within a flood risk zone?** No
- **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** None indicated via a desktop assessment
- **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield
- **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** Site situated on the edge of the village, part of the site developed, but largely a greenfield site. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.
- **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** Not on formal designations
- **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout
- **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** No
- **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** No
- **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** Grade 3

**Summary - residential**
The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?** Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Boddington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated on the edge of the village, greenfield sites that shares a visual affinity with the open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)                 | 1.95   |
| Density applied (dph)                                                  | 30     |
| Development ratio applied (%)                                          | 80     |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio                         | 0      |
| Notes                                                                   | Duplicate site - Capacity included in LAA site 196 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Manor Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village and site not well related to them, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield</td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated on the edge of the village, greenfield sites that shares a visual affinity with the open countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Unknown

Occupied or vacant? Unknown

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Unknown

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Unknown

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site? Unknown

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Unknown

When does promoter expect site to be available? Unknown

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? Not currently available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF Not Developable

How to overcome constraint It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 6.92

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 125

Notes 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Boddington Road South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated on the edge of the village, greenfield sites that shares a visual affinity with the open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not adequately be mitigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Notes                                                                   | 14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Byfield

Site Location: Church Street

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Is the site consistent with Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature

Site situated within the village, providing a natural green break in the built up area that contributes to the form and character of the village. There may be some impact on neighbouring grade II listed buildings adjacent to the site.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? None indicated via desktop assessment

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not adequately be mitigated

Impact on public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Byfield

Summary - residential

The site is a greenfield backland situated outside the village confines providing a natural break to the built up area that contributes to the form and character of the village. The site does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Unknown

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Unknown

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Unknown

Occupied or vacant? Unknown

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Unknown

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? Unknown

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Unknown

When does promoter expect site to be available? Unknown

Availability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? Not currently available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Achievability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.43

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 13

Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Westhorpe House Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None Indicated via desktop study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated on the edge of village and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not adequately be mitigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter estimated first year of delivery</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>The Twislte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated on the edge of village and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not adequately be mitigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Availability summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available?

Not currently available

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest?

Unknown

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?

Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Unknown

Achievability summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable?

Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Not Developable

How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

6.51

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

117

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Chapel Brampton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Northampton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2014/0795 - Refused 12/10/2016 and dismissed at appeal 18/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North. The site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Yes

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

The site is promoted by Mulberry Property Development and is controlled under option.

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2018/2019

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Not stated

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

2.59

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

47

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Charwelton Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Charwelton South Western boundary of the site is in flood zone 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is in the special landscape area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Site is adjacent to the grade 2 listed Charwelton Hall therefore development would have to have regard to the significance and setting of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rights of way and enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - Residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

**Is the site available?**

Not Currently Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Unknown

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

Unknown

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Unknown

**Achievability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

**Is the site achievable?**

Not Currently Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 4.59 |
| Density applied (dph)                                  | 30   |
| Development ratio applied (%)                          | 60   |

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

83

**Notes**

1.52Ha subtracted from total site area to account for overlap with LAA site 024.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Clay Coton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Brownfield site situated in an isolated location outside of the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-brownfield site. Social-Difficult to access limited services and facilities in Clay Coton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The brownfield site is situated in an isolated location from the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Yes

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

About 2 years with no interest in commercial use.

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

1

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

1

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Deliverable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

2.75

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

50

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Church Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Does site have current planning permission? | No |
| Does site have relevant planning history? | No |

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**

Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**

No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**

Environmental-greenfield site. Social - Access limited services and facilities in Clipston village. Economic - Some additional use of services and facilities in the village

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**

Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**

No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**

None indicated via desktop assessment.

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**

Yes

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**

Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is adjacent to the Clipston Medieval settlement scheduled ancient monument therefore development would have to have regard to the significance and setting of this.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**

Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**

No

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**

Grade 3

**Summary - residential**

The greenfield site is situated in an isolated location from the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Development would have to have regard to the scheduled ancient monument adjacent to the site.

**Is the site suitable?**

Not Suitable
### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**Promoter estimated first year of delivery?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Not stated

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</th>
<th>0.35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

11

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAA Ref: 013</th>
<th>Settlement Name: Cold Ashby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed: Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location: Cedars Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does site have current planning permission?** No

**Does site have relevant planning history?** DA/2016/1100 - Construction of nine dwellings and conversion of barn to single dwelling. Application withdrawn

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Currently occupied by agricultural buildings therefore could result in environmental improvements, but it has not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

**Is the site consistent with National policy?** Environmental-brownfield site. Social-Access limited services and facilities in Cold Ashby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?** No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** None indicated via desktop assessment.

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?** Footpath required to access the heart of the village.

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary although it is currently occupied by agricultural buildings. Site is adjacent to a Grade 2 listed building and its development would have to have regard to its significance and setting.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** Not on any formal designations.

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** No

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** Grade 3

**Summary - residential**

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of a village, located outside the confines. It is a greenfield site however its development could potentially be regarded as an environmental improvement. The site is peripheral to the limited services and facilities in the village with poor pedestrian access. Development would have to have regard to the listed building adjacent to the site.
### Is the site suitable?

- **Not Suitable**

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?

- **No**

### Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

- **N/A**

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?

- **Yes**

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

- **No**

### Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

- **No**

### Occupied or vacant?

- **Partly occupied**

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

- **No**

### When does promoter expect site to be available?

- **0-5 years**

### Availability summary

- Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?

- **Available**

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?

- **No**

### If yes, how long and level of interest

- **N/A**

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

- **No**

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

- **2016/17**

### Promoter - how many years to complete?

- **1**

### Promoter - how many developers involved?

- **1**

### Achievability summary

- There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?

- **Achievable**

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF

- **Not Developable**

### How to overcome constraint

- It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS can be overcome at present.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

- **0.47**

### Density applied (dph)

- **30**

### Development ratio applied (%)

- **100**

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

- 14

### Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Cold Ashby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Church Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2015/0118 Construction of 4 detached dwellings. Refused 14/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Access to limited services and facilities in Cold Ashby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to access the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designs?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside and outside the confines therefore does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Yes

Are there other owners support the proposal for the site? Yes

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Unknown

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? No

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site? No

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Occupied or vacant? Vacant

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest? N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Not stated

Promoter - how many years to complete? 1

Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.28

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Cold Ashby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Manor Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>DA/2015/0193 - Outline application for 5 dwellings. Approved for southern section of the site only-13/07/2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2014/0382 Outline application for construction of 10 dwellings. Refused 09/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Access limited services and facilities in Cold Ashby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside and outside the confines therefore does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. However the Southern part of the site does have planning permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?
Yes

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
Yes

Does landowner/developer have control over access?
Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
No

Occupied or vacant?
Partly occupied

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
No

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
Yes

When does promoter expect site to be available?
0-5 years

Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available?
Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use?
No

If yes, how long and level of interest

Land is subject to an Option Agreement therefore developer interest from Francis Jackson Homes Ltd. has been established and we have secured planning permission for 5 no. dwellings on the southern part of the site at the present time.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
Yes - Evidence submitted states that at the current time, the scale of permitted development (5 no. dwellings only) has significant viability constraints due to the requirement for CIL and contributions to affordable housing (40%) - together, on such a mo

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
2017/2018

Promoter - how many years to complete?
2

Promoter - how many developers involved?
1

Achievability summary
There are financial implications that could restrict potential delivery on site in the short term however developer anticipates the first delivery could be in 2017

Is the site achievable?
Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS could be overcome at present for the portion of the site that does not have planning permission.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
0.49

Density applied (dph)
30

Development ratio applied (%)
100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
15

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Creaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Court House Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2015/1110 Outline application for 10 dwellings - Refused 27/01/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Access limited services and facilities in Creaton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and West. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside and outside the confines therefore does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
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| **LAA Ref.** | 074 |
| **Settlement Name** | Creaton |

- **Land Use Proposed**: Residential
- **Site Location**: Teeton Lane
- **Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

- **Does site have current planning permission?**: No
- **Does site have relevant planning history?**: No
- **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**: Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

- **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**: No adopted Neighbourhood Plan
- **Is the site consistent with National policy?**: Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Access limited services and facilities in Creaton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village

- **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**: Yes
- **Is the site within a floodrisk zone?**: No
- **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**: None indicated via desktop assessment.
- **Accessible to existing services and facilities?**: Footpath required to access the heart of the village.

- **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**: Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North East. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.
- **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**: Not on any formal designations.

- **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.
- **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**: No
- **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**: No
- **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**: Grade 3

- **Summary - residential**: The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside and outside the confines therefore does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.
- **Is the site suitable?**: Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners not being considered in the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>An option on the site was advertised for sale in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)                 | 0.72   |
| Density applied (dph)                                                  | 30     |
| Development ratio applied (%)                                          | 80     |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio                          | 17     |

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Welford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Access limited services and facilities in Creaton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside and outside the confines therefore does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Availability Summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Crick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Marsh Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2013/0873 Conversion of barns to three residential units. Refused and dismissed at appeal 27/11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via destop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Daventry town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in a gap between existing residential development. Part of the site is used as an informally maintained garden and the Eastern part shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary Located adjacent to a listed building, development would need to have regard to the setting and significance of this building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village, outside the confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. There are services and facilities in the village which this site would provide access to. The site is flanked by existing residential development, however, one of these is a listed building and an assessment of the impact of development on its significance and setting would be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the site suitable? Not Suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site? No

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Vacant

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? 2017/18

Promoter - how many years to complete? 2

Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.35

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 11

Notes
**Settlement Name**: Crick

**Land Use Proposed**: Residential

**Site Location**: Land at Watford Road

**Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

**Does site have current planning permission?**: No

**Does site have relevant planning history?**: DA/2015/0233 Outline application for up to 120 dwellings. Refused 24/09/2015.

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**: Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**: Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**
- Environmental - greenfield site.
- Social - Can access services and facilities in Crick village.
- Economic - Some additional use of services and facilities.

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**: Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**: No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**: No

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**
- Site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Daventry town.

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**: Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**: Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**: No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**: No

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**: Grade 3

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**: Not on any formal designations

**Summary - residential**: The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?**: Not Suitable
Are there other owners/agents of the site? No

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Vacant

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

Are any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? None declared

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Available summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

- If yes, how long and level of interest N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? 2017/2018

Promoter - how many years to complete? 4

Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 4.72

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 85

Notes
Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land at Deer Park

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? DA/2015/0265 - refusal. DA/2015/0225 - refusal. Both refused on appeal 01/09/2016

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Brownfield site outside the confines of the village in open countryside. Appeal inspector considered it unlikely that site would represent an environmental improvement and could cause harm. It has not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental - brownfield site located in open countryside, would impact on rural character. Social - site is not well related to existing residential development or services and facilities in Crick. Economic - some additional use of services and facilities but not well related and distant from the village.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? Unknown however previous use could require decontamination.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Footpath improvements required to access services and facilities in Crick, occupiers would be reliant on a car.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site situated in open countryside, although brownfield nature of site and existing buildings mean that its character is different to the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The site is situated in the open countryside, outside the village confines and remote from facilities and services. Although brownfield it does not meet the requirements of the JCS.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability Summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability Summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Crick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Manor Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located within the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - greenfield site. Social - Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic - Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Daventry town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Northern boundary formed by a line of trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders which would need to be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated within the village confines of Crick, however, it does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present as its development would not result in environmental improvements. The site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership needs acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Partly occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Deliverable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How to overcome constraint
Site is located within village confines, however it is greenfield and would need to demonstrate either an environmental improvement or that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Crick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Lauds Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - greenfield site. Social - Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via destop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Daventry town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Yes - to enable access to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

The site suggestion form indicates that land in other ownership would be required to enable access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not Currently Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence provided to suggest that the site is viable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Access arrangements must also be overcome in order for the site to be considered available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Crick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Main Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - greenfield site. Social - Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic - Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment uses are situated to the north of the site. Impact on potential occupiers would need to be mitigated against through layout/design.</td>
<td>Employment uses are situated to the north of the site. Impact on potential occupiers would need to be mitigated against through layout/design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - Residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? No

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Occupied

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? None declared

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest? N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? 2017/2018

Promoter - how many years to complete? 1-2 years

Promoter - how many developers involved? Not stated

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint: It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 4.44
 Density applied (dph) 30
 Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 80

Notes
### Crick

**Settlement Name**: Crick

**Land Use Proposed**: Mixed

**Site Location**: Land to the south west of Crick (A)

**Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

**Does site have current planning permission?**: No

**Does site have relevant planning history?**: No

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**: Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. Site is detached from the existing employment area.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**: Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**: Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities and potential job creation for residents of Crick and the District.

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**: Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**: No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**: None declared via desktop assessment.

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**: Footpath improvements required to access services and facilities in Crick and public transport to Daventry

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**: Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North East.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**: Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**: The site includes one existing dwelling however amenity impacts could be mitigated against through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**: No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**: The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**: Grade 3

**Summary - residential**: The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present with regard to both the residential and employment elements of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Crick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land to the south west of Crick (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. Site is detached from the existing employment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities and potential job creation for residents of Crick and the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath improvements required to access services and facilities in Crick and public transport to Daventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbouring land uses Site is adjacent to the M1 however this could be mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary - residential

The greenfield site is situated remotely from the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?** Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Not stated

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint?**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS could be overcome at present with regard to both the residential and employment elements of this site.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

26.54

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

478

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Crick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land to the south west of Crick (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. Site is detached from the existing employment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities and potential job creation for residents of Crick and the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath improvements required to access services and facilities in Crick and public transport to Daventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part of the site is adjacent to the M1 however this could be mitigated through design/layout.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated remotely from the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present with regard to both the residential and employment elements of this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>42.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Crick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off West Haddon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2015/0347 Outline for 65 dwellings, 500sqm of retail and 500sqm Medical Centre. Refused 17/12/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic- Some additional use of services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Daventry town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Eastern boundary formed by Grand Union Canal Conservation Area. Development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting. Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Majority of site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. development could impact all of these assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greenfield site is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Proximity to Grand Union Canal Conservation Area would need further assessment.

### Is the site suitable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Is the site available?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?

Achievable

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF

Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint

- It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

| 4.22 |

### Density applied (dph)

| 30 |

### Development ratio applied (%)

| 60 |

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

<p>| 76 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of site</th>
<th>2016 Call for Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Elms Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA/2015/0354 - Refused; DA/2016/0199 refused; allowed on appeal for 4 dwellings 22.12.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Does landlord/developer have control over access?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Availability summary

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Is the site available?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Achievability summary

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Is the site achievable?

Site has planning permission for 4 dwellings.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

1.21

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%)

80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

4

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land south of Main Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Outline DA/2012/0242. Full DA/2014/0240 - Approved 14/05/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any other owners/support the proposal for the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

0.37

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%)

100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

14 August 2018

Page 153 of 472
Settlement Name: Crick

- **Land Use Proposed**: Residential

- **Site Location**: Main Road

- **Does site have current planning permission?**

- **Does site have relevant planning history?**
  - N/A

- **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Is the site consistent with National policy?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Summary - residential**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

- **Is the site suitable?**
  - Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Site Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Crick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Watford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - greenfield site. Social - Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic - Some additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site is accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Daventry town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village, outside the confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability Summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
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**Land Use Proposed**: Residential

**Site Location**: Marsons Drive

**Source of site**: 2012 SHLAA

**Does site have current planning permission?**

- No

**Does site have relevant planning history?**

- No

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**

- Greenfield site located on the edge of the village outside the confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**

- Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**

- Environmental—greenfield site. Social—Can access services and facilities in Crick village. Economic—Some additional use of services and facilities in the village.

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**

- Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**

- No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**

- None indicated via desktop assessment

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**

- Site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Daventry town.

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**

- Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**

- Site is entirely covered by a TPO Area designation. Regard would be needed to the impact and mitigation requirements.

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**

- None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**

- No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**

- The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**

- Grade 3

**Summary - residential**

The greenfield site is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. It is also entirely covered by a TPO Area designation and is therefore not considered to be suitable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. It is not considered that the constraint regarding the TPO Area designation can be overcome. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Woolcombe Adams Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2017 Emerging draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Neighbourhood plan is emerging but not currently adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Crick village but not well related to the village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities in Crick and bus services provide sustainable transport links to Daventry town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The Eastern boundary of the site adjoins the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area. Development would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of this heritage asset. Part of the site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Local Wildlife Site site outside the site but forms part of eastern boundary, this would require further assessment and mitigation of impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary - residential

The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Further consideration of the conservation area and Local Wildlife site would be required to ensure appropriate mitigation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants that affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAA Ref</strong></td>
<td>037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Farndon Fields Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site situated within open countryside, not relating to any settlement. Not considered that its development could represent an environmental improvement nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - site is greenfield in open countryside. Social - the site is not adjacent to an existing settlement, likely to make use of facilities and services located within larger settlement of Market Harborough than East Farndon. Economic - limited use of facilities and services in nearby settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Eastern edge of the site is located within flood zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via destop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not accessible to limited services and facilities within East Farndon but is accessible to a wider variety in Market Harborough, which site is adjacent to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site located within open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site lies adjacent to the SLA boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Are the site suitable? Not suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site? Yes

Are there any restrictive ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Vacant

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? None declared

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

 availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest? N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Not stated

Promoter - how many years to complete? Not stated

Promoter - how many developers involved? Not stated

Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint

Due to the site being located in open countryside near a settlement with limited services and facilities it is not considered that the constraint regarding suitability can be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 18.7

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 337

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>092</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Farndon Fields Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site situated within open countryside, not relating to any settlement. Not considered that its development could represent an environmental improvement nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - site is greenfield in open countryside. Social - the site is not adjacent to an existing settlement, likely to make use of facilities and services located within larger settlement of Market Harborough than East Farndon. Economic - limited use of facilities and services in nearby settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is not accessible to limited services and facilities within East Farndon but is accessible to a wider variety in Market Harborough, which site is adjacent to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site located within open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site lies adjacent to the SLA boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?**
- Not suitable

**Are there other owners/agents of the site?**
- Yes

**Does any other owner support the proposal for the site?**
- Yes

**Does landlord/developer have control over access?**
- Yes

**Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?**
- No

**Any other ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?**
- No

**Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?**
- No

**Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop site?**
- Yes

**Occupied or vacant?**
- Occupied

**Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?**
- Unknown

**When does promoter expect site to be available?**
- 0-5 years

**Availability summary**
- Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**
- Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**
- Unknown

**If yes, how long and level of interest**
- Unknown

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**
- Unknown

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**
- 2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**
- N/A

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**
- Not stated

**Achievability summary**
- There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**
- Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**
- Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**
- Due to the site being located in open countryside near a settlement with limited services and facilities it is not considered that the constraint regarding suitability can be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**
- 20.97

**Density applied (dph)**
- 30

**Development ratio applied (%)**
- 60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**
- 377

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>East Farndon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Farndon Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site have relevant planning history?** | No |

| **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. |
| **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | No adopted Neighbourhood Plan |

| **Isn't National policy?** | Environmental - site is greenfield in open countryside. Social - the site is adjacent to an existing settlement, likely to make use of limited facilities and services located within East Farndon. Economic - limited use of facilities and services in nearby settlements. |
| **Is site suitable for access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
| **Is the site within a flood risk zone?** | No |

| **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | None indicated via desktop assessment |
| **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within East Farndon. |

| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. |
| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Not on any formal designations |

| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |

| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation. |
| **Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 3 |

<p>| <strong>Summary - residential</strong> | The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. |
| <strong>Is the site suitable?</strong> | Not Suitable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site available?</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site achievable?</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Hopton Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines and not relating to any settlement within Daventry District. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - site is greenfield in open countryside. Social - the site is not adjacent to an existing settlement in Daventry District, more likely to make use of facilities and services located within larger settlement of Market Harborough than East Farndon. Economic - limited use of facilities and services in nearby settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is not accessible to limited services and facilities within East Farndon but is accessible to a wider variety in Market Harborough, which site is adjacent to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Summary - residential                                                 | The site is situated in open countryside, in designated SLA. It does not meet the
requirements of the JCS at present. Limited services and facilities in the village however site would provide access to services and facilities in Market Harborough outside of the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>Due to the site being located in open countryside near a settlement with limited services and facilities it is not considered that the constraint regarding suitability can be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Nursery Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines and not relating to any settlement within Daventry District. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - site is greenfield in open countryside. Social - the site is not adjacent to an existing settlement in Daventry District, more likely to make use of facilities and services located within larger settlement of Market Harborough than East Farndon. Economic - limited use of facilities and services in nearby settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within East Farndon but is accessible to a wider variety in Market Harborough, which site is adjacent to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and is adjacent to the SLA boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>Due to the site being located in open countryside near a settlement with limited services and facilities it is not considered that the constraint regarding suitability can be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Notes                                                                  | 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Hopton Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines and not relating to any settlement within Daventry District. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - site is greenfield in open countryside. Social - the site is not adjacent to an existing settlement in Daventry District, more likely to make use of facilities and services located within larger settlement of Market Harborough than East Farndon. Economic - limited use of facilities and services in nearby settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is not accessible to limited services and facilities within East Farndon but is accessible to a wider variety in Market Harborough, which site is adjacent to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Summary - residential                                                  | The site is situated in open countryside, in designated SLA. It does not meet the
requirements of the JCS at present. Limited services and facilities in the village however site would provide access to services and facilities in Market Harborough outside of the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>East Farndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>North of Back Lane, East Farndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within East Farndon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated opposite listed building and development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting. The site is located within open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any other ownership needs acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? No

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Vacant

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? None declared

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Not stated

Promoter - how many years to complete? Not stated

Promoter - how many developers involved? Not stated

Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Developable

How to overcome constraint
The site is located within the village confines and may be suitable in future subject to development demonstrating that it can meet criteria A-G and i)-v) of policy R1 of the JCS and would not harm the significance or setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.31

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 9

Notes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Moyargot, Main Street, East Farndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Part brownfield / greenfield site that is partly located within the confines of the village and partly in the open countryside. Development of part of the site may result in environmental improvements. It has not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Part brownfield, part greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Part brownfield / greenfield site that is partly located within the confines of the village and partly in the open countryside. Development of part of the site may result in environmental improvements. It has not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Located opposite scheduled ancient monument, development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting. Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The part brownfield and part greenfield site is situated partly within the village confines and partly in open countryside. Development of the would need to demonstrate that there would be no harm to the significance or setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Not stated

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint?**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. However, the portion of the site that is within the village confines may be suitable in future subject to development demonstrating that it can meet criteria A-G and i)-v) of policy R1 of the JCS and would not harm the significance or setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)***

0.17

**Density applied (dph)***

30

**Development ratio applied (%)***

100

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio***

5

**Notes**
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Settlement Name: East Haddon

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Church Lane

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in East Haddon village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within East Haddon.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? An Area TPO lies adjacent to the Northern boundary of the site. Any development would need to mitigate any impact on this.

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The site is situated on the edge of a village in open countryside, located outside the confines and does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Settlement Name: Flore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Source of site</th>
<th>Does site have current planning permission?</th>
<th>Does site have relevant planning history?</th>
<th>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</th>
<th>Does site within a flood risk zone?</th>
<th>Is the site consistent with National policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is not located within the village confines nor is it an allocated site. Neighbourhood plan identifies protected view 5 across the site therefore development could not lead to adverse impacts on this view.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Flore village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</th>
<th>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</th>
<th>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities within Flore.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</th>
<th>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relativley enclosed by existing development to the North.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</th>
<th>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</th>
<th>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary - residential</th>
<th>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site suitable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Flore Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Flore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site have relevant planning history?** | No |
| **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. |

| **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | The site is not located within the village confines nor is it an allocated site. Neighbourhood plan identifies protected view 1 across part of the site therefore development could not lead to adverse impacts on this view. |
| **Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Flore village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities. |

| **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
| **Is the site within a flood risk zone?** | No |
| **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | None indicated via desktop assessment |
| **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Yes |

| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the south east. |
| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Not on any formal designations |
| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design / layout |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |
| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | No |
| **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 2 |

<p>| <strong>Summary - residential</strong> | The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. |
| <strong>Is the site suitable?</strong> | Not Suitable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
<td>Page 187 of 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Flore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land adjacent High Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2013/0863 - Construction of 1 dwelling - Refused 24/12/2013 and dismissed at appeal 17/07/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not located within the village and is not an allocated site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Flore village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are services and facilities accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities within Flore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design / layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? No

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? N/A

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? None declared

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Occupied or vacant? Vacant

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest? N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? None stated

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? 2016/17

Promoter - how many years to complete? 2

Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.47

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 14

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>083</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Flore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land north of A45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not located within the village confines nor is it an allocated site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Flore village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities within Flore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the south and to the north by the M1. There are four listed buildings on opposite side of the road, development would need to mitigate any impact on their significance and setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design / layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>None stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint:</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Flore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAA Ref</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Brockhall Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is not located within the village confines nor is it an allocated site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Flore village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath required to access services and facilities in the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the south and to the north by the M1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design / layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the owner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>None stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land north of High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>DA/2015/0549 - Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Do any other owners need acquiring to develop the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 4.16

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
| **LAA Ref** | 177 |
| **Settlement Name** | Flore |
| **Land Use Proposed** | Residential |
| **Site Location** | Brockhall Road |
| **Source of site** | Planning permissions |

| **Does site have current planning permission?** | DA/2014/0454 - Approved |
| **Does site have relevant planning history?** | N/A |

| **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |

| **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |
| **Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |

| **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |
| **Is the site within a flood risk zone?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |

| **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |
| **Accessibility to existing services and facilities?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |

| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |
| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |

| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |

| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |
| **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |

| **Summary - residential** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |
| **Is the site suitable?** | Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA. |
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary

Is the site available?

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Is the site achievable?

Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

2.12

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%)

60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Great Brington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2015/0364 - Construction of 8 dwellings Refused 24/09/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Great Brington village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North, East and South East. There are three 2* listed buildings located in close proximity to the Eastern boundary of the site which also lies within a conservation area, development would need to mitigate any impact on their significance and setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>There is a group TPO along the Western boundary of the site which could affect access onto Back Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site available?</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site achievable?</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 0.44 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 100 |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 13 |

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Guilsborough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land west of Coton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Guilsborough village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North. Grade 2* listed church is adjacent to the South Eastern boundary of the site, development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

4

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

72

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Coton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social - Can access services and facilities in Guilsborough village. Economic - Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North. Grade 2* listed church is adjacent to the Northern boundary of the site, development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability Summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Achievability Summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Notes

14 August 2018
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Guilsborough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land south of West Haddon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2015/0493 Outline application for 28 dwellings refused 24/09/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Guilsborough village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the East and the GP surgery lies on its South-Eastern boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>South-Western part of the site is grade 3 and North Eastern part of the site is grade 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>South-Western part of the site is grade 3 and North Eastern part of the site is grade 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Guilsborough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Upper Thorneycraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2015/0493 Outline application for 28 dwellings refused 24/09/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Guilsborough village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the East and the GP surgery lies on its South-Eastern boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>South-Western part of the site is grade 3 and North Eastern part of the site is grade 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

- **Is the site available?** Available
- **Has site been marketed for proposed use?** No
- **If yes, how long and level of interest** N/A
- **Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?** No
- **Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?** Not stated
- **Promoter - how many years to complete?** Not stated
- **Promoter - how many developers involved?** Not stated

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

- **Is the site achievable?** Achievable
- **Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?** Not Developable
- **How to overcome constraint**
  It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

- **Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)** 1.58
- **Density applied (dph)** 30
- **Development ratio applied (%)** 80
- **Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio** 38

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Hannington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Walgrave Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Hannington village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

No

Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?

N/A

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

No

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

No

Occupied or vacant?

Vacant

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

No

When does promoter expect site to be available?

0-5 years

Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available?

Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

No

If yes, how long and level of interest

N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

2018/2019

Promoter - how many years to complete?

2 to 3

Promoter - how many developers involved?

1

Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable?

Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Not Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

0.96

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%) (dph)

80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

23

Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>085</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Hannington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Clarke's Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
**Does site have relevant planning history?** | No |
**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. |

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | No adopted Neighbourhood Plan |
**Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Isolated from limited services and facilities in Hannington village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities. |
**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
**Is the site within a floodrisk zone?** | No |
**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | None declared via desktop assessment. |
**Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Footpath required to access the limited services and facilities in the village. |
**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site is situated in an isolated location in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. |
**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Not on any formal designations |
**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout. |
**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |
**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation. |
**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 3 |

**Summary - residential** | The greenfield site is situated in an isolated location, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. |
**Is the site suitable?** | Not Suitable |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landlord/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landlord/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landlord/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability Summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability Summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Hannington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Bridal Road Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Hannington village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to access the limited services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners who support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners who support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**
Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**
No

**If yes, how long and level of interest**
N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**
No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**
2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**
1.5

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**
Unknown

**Achievability summary**
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**
Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**
Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**
2.1

**Density applied (dph)**
30

**Development ratio applied (%)**
60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**
38

**Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>The Estate Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Brownfield site situated within a hamlet and therefore judged to be open countryside. The site may represent an environmental improvement, it is not demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. The proposal would not be of appropriate scale to the existing settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-brownfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Harlestone. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Footpath required to access the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Grade 2 listed building on Northern boundary of site. Development would need to demonstrate how any impact to the significance and setting can be mitigated. Development may have a negative impact on the character of the access lane as the green verges would likely be eroded in order to provide safe access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The brownfield site is situated within a hamlet and therefore judged as open countryside. Development of the site may represent environmental improvements. It is not considered that development of this site would be of a scale proportionate to the size of the existing settlement. Consideration to the grade 2 listed building on the site boundary required in addition to any harm to the character of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Availability Summary

The site suggestion form indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

- **Is the site available?**
  - Available

- **Has site been marketed for proposed use?**
  - No

- **If yes, how long and level of interest?**
  - N/A

- **Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**
  - No

- **Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**
  - 2017/18

- **Promoter - how many years to complete?**
  - 1

- **Promoter - how many developers involved?**
  - 1

### Achievability Summary

There are no market factors or financial implications that could restrict potential delivery on site.

- **Is the site achievable?**
  - Achievable

- **Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**
  - Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS could be overcome at present.

- **Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**
  - 0.76

- **Density applied (dph)**
  - 30

- **Development ratio applied (%)**
  - 80

- **Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**
  - 18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA - Site has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Harlestone Road East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>DA/2014/0221 Outline application for 48 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 14.81

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Harlestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Wykes Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2016/0077 Land off Whites Lane, Construction of 54 dwellings refused 05/08/2016 DA/2016/084 0 Land off Whites Lane, Construction of 53 dwellings (pending consideration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Is the site suitable?
- **Suitable - Residential**

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Occupied or vacant?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### When does promoter expect site to be available?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Availability summary
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Is the site available?
- **Available**

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### If yes, how long and level of interest?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Promoter - how many years to complete?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Promoter - how many developers involved?
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Achievability summary
- **Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4**

### Is the site achievable?
- **Achievable**

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
- **Developable**

### How to overcome constraint:

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
| 11.76 |

### Density applied (dph)
| 30 |

### Development ratio applied (%) [4:1]
| 60 |

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
| 212 |

### Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land south of Wykes Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4, Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Suitable - Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Occupied or vacant?

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Availability summary

- Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4

- Is the site available?
  - Available

- Has site been marketed for proposed use?
  - Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4
  - If yes, how long and level of interest
    - Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4

- Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?
  - Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4
  - Promoter estimated first year of delivery?
    - Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4

- Promoter - how many years to complete?
  - Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4
  - Promoter - how many developers involved?
    - Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4

Achievability summary

- Site is allocated in the WNJCS - Policy N4

- Is the site achievable?
  - Achievable

- Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF
  - Developable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 32.75
  - Density applied (dph)
  - 30
  - Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 590

Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Holcot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Poplar Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Holcot village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North and East. Grade 2 listed building Poplar Farm to the South of the site, development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDOWNER/DEVELOPER HAVE CONTROL OVER ACCESS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS/OWNERSHIP Constraints The Promoter Is Aware Of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Or Vacant?</td>
<td>Occuped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land near Glebe Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Holcot village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential**
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?

Achievable

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

<p>| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 1.77 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 80 |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 42 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>305</th>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Holcot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land on South East side of Moulton Road</td>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2006/1045 Outline application for 6 dwellings. Refused 15/11/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Holcot village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary to the South East but is otherwise relatively enclosed by existing development.</td>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?
Available

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?
No

### If yes, how long and level of interest
N/A

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
No

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
2016/17

### Promoter - how many years to complete?
1

### Promoter - how many developers involved?
1

### Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?
Achievable

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
0.3

### Density applied (dph)
30

### Development ratio applied (%)
100

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
9

### Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Kilsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Rugby Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy K3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Kilsby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or Neighbourhood Plan at present.

### Is the site suitable?

- Not Suitable

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?

- No

### Does any other owner support the proposal for the site?

- N/A

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?

- Yes

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

- No

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

- No

### Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

- No

### Occupied or vacant?

- Occupied

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

- No

### When does promoter expect site to be available?

- 0-5 years

### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?

- Available

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?

- No

### If yes, how long and level of interest

- N/A

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

- No

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

- 2017/2018

### Promoter - how many years to complete?

- 1

### Promoter - how many developers involved?

- 1

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?

- Achievable

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

- Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 4.54 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 60 |

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 82
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Kilsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Barby Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Barby Road</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy K3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Kilsby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the East and the M45 to the South.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site is bounded by the M45 to the South however it may be possible to mitigate this through design and layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M45 on the Southern boundary of the site.</td>
<td>M45 on the Southern boundary of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
<td>M45 on the Southern boundary of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or Neighbourhood Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Is the site suitable?
- **Not Suitable**

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?
- Yes

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
- No

### Occupied or vacant?
- Occupied

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
- No

### When does promoter expect site to be available?
- 0-5 years

### Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
- Yes

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?
- Yes

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
- No

### Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?
- No

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?
- No

### if yes, how long and level of interest
- N/A

### Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?
- No

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
- 2016/17

### Promoter - how many years to complete?
- 2

### Promoter - how many developers involved?
- 1

### Achievability summary
- There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?
- Achievable

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
- Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint
- It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
- 2.84

### Density applied (dph)
- 30

### Development ratio applied (%)
- 60

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
- 51

### Notes

---

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**
- Available

---

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**
- 2

---

**Notes**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land at 54 Rugby Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated outside the confines of the village and is therefore contrary to policy K3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Kilsby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
require mitigation.

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or Neighbourhood Plan at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable

- Are there other owners/agents of the site? No
- Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? N/A
- Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes
- Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? No
- Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No
- Occupied or vacant? Occupied
- Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No
- When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

- Has site been marketed for proposed use? No
- If yes, how long and level of interest N/A
- Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No
- Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? 2017/2018
- Promoter - how many years to complete? 1
- Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.25
Density applied (dph) 30
Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes

Duplicate site - capacity counted in LAA site 032
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Kilsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Daventry Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>DA/2014/0221 Outline application for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available? Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable? Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 2.26

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Lilbourne village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to access services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential**
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?** Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Yes - Not to construct any building on the Property without the prior written consent of the Transferor to plans and specifications design and siting thereof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.
**Notes**

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio: 11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site - DA.2005/0897 Outline application for 24 units refused 28/09/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Lilbourne village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to access services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability Summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

#### Is the site available?
Available

#### Has site been marketed for proposed use?
No

#### If yes, how long and level of interest
N/A

#### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
No

#### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
2016/2017

#### Promoter - how many years to complete?
1 to 2

#### Promoter - how many developers involved?
1

### Achievability Summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

#### Is the site achievable?
Achievable

#### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
Not Deliverable

#### How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

#### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
0.57

#### Density applied (dph)
30

#### Development ratio applied (%)
80

#### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
14

Notes

---

14 August 2018
LAA Ref. 088

Settlement Name: Lilbourne

Land Use Proposed: Mixed

Site Location: Green Farm

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Lilbourne village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a floodrisk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Impact on services and facilities? Accessible to existing services and facilities.

Is the site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed at its North Eastern corner and is bounded by a lorry park on its South Western boundary.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?

Summary - residential The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village on open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not in or adjacent to an existing employment area. It is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Occupied

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Yes, part

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Yes

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? No

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Not stated

Promoter - how many years to complete? Not stated

Promoter - how many developers involved? Not stated

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint: It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 49.3

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 887

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Little Brington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Blacksmiths Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2009/0780 Demolition of stable block and erection of four bed dwelling refused and dismissed at appeal 06/07/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Brownfield site located within a hamlet that is unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-brownfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Little Brington. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site shares visual affinity within the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North. Site is in the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Development may have a negative impact on the character of Blacksmiths lane as the green verges would likely be eroded. Site is also adjacent to grade 2 listed buildings at 26-27 Main Street, development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The brownfield site is situated on the edge of the settlement in the open countryside and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the site suitable? | Not Suitable
--- | ---
Are there other owners/agents of the site? | No

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? | N/A

Does landowner/developer have control over access? | Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? | No

Occupied or vacant? | Partly occupied

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? | No

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? | No

When does promoter expect site to be available? | 0-5 years

### Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? | Available
--- | ---
Has site been marketed for proposed use? | No

If yes, how long and level of interest | N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? | No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? | 2016/2017

Promoter - how many years to complete? | 0.5

Promoter - how many developers involved? | 1

### Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? | Achievable
--- | ---
Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? | Not Deliverable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 0.47

Density applied (dph) | 30

Development ratio applied (%) | 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Berryfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Promotion agreement with National Housebuilder in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land at Park Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Sites</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does the site have relevant planning permission?** | No |

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**
Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site have relevant planning permission?** | No |

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**
No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**
Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

| **Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Yes |
| **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
| **Is the site within a floodrisk zone?** | No |

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**
None declared via desktop assessment.

| **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | No |
| **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Yes |

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**
Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North and East

| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | No |
| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Not on any formal designations |

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**
None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | No |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**
The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | Grade 3 |
| **Include best and most versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 3 |

**Summary - residential**
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

<p>| <strong>Summary - residential</strong> | Not Suitable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No - An estate road is being provided within the residential development being delivered on the neighbouring site by Bovis. Hallam Land Management has a right of access through this development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Long Buckby

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land off Brington Road

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? DA/2015/0528 - Outline application for residential development refused 05/11/2015. Appeal withdrawn.

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North and West.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off The Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? No

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? N/A

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No

Occupied or vacant? Occupied

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? N/A

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No

When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? No

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter estimated first year of delivery? 2017/2018

Promoter - how many years to complete? 1

Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

If yes, how long and level of interest N/A

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 3.1

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 56

Notes

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>East Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2007/1158 - Outline application for 3 dwellings refused and dismissed on appeal 01/10/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way which would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

1

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

1

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

0.44

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

100

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

13

Notes

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Long Buckby

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land east of Station Road

Source of site: Planning permission

Does site have current planning permission?: DA/2015/0666 - Reserved matters for 107 dwellings approved 08/08/2016

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site consistent with National policy?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Summary - residential: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site suitable?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Are there other owners/agents of the site?: Site has Planning Permission

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?: Site has Planning Permission

Does landowner/developer have control over access?: Site has Planning Permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land west of Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>Planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is suitable</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>DA/2013/0529 - Reserved matters for 132 dwellings approved 18/10/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint


Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

9.53

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%)

60
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land west of Hilgay, Harbridges Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>Planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>DA/2012/0607 Outline application for 5 dwellings refused but granted on appeal 27/05/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Occupied or vacant? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

When does promoter expect site to be available? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Availability summary Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site available? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

If yes, how long and level of interest? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many years to complete? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many developers involved? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Achievability summary Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site achievable? Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.52

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>219</th>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Long Buckby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Station Road South</td>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the West and is bounded by the railway line to the North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>With regard to residential development, it is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. There is currently no requirement for further employment land in the District, however subject to the detail of a scheme, development of the site may meet the requirements of policy R2 in the WNJCS. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>East of Station Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site is currently open space and sufficient evidence would be required to justify its loss. Evidence will be required to demonstrate that there is evidence that improvements can be made through the provision of a replacement facility of equal or better quality taking into account accessibility; or the proposal will bring about community benefits that outweigh the loss of the facility; or having regard to the relevant open space study, the space is surplus or is little used. Greenfield site within the vonfines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Would result in loss of open space. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is relatively enclosed by existing development on all sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site is currently used as a sports park and sufficient evidence would be required to justify its loss. Evidence will be required to demonstrate that there is evidence that improvements can be made through the provision of a replacement facility of equal or better quality taking into account accessibility; or the proposal will bring about community benefits that outweigh the loss of the facility; or having regard to the relevant open space study, the space is surplus or is little used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Greenfield site within the confines of the village. It is currently open space and therefore alternative provision of an equivalent amount, type and accessibility would need to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the site suitable? | Not Suitable
---|---
Are there other owners/agents of the site? | Unknown
Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? | Unknown
Does landowner/developer have control over access? | Unknown
Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? | Unknown
Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? | Unknown
Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? | Unknown
When does promoter expect site to be available? | Unknown

**Availability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? | Not currently available
---|---
Has site been marketed for proposed use? | Unknown
If yes, how long and level of interest | Unknown
Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? | Unknown
Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? | Unknown
Promoter - how many years to complete? | Unknown
Promoter - how many developers involved? | Unknown

**Achievability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? | Not Currently Achievable
---|---
Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? | Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 6.32 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 60 |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 114 |

Notes
Settlement Name: Long Buckby

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Floyers Farm

Source of site: 2012 SHLAA

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North and is bounded by the railway line to the South.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

**Is the site available?**

Not currently available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Unknown

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

Unknown

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Unknown

**Achievability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achievability is unknown.

**Is the site achievable?**

Not Currently Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

16.14

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

291

Notes

14 August 2018
**Settlement Name:** Long Buckby

**Land Use Proposed:** Residential

**Site Location:** Brington Road

**Source of site:** 2012 SHLAA

**Does site have current planning permission?** No

**Does site have relevant planning history?** No

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

**Is the site consistent with National policy?** Environmental - greenfield site. Social - Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic - Some additional use of services and facilities.

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?** No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** None declared via desktop assessment.

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?** Yes

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** Grade 3

**Summary - residential** The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?** Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

**Is the site available?**

Not currently available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Unknown

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

Unknown

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Unknown

**Achievability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

**Is the site achievable?**

Not Currently Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

24.83

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

447

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>East Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? | Unknown
---|---
Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? | Unknown
Does landowner/developer have control over access? | Unknown
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? | Unknown
Occupied or vacant? | Unknown
Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? | Unknown
Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? | Unknown
Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? | Unknown
When does promoter expect site to be available? | Unknown

Availability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? | Not currently available
---|---
Has site been marketed for proposed use? | Unknown
If yes, how long and level of interest | Unknown
Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? | Unknown
Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? | Unknown
Promoter - how many years to complete? | Unknown
Promoter - how many developers involved? | Unknown

Achievability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? | Not Currently Achievable
---|---
Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? | Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 7.91
---|---
Density applied (dph) | 30
Development ratio applied (%) | 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 142

Notes
14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Grove Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA - Site has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2014/0257 Outline application for 3 dwellings approved. DA/2015/0801 Reserved matters above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Does landowner/developer have control over access?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Occupied or vacant?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

When does promoter expect site to be available?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Availability summary
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Is the site available?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings

Has site been marketed for proposed use?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

If yes, how long and level of interest
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Promoter considers any factors that could restrict delivery?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Promoter - how many years to complete?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Promoter - how many developers involved?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Achievability summary
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Is the site achievable?
Site has planning permission for 3 dwellings and is under construction

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:
Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha):
0.33

Density applied (dph):
30

Development ratio applied (%):
100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAA Ref</th>
<th>Settlement Name</th>
<th>Source of site</th>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>Does site have current planning permission?</th>
<th>Does site have relevant planning history?</th>
<th>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</th>
<th>Does site have consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</th>
<th>Is the site consistent with National policy?</th>
<th>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</th>
<th>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</th>
<th>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</th>
<th>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</th>
<th>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</th>
<th>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</th>
<th>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</th>
<th>Summary - residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Long Buckby</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Stenhouse Close</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DA/2010/0230 - Construction of 15 affordable dwellings refused and dismissed at appeal 14/05/2012</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership needs acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018: Page 281 of 472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Settlement Name**: Long Buckby

**Land Use Proposed**: Residential

**Site Location**: West Street

**Source of site**: 2012 SHLAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential**: The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Settlement Name: Long Buckby

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land off The Banks

Does site have current planning permission?  No

Does site have relevant planning history?  No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?  Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?  No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy?  Environmental - greenfield site. Social - Can access services and facilities in Long Buckby village. Economic - Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?  Yes

Is the site within a floodrisk zone?  No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?  None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities?  Yes

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?  Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?  Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?  None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?  No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?  The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?  Grade 3

Summary - residential

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable?  Not Suitable
### Availability Summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners who are aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)       | 2.5     |
| Density applied (dph)                                        | 30      |
| Development ratio applied (%)                                | 60      |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio               | 45      |
| Notes                                                         |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Maidwell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land adjoining A508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Call for Sites</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site have relevant planning history?** | DA/1984/0970 - Erection of a 4 bed detached house for agricultural worker - Refused |

**Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.**

| **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | No adopted Neighbourhood Plan |
| **Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Maidwell village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities. |

| **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
| **Is the site within a floodrisk zone?** | No |
| **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | None declared via desktop assessment. |
| **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Footpath required to access services and facilities in the village. |

Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is relatively enclosed to the South

| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Not on any formal designations |
| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | None |

| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout. |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |
| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | No |
| **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 3 |

<p>| <strong>Summary - residential</strong> | The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. |
| <strong>Is the site suitable?</strong> | Not Suitable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

N/A

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2016/17

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

18 months

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

1

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

0.34

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

100

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

10

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Maidwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land adjoining Hall Farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Maidwell village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any other owners support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter how many years to complete?</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site available? Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No

- If yes, how long and level of interest N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No

Promoter estimated first year of delivery? 2016/17

Promoter how many years to complete? 18 months

Promoter how many developers involved? 1

Notes

14 August 2018
Residential

Draughton Road

2016 Call for Sites

Yes - Part of site has approval for new changing rooms and bootroom infill at Maidwell School (DA/2015/1117)

No

Brownfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Environmental-brownfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Maidwell village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Yes

No

Yes

Yes

None declared via desktop assessment.

Site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and West and Maidwell School to the South. There are several listed buildings in close proximity to the site, development would need to mitigate any impact on their significance and setting.

There is a group TPO within the site.

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

No

No

Grade 3

The brownfield site is situated outside the village confines on the edge of the village and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. There are several heritage assets in close proximity to the site which is also covered by a group TPO.

Not Suitable
### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership interest need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Is the site available?

Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS could be overcome at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Settlement Name: Maidwell

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land at Blueberry Lane

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? DA/2014/0271 - Outline for 7 dwellings refused and dismissed at appeal 30/01/2014

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Maidwell village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes

Footpath required to access services and facilities in the village.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the East. The Southern edge of the site is in the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site available?</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the site achievable?</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 0.15 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 80 |

| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 4 |

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Maidwell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>The Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site has outline approval for a single dwelling - DA/2015/0581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Part brownfield and part greenfield site located outside part within but mostly outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Maidwell village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North, South and West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The part brownfield, part greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, the majority of the site is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint:</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Part of the site may be suitable and this part already has planning permission for a single dwelling. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)                | 0.87   |
| Density applied (dph)                                                  | 30     |
| Development ratio applied (%)                                          | 80     |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio                         | 21     |

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land south of Boughton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2014/0541 - Refused 06/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site is allocated in the Moulton Neighbourhood Development Plan - Policy H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Suitable - Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How to overcome constraint**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Answer/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlemet Name</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>New Manor Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Isoalted location from Moulton village. Economic-Will generate limited additional use of services and facilities in Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is not accessible to services and facilities within Moulton but is accessible to a wider variety in Northampton, which site is adjacent to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants that affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>(\text{No})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Not stated

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and Moulton Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 32.88 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 60 |

**Notes**

592

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land west of Thorpeville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Isolated location from Moulton village. Economic-Will generate limited additional use of services and facilities in Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is not accessible to services and facilities within Moulton but is accessible to a wider variety in Northampton, which site is adjacent to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Majority grade 3. Northern eastern corner is grade 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and Moulton Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>31.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land behind The Nest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Moulton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to access services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated in an isolated location outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or Moulton Neighbourhood Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer has control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**
Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**
No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?**
N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**
No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**
2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**
5

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**
Not stated

**Achievability summary**
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**
Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**  Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint?**
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS and Moulton Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**
2.34

**Density applied (dph)**
30

**Development ratio applied (%)**
80

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**
56

**Notes**

---

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Moulton

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land west of Holcot Road

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Isolated location from Moulton village. Economic-Will generate limited additional use of services and facilities in Moulton

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The greenfield site is situated in an isolated location outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**
Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**
Unknown

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**
No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**
2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**
7

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**
1

**Achievability summary**
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**
Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**
Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and Moulton Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**
17.87

**Density applied (dph)**
30

**Development ratio applied (%)**
60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**
322
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Moulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Moulton Heights (2000 dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Moulton village however by virtue of its size it would create a new community. Economic-Provision of services and facilities within the site and additional use of services and facilities in Moulton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Local Nature Reserve is situated 1km to the South of the site and a SSSI (Pitsford Reservoir) is located approx. 1.3km to the North West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated in an isolated location outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Unknown

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

12

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

4

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and Moulton Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

200.15

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

3603

**Notes**

3.8Ha subtracted from total site area available to account for Sandy Hill Lane site that has been developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Moulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Moulton Heights Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Isolated location from Moulton village. Economic-Will generate limited additional use of services and facilities in Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>No, the site is isolated from the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Local Nature Reserve is situated 1km to the South of the site and a SSSI (Pitsford Reservoir) is located approx. 1.3km to the North West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated in an isolated location outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or Moulton Neighbourhood Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Availability Summary
The site suggestion form indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**
- Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**
- No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?**
- N/A

**Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?**
- No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**
- 2018/2019

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**
- 6

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**
- 1

### Achievability Summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**
- Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**
- Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint?**
- It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS and Moulton Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 10.3 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 60 |

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**
- 0

**Notes**
- Duplicate site - capacity included in LAA site 99
LAA Ref: 101

Settlement Name: Moulton

Land Use Proposed: Mixed

Site Location: Moulton Heights (1000 dwellings)

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Isolated location from Moulton village however by virtue of its size it would create a new community. Economic-Provision of services and facilities within the site.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? A small part of the site lies within Flood Zone 3

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? No, the site is isolated from the heart of the village.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Local Nature Reserve is situated 1km to the South of the site and a SSSI (Pitsford Reservoir) is located approx. 1.3km to the North West.

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The greenfield site is situated in an isolated location outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
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### Are there other owners/agents of the site?
- No

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
- No

### Occupied or vacant?
- Vacant

### Are any ownership need acquiring to develop site?
- No

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?
- Yes

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
- No

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
- N

### When does promoter expect site to be available?
- 0-5 years

### Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.
- Available

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?
- Unknown

### If yes, how long and level of interest
- N/A

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
- No

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
- 2017/2018

### Promoter - how many years to complete?
- 9

### Promoter - how many developers involved?
- 3

### There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.
- Achievable

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF
- Not Developable

### It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS and Moulton Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 63.4 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 60 |

### Notes
- Duplicate site - capacity included in LAA site 99
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Moulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Pitsford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. Site contains allotments therefore evidence will be required to demonstrate that there is evidence that improvements can be made through the provision of a replacement facility of equal or better quality taking into account accessibility; or the proposal will bring about community benefits that outweigh the loss of the facility; or having regard to the relevant open space study, the space is surplus or is little used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Moulton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>The Northern edge of the site is within Flood Zone 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South. Site slopes away to the North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site is an allotment therefore evidence will be required to demonstrate that there is evidence that improvements can be made through the provision of a replacement facility of equal or better quality taking into account accessibility; or the proposal will bring about community benefits that outweigh the loss of the facility; or having regard to the relevant open space study, the space is surplus or is little used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated in an isolated location outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or Moulton Neighbourhood Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the site suitable?
Not Suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site?
No

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
N/A

Does landowner/developer have control over access?
Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
No

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
No

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?
No

Occupied or vacant?
Partly occupied

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
Yes - Re-provision of allotments

When does promoter expect site to be available?
0-5 years

Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available?
Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use?
No

If yes, how long and level of interest
N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
2017/2018

Promoter - how many years to complete?
1 to 2

Promoter - how many developers involved?
Not stated

Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable?
Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
Not Developable

How to overcome constraint:
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and Moulton Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
6.95

Density applied (dph)
30

Development ratio applied (%)
60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
125

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Moulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land north of Sandy Hill Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2013/0554 - 27 Dwellings - Approved 03/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

if yes, how long and level of interest

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Achievability summary

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site achievable?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF: 
Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 
0.9

Density applied (dph) 
30

Development ratio applied (%) 
80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Moulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land east of Northampton Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>Planning permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2013/0431 - Reserved Matters 145 Dwellings - Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other owners need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Sandy Hill Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>Planning permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>DA/2013/0686 - Outline up to 85 Dwellings - Approved 27/08/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA.
Available summary

Is the site available?

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Achievability summary

Is the site achievable?

Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF?

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Occupied or vacant?

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

14 August 2018
Land Use Proposed: Residential

Source of site: 2012 SHLAA

Settlement Name: Moulton

Site Location: Oakley Drive

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? The site is not in the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1. A large part of the site lies within the Crowfields Common Nature Reserve Local Green Space.

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Moulton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North, West and East. A large part of the site is within the Moulton conservation area. Development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? A large part of the site is within the Crowfields Common Local Nature Reserve.

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 2

Summary - residential: The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. The site is also a designated Local Nature Reserve and part of the site is allocated as Local Green Space in the Moulton Neighbourhood Plan. Part of the site is within the Moulton conservation area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS or Neighbourhood plan could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Settlement Name: Moulton

Site Location: Cottingham Drive

Source of site: 2012 SHLAA

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Does site have current planning permission?

DA/2015/0944 - Construction 41 dwellings approved 07/10/2016

Does site have relevant planning history?

N/A

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Does site have current planning permission?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site consistent with National policy?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site within a floodrisk zone?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Accessible to existing services and facilities?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Summary - residential

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site suitable?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has Planning Permission

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

Site has Planning Permission

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Site has Planning Permission.
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Occupied or vacant?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Availability summary

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Yes, how long and level of interest?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Achievability summary

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site achievable?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

1.83

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land west of The Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is not in the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1. Part of the site lies within the Pages Brook Valley Local Green Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Moulton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South and East. Site is adjacent to the Moulton conservation area, any development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Part of the site is within the Hog Hole Spinney Local Wildlife Site and part within the Pages Brook Valley Local Green Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Part of the site lies within the Page Brook Valley Local Green Space identified in the Moulton Neighbourhood Plan ad part within the Hog Hole Spinney Local Wildlife Site. Site is adjacent to the Moulton conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS or Neighbourhood plan could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Church Hill Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Yes for part of site (DA/2013/0058) Construction of six student residential buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is not in the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1. It lies entirely within the Pages Brook Valley Local Green Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Moulton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South.</td>
<td>Part of the site lies within the Pages Brook Valley Local Green Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Part of the site lies within the Page Brook Valley Local Green Space identified in the Moulton Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Unknown

Occupied or vacant? Unknown

Are there other owners support the proposal for the site? Unknown

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Unknown

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Unknown

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Unknown

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? Unknown

When does promoter expect site to be available? Unknown

Availability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? Not currently available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Achievability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS or Neighbourhood plan could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 32.24

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 580

Notes
14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Moulton

Source of site: 2012 SHLAA

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land south of Church Hill Farm

Does site have current planning permission?: No

Does site have relevant planning history?: No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?: Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: The site is not in the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1. It lies entirely within the Pages Brook Valley Local Green Space.

Is the site consistent with National policy?: Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Moulton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?: Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone?: The Northern edge of the site is within Flood Zone 3.

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities?: Yes

Impact on landscape, character and/or heritage assets?: Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South. Site is within the Moulton conservation area and any development would need to mitigate impact on its significance and setting.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Site lies entirely within the Pages Brook Valley Local Green Space

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?: No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?: Grade 3

Summary - residential: The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or Moulton Neighbourhood Plan at present. It is entirely within the Moulton conservation area. Part of the site lies within the Page Brook Valley Local Green Space identified in the Moulton Neighbourhood Plan and part of the site is flood zone 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How to overcome constraint:**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNICS or Neighbourhood plan could be overcome at present. Part of the site may be suitable and this part already has planning permission for a single dwelling. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 1.5 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 80 |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 36 |

**Notes**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Warren Spinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>Yes for part of site DA/2013/0690 Outline application for up to 70 dwellings. DA/2016/0454 Reserved matters for residential development up to 70 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Moulton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the East. Site contains two listed buildings - Holly Lodge (Grade 2) and Old Church of St John (Grade 2). Also Old St John's Church Scheduled Ancient Monument. Development of the site would need to mitigate any impact on their significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Site contains a number of heritage assets to which any impact must be mitigated.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site? Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Unknown

Occupied or vacant? Unknown

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest? Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint: It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS or Neighbourhood plan could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 83.87

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 1510

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Moulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land South of Boughton Road, Moulton Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines in an isolated location. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site is within Moulton parish which has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan however the site is not within the village and would therefore be contrary to policy H1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - greenfield site, social, site is not well related to existing residential development, economic - not particularly close to existing employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is in an isolated location some distance from existing services and facilities in Boughton and Moulton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and has a visual connection with the open countryside. Site is relatively enclosed to the South by Moulton Park. Grade 2 listed Holly Lodge is adjacent to the site, development of the site would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS or Neighbourhood plan could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Duplicate site - capacity included in LAA sites 248 and 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Naseby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2000/0844 - Outline application for residential ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Naseby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants – affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants – affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary:**
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary:**
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Naseby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Cottesbrooke Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Brownfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-brownfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Naseby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and by its brownfield nature is likely to have limited landscape impact subject to the design and layout of the site. It is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The brownfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants that affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation/vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation/vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAA Ref: 070
Settlement Name: Naseby

Land Use Proposed: Residential
Site Location: Land off High Street
Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have current planning permission?: No
Does site have relevant planning history?: DA/2000/0844 - Outline application for residential refusal

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?: Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: No adopted Neighbourhood Plan
Is the site consistent with National policy?: Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Naseby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?: Yes
Is the site within a flood risk zone?: No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: None declared via desktop assessment.
Accessible to existing services and facilities?: Yes

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?: Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and West.
Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Not on any formal designations
Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?: No
Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?: Grade 3

Summary - residential: The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable?: Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Duplicate site - capacity counted in LAA site 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Naseby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Policeman's Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Naseby village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the West and South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability Summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Yes

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2016/2017

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

2

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

1

**Achievability Summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Deliverable

**How to overcome constraint?**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

1.77

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

80

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Naseby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Cottesbrooke Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>Planning permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2015/1071 Approved for 20 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect delivery?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupied or vacant?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When does promoter expect site to be available?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability summary</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site available?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoter - how many years to complete?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoter - how many developers involved?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievability summary</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site achievable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</strong></td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to overcome constraint</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</strong></td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density applied (dph)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development ratio applied (%)</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAA Ref</strong></td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Norton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Weedon Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site has approval for B1 use (DA/2015/0686)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2017/0128 Outline application for 12 dwellings. Refused 06/06/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Norton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities however limited due to their limited nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and East.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Lamport Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Old village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities however limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint:</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Availability summary: Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Achievability summary: There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land rear of Sywell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2004/0525 Outline application for residential development - Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Overstone village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities however limited due their limited nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)                  | 1.7    |
| Density applied (dph)                                                   | 30     |
| Development ratio applied (%)                                            | 80     |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio                           | 41     |

Notes: 14 August 2018
| **LAA Ref** | 239 |
| **Settlement Name** | Overstone |
| **Land Use Proposed** | Residential |
| **Site Location** | Sywell Road |
| **Source of site** | 2012 SHLAA |
| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site have relevant planning history?** | No |
| **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. |
| **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | No adopted Neighbourhood Plan |
| **Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Overstone village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities however limited due their limited nature. |
| **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
| **Is the site within a floodrisk zone?** | No |
| **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | None declared via desktop assessment. |
| **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Yes |
| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South |
| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Not on any formal designations |
| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout. |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |
| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation. |
| **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 2 |

**Summary - residential**

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?**

Not Suitable
Availability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available?
Not currently available

Has site been marketed for proposed use?
Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest
Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete?
Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved?
Unknown

Achievability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable?
Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF
Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
51.07

Density applied (dph)
30

Development ratio applied (%)
60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
919

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>240</th>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Overstone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land south of Sywell Road</td>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2016/0737 Construction of nine dwellings - Refused 13/07/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Overstone village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities however limited due their limited nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North</td>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>The site is part of a Local Wildlife site - Parsons Wood</td>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Part of the site is a Local Wildlife Site.</td>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?
Unknown

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
Unknown

Does landowner/developer have control over access?
Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
Unknown

Occupied or vacant?
Unknown

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
Unknown

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?
Unknown

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
Unknown

When does promoter expect site to be available?
Unknown

Availability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available?
Not currently available

Has site been marketed for proposed use?
Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest
Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete?
Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved?
Unknown

Achievability summary
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable?
Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
4.52

Density applied (dph)
30

Development ratio applied (%)
60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
81

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Overstone Leys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Yes - Outline DA/2013/0850 for 2000 dwellings. Reserved matters DA/2016/0517 Phases 1A and 1B (200 dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Is the site suitable?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Occupied or vacant?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### When does promoter expect site to be available?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.

### Availability summary
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA.
Achievability summary:
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WNJCS to meet needs of the NRDA. See HLA

Is the site achievable?
Site has planning permission and is allocated in the WN

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:
Deliverable

How to overcome constraint:
N/A

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha):
115.61

Density applied (dph):
30

Development ratio applied (%):
60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio:

Notes:
14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Overstone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Billing Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Predominantly greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social—Can access services and facilities provided for in Northampton outside the District. Economic—Additional use of services and facilities in Northampton outside the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site would be accessible to local centres in Northampton outside the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scout camping ground located to the South of the site.</strong></td>
<td>Scout camping ground located to the South of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupied or vacant?</strong></td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When does promoter expect site to be available?</strong></td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Unknown

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

1.5

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

80

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

36

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Overstone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>South of The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2013/0602 Construction of two dwellings - Refused 27/11/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities provided for in Northampton outside the District. Economic-Additional use of services and facilities in Northampton outside the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the Eastern edge of the site is located within Flood Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>The North West corner of the site contains a group Tree Preservation Order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Availability summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Pitsford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>The Oaks Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Pitsford village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, however road to access the heart of the village is very narrow with no room to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Pedestrian links to the heart of the village would be required and at present the highway cannot accommodate these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners who support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability Summary:**
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?** Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?** No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?** N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?** No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?** 2019/20

**Promoter - how many years to complete?** 4

**Promoter - how many developers involved?** 1

**Achievability Summary:**
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?** Achievable

**Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF?** Not Deliverable

**How to overcome constraint:** It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha):** 8.9

**Density applied (dph):** 30

**Development ratio applied (%):** 60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio:** 160

**Notes:**

14 August 2018
### Settlement Name: Pitsford

- **Land Use Proposed:** Residential
- **Site Location:** Land off Moulton Road
- **Source of site:** 2016 Call for Sites
- **Does site have current planning permission?** No
- **Does site have relevant planning history?** DA/2016/0389 Outline application for residential development comprising starter homes/self build and bungalows - WITHDRAWN
- **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.
- **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** No adopted Neighbourhood Plan
- **Is the site consistent with National policy?** Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Pitsford village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.
- **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** Yes, however road to access the heart of the village is very narrow with no room to
- **Is the site within a floodrisk zone?** No
- **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** None declared via desktop assessment.
- **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village.
- **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.
- **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** Not on any formal designations
- **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.
- **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** No
- **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** No
- **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** Grade 3

### Summary - residential

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Pedestrian links to the heart of the village would be required and at present the highway cannot accommodate these.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Pitsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Moulton College Grange Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Pitsford village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is adjacent to the Pitsford conservation area, any development would need to mitigate any impact on its significance and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>An area TPO lies adjacent to the Southwestern boundary of the site. Any development would need to mitigate any impact on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village and development must mitigate any harm to the setting of the conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Availability summary: Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Site available? Not Currently Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest? Unknown

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Achievability summary: Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achievability is unknown.

Site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint: It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 14.46

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 260

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Pitsford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site have relevant planning history?** | No |

| **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. |

| **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | No adopted Neighbourhood Plan |
| **Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Pitsford village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities. |

| **Is the site within a flood risk zone?** | No |

| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the West and South as well as the heart of the village being located to the East. |

| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | There are two groups of TPO’s within the site boundary |

| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout. |

| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | No |

| **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 3 |

<p>| <strong>Summary - residential</strong> | The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. |
| <strong>Is the site suitable?</strong> | Not Suitable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

**Is the site available?**

Not Currently Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Unknown

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

Unknown

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Unknown

**Achievability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

**Is the site achievable?**

Not Currently Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

1.65

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

80

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

40

**Notes**

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Ravensthorpe

Site Location: Hawtoft Farm

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? DA/2014/0280 Construction of 4 dwellings refused and dismissed on appeal 02/12/2014DA/2015/011 02/12/2015 DA/2014/0280 Construction of 3 dwellings. Withdrawn 11/06/2015

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Ravensthorpe village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South and land slopes away to the North. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No/No Information</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Application made on 1st April 2014 with prospective buyer. Subsequent enquiries made by various builders and private individuals to self-build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAA Ref</strong></td>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Scaldwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Use Proposed
- Residential

### Site Location
- East End

### Source of site
- 2012 SHLAA

### Does site have current planning permission?
- No

### Does site have relevant planning history?
- No

### Does site support the delivery of the JCS?
- Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

### Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?
- No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

### Is the site consistent with National policy?
- Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access very limited services and facilities in Scaldwell village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.

### Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?
- Yes

### Is the site within a flood risk zone?
- No

### Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?
- None declared via desktop assessment.

### Accessible to existing services and facilities?
- Yes

### Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?
- Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the West. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.

### Impact on environmental or other open space designations?
- Not on any formal designations

### Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?
- None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

### Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?
- No

### Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?
- The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

### Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?
- Grade 3

### Summary - residential
- The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

### Is the site suitable?
- Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

**Is the site available?**

Not Currently Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Unknown

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

Unknown

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Unknown

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Unknown

**Achievability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

**Is the site achievable?**

Not Currently Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achieveability of the site would also be required.

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 1.51 |
| Density applied (dph) | 30 |
| Development ratio applied (%) | 80 |

| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 36 |

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Spratton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is outside the settlement boundary and is therefore classified as open countryside and is therefore contrary to policies SB1 and SB2 of the Spratton Neighbourhood Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Spratton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or the Spratton Neighbourhood Development Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Yes

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Yes

Does the landowner/developer have control over access? Yes

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No

Occupied or vacant? Occupied

Are there any restrictive covenants that affect deliverability? No

Have any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site? No

Existing uses need to be relocated for the site to be developed? No

When does promoter expect the site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available

Has the site been marketed for proposed use? Yes

If yes, how long and level of interest? N/A

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery? No

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Not stated

Promoter - how many years to complete? Not stated

Promoter - how many developers involved? Not stated

Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 2.56

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 46

Notes

14 August 2018 Page 376 of 472
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>079</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Spratton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land off Brixworth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2014/0683 Outline application for up to 37 dwellings - Refused 20/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>The majority of the site is considered to be outside and not immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and is classified as being in open countryside. It is therefore contrary to policies SB1 and SB2 of the Spratton Neighbourhood Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in Spratton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the West. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or the Spratton Neighbourhood Development Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners supporting the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

Yes

**If yes, how long and level of interest**

The site is promoted by an established developer Mulberry Property Development and is controlled under option.

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2018/2019

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

Not stated

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Not stated

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Deliverable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

3.05

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

55

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Daventry Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>Application for up to 50 dwellings DA/2015/0537 - Withdrawn September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site with partial previously developed land. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Staverton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South West. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Site is adjacent to the Staverton Conservation Area. Any development would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of this assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The largely greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>There is a promotion agreement with a National Housebuilder in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land north of Daventry Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2013/0646 refused and dismissed at appeal 25/02/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Staverton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Site is adjacent to the Staverton Conservation Area and 2 listed buildings (Grade 1 listed church and another grade 2 listed building). Any development would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of these assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential**
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Site is adjacent to heritage assets and it would need to be demonstrated that development of this site would mitigate any harm to them or their settings.

**Is the site suitable?** Not Suitable
Are there other owners/agents of the site? No
Are any other owners/support the proposal for the site? N/A
Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes
Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? No
Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? No
Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No
Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No
Occupied or vacant? Occupied
-When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

Is the site available? Available
Has site been marketed for proposed use? No
-If yes, how long and level of interest N/A

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery? No
Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? 2016/17
Promoter - how many years to complete? 18 months
Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable
Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.69
-Density applied (dph) 30
-Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 17

Notes
14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Staverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land west of Braunston Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access limited services and facilities in Staverton village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the East. Site is adjacent to the Staverton Conservation Area. Any development would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of this assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Site is adjacent to heritage assets and it would need to be demonstrated that development of this site would mitigate any harm to them or their settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes/No/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

1

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

1

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint?**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

1.61

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

29

**Notes**

14 August 2018
### Site Information

- **Settlement Name**: Sulby
- **Land Use Proposed**: Mixed

### Site Details

- **Site Location**: Land at Sulby Estate
- **Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

### Planning and Development

- **Does site have current planning permission?**: No
- **Does site have relevant planning history?**: No
- **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**: Majority of the site is greenfield and is situated in a hamlet and therefore judged to be within open countryside. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. The proposal would not be of appropriate scale to the existing settlement.

### Neighbourhood Plan

- **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**: No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

### National Policy

- **Is the site consistent with National policy?**: Environmental - Largely greenfield site but some redevelopment of brownfield land. Social - Proposal for a low density country estate village would contribute to community and provide services and facilities however isolated from larger towns and villages. Economic - provision of services and facilities in the village and some additional employment use provided.

### Accessibility and Services

- **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**: Yes
- **Is the site within a flood risk zone?**: Very small proportion of the site is within flood zone 3.
- **Accessible to existing services and facilities?**: Although the proposed site would include services and facilities, there are currently none in this hamlet and no footpath exists to the nearest services and facilities.

### Landscape and Heritage

- **Impact on landscape, character and/or heritage assets?**: Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.

### Environmental and Open Space

- **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**: Site is adjacent to the Local Wildlife Site - Sulby reservoir

### Amenities and Occupiers

- **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.
- **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**: Site is adjacent to an airfield that remains in use.

### Public Rights of Way

- **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**: The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

### Usage and Design

- **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**: Grade 3

---

14 August 2018
Largely greenfield site situated in and around a hamlet and therefore judged to be within open countryside. It is not of appropriate scale to the existing settlement and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?** Not Suitable

**Are there other owners/agents of the site?** No

**Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?** N/A

**Does landowner/developer have control over access?** Yes

**Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?** No

**Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?** No

**Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?** No

**Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?** No

**When does promoter expect site to be available?** 0-5 years

**Occupied or vacant?** Vacant

**Is the site available?** Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?** No

**If yes, how long and level of interest** N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?** No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?** 2017/18

**Promoter - how many years to complete?** 6

**Promoter - how many developers involved?** Not stated

**Is the site achievable?** Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?** Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint** It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)** 174

**Density applied (dph)** 30

**Development ratio applied (%)** 60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio** 3132

**Notes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Walgrave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land at Old Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>Pre Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-Greenfield site. Social-Access to very limited services and facilities in Walgrave. Economic-limited additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by development to the East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal for the site support the proposal of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership restrictions that need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not Currently Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>3.63 Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Availability summary: Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Achievability summary: Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achievable is unknown.

Notes: 14 August 2018
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Watford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Henley Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-Greenfield site. Social-Access to very limited services and facilities in Watford. Economic-limited additional use of services and facilities in the village however limited due to their limited nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, it is relatively enclosed by development to the West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designs?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Unknown

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Unknown

Does the owner/developer have control over access? Unknown

Are there other owners of the site? Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Unknown

Occupied or vacant? Unknown

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Unknown

When does promoter expect site to be available? Unknown

Availability summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? Not Currently Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Achievability summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. Further information on the availability and achievability of the site would also be required.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.2

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 100

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 6

Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Cavalry Hill Industrial Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Brownfield site currently occupied for employment use. No evidence provided to demonstrate that the site is no longer viable for employment purposes in the long term or that its release would offer significant benefits to the local area. Site is situated within the village confines and development of the site may result in an environmental improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-Brownfield site. Social-There would be access to services and facilities in Weedon. Amenity of residents will need to be considered due to impacts from industrial uses at Cavalry Hill. Economic - loss of employment land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>By virtue of its location within village, the site is considered to be relatively enclosed by existing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Neighbouring industrial uses would need to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Brownfield site within the village confines. No evidence provided to demonstrate that the site is no longer viable for employment purposes in the long term. Development would result in a loss of employment land. Development of the site may result in an environmental improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not currently available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2022/2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>7 year lease expires in 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Weedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land at New Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2014/0455 Outline application for 121 dwellings allowed at appeal 18/12/2014. Decision quashed by the Court of Appeal 23/11/2016. New decision pending DA.2015/0339 Outline application for up to 121 dwellings - Undetermined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social-Can access services and facilities in the village. Economic-Some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North. Site is adjacent to the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating possibility of a higher quality landscape. Due to the topography of the village there may be impact on the Former Weedon Barracks and Blast Houses listed buildings. Development would need to mitigate any impact on the significance or setting of these heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. Its enjoyment and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Development of the site would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of the listed buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land at Bridge Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2015/1060 - Outline application for 8 dwellings withdrawn 05/01/2016 DA/2016/094 1 - Outline application for 8 dwellings withdrawn 02/03/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site. Social- Can access services and facilities in the village. Economic-some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside, it is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North and East. Site is next to the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area, any development would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of this asset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential**

The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Development of the site would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of the conservation area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability Summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)                 | 0.45   |
| Density applied (dph)                                                  | 30     |
| Development ratio applied (%)                                           | 100    |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio                         | 14     |

Notes: 14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Dodford Wharf Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Predominantly greenfield site, the majority of which is located outside the confines of the village. Unlike that its development would result in environmental improvements however the redevelopment of existing buildings may do. It been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-predominantly greenfield site. Social- Access to services and facilities is limited due to access across the A45. Economic-some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes but would require a new access point from the A45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village. Would require a crossing point over the A45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land use which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The predominantly greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, the majority of the site is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. However a small part of the site is brownfield land that is within the confines of the village and may result in environmental improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Weedon

Site Location: Church Street

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site. A large proportion in flood zone 3. Social - Access to services and facilities in the village is limited due to access across the canal and railway line. Economic-some additional use of services and facilities.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? Yes. A large proportion of the site is flood zone 3.

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village. Connectivity constraints exist in the canal and railway line

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is next to the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area, any development would need to be required to demonstrate how that it would not harm the significance or setting of this asset.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? Majority of the site is in flood zone 3.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present. The majority of the site is within flood zone 3.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
### Are there other owners/agents of the site?
- Yes

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
- No

### Occupied or vacant?
- Occupied

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
- No

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
- No

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
- N

### When does promoter expect site to be available?
- 0-5 years

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?
- Yes

### Are there other owners supporting the proposal for the site?
- Yes

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?
- Yes

### Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?
- Available

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?
- No

### If yes, how long and level of interest
- N/A

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
- No

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
- 2017/2018

### Promoter - how many years to complete?
- 2

### Promoter - how many developers involved?
- Unknown

### There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?
- Achievable

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
- Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint
- It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
- 11.73

### Density applied (dph)
- 30

### Development ratio applied (%)
- 60

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
- 211

### Notes

---

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Weedon

Site Location: Queen Street

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Does site have current planning permission?: No

Does site have relevant planning history?: No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?: Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy?: Environmental-greenfield site Social-Access to services and facilities in the village, Economic-some additional use of services and facilities in the village.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?: Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone?: No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: None declared via desktop assessment.

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?: Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Part of the site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?: No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?: Grade 3

Summary - residential: The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable?: Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other owners supporting the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>17.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 August 2018
Land Use Proposed: Mixed
Site Location: Land east of Ordnance Road
Does site have current planning permission?: No
Does site have relevant planning history?: No
Does site support the delivery of the JCS?:
Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.
Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: No adopted Neighbourhood Plan
Is the site consistent with National policy?: Environmental-greenfield site forms part of the setting of a grade 2* listed building. Social-Access to services and facilities in the village, Economic-some additional use of limited services and facilities in the village.
Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?: Yes
Is the site within a flood risk zone?: No
Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: None declared via desktop assessment.
Site is situated in open countryside although the site is relatively enclosed to the East by existing development. Site abuts and forms part of the setting of the grade 2* listed building - the former Weedon Barracks Blast Houses. Any development should not harm the significance or setting of this heritage asset.
Accessible to existing services and facilities?: Yes
Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?: Site is situated in open countryside although the site is relatively enclosed to the East by existing development. Site abuts and forms part of the setting of the grade 2* listed building - the former Weedon Barracks Blast Houses. Any development should not harm the significance or setting of this heritage asset.
Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Not on any formal designations
Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.
Impact on amenity for Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?: Industrial use to the North East however this could be mitigated through design and layout
Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: No
Summary - residential
The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is also outside the existing confines, and development of the site may impact on the setting of a grade 2* listed building. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.
Is the site suitable?: Not Suitable

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

7

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Unknown

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint?**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

13.77

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

248

**Notes**

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Weedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Ordnance Road South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site - DA/2010/0425 Outline for 21 dwellings refused 11/08/2010 and dismissed on appeal 18/08/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site forming part of the setting of a grade 2* listed building. Social-Access to services and facilities in the village. Economic-some additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site is situated in open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary although the site is relatively enclosed to the South and East sides by existing development. Site forms part of the setting of the grade 2* listed building - the former Weedon Barracks Blast Houses and development should not harm the significance or setting of this heritage asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is also outside the existing confines. Development of the site should not harm the significance or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
setting of a grade 2* listed building. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>12.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Land off Croft Way

Does site have current planning permission?: No

Does site have relevant planning history?: DA/2014/0369 outline for 26 dwellings refused 17/07/2014 and dismissed at appeal 18/06/2015

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?: Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy?: Environmental-greenfield site forming part of the setting of a grade 2* listed building. Social-Access to services and facilities in the village, Economic-some additional use of services and facilities in the village.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?: Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone?: No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities?: Yes. Footpath provides access to the heart of the village

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?: Site is situated in open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. The site is relatively enclosed to the South side by existing development. Site sits in the setting of the grade 2* listed building - the former Weedon Barracks Blast Houses. Any development would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of this asset.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?: No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.

Include best and Most versatile agricultural land?: Grade 3

Summary - residential: The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in open countryside, it is also outside the existing confines. Development of the site may impact on the setting of a grade 2* listed building. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.
Is the site suitable? | Not Suitable
---|---
Are there other owners/agents of the site? | No
Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? | N/A
Does landowner/developer have control over access? | Yes
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? | No
Occupied or vacant? | Vacant
Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? | No
Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop site? | No
Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? | No
When does promoter expect site to be available? | 0-5 years

### Availability summary
Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

| Is the site available? | Available
---|---
Has site been marketed for proposed use? | No
If yes, how long and level of interest | N/A
Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? | No
Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? | Not stated
Promoter - how many years to complete? | 1
Promoter - how many developers involved? | 1

### Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

| Is the site achievable? | Achievable
---|---
Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF | Not Developable
How to overcome constraint | It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.
Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) | 0.45
Density applied (dph) | 30
Development ratio applied (%) | 80
Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio | 11
Notes
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Settlement Name: Weedon

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Former Ace Café

Does site have current planning permission? Yes

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have relevant planning history? Yes

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Yes

Does site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Does the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Not currently. There is no footpath to provide pedestrian access to the heart of the village. Provision of such access may be difficult due to crossing the A45

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Does site have relevant planning history? DA/2007/1359 - Extant permission for B1 use

Does the site have current planning permission? DA/2015/0416 - Outline for residential (35) finally disposed of Feb 2016DA/2016/0170 - Outline application for residential development - Not determined.

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Brownfield site situated outside the village confines. Development of the site may result in environmental improvements. It has not been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.
The brownfield site is situated in open countryside and is located outside the village confines. Due to its location outside the confines and detachment from the village it is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

### Is the site suitable?

- **Not Suitable**

### Are there other owners/agents of the site?

- **No**

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

- **No**

### Occupied or vacant?

- **Vacant**

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

- **No**

### When does promoter expect site to be available?

- **0-5 years**

### Available summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?

- **Available**

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?

- **No**

### If yes, how long and level of interest

- **N/A**

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

- **No**

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

- **2017/2018**

### Promoter - how many years to complete?

- **2**

### Promoter - how many developers involved?

- **Not stated**

### Achievability summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?

- **Achievable**

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

- **Not Developable**

### How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

- **1.22**

### Density applied (dph)

- **30**

### Development ratio applied (%)

- **60**

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

- **22**

### Notes

14 August 2018
Settlement Name: Weedon

Site Location: Land east of New Street

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site Social-Access to services and facilities in the village, Economic-some additional use of services and facilities in the village.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? Site situated in open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary, the site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the South. Part of the site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?

Summary - residential The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable? Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not Currently Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>11.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: Roseacres, Walting Street

Source of site: Planning permissions

Does site have current planning permission?: DA/2013/0215 - Outline approval for 16 dwellings

Does site have relevant planning history?: N/A

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site consistent with National policy?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site within a flood risk zone?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Accessible to existing services and facilities?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Summary - residential: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site suitable?: Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Are there other owners/agents of the site?: Site has Planning Permission

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?: Site has Planning Permission

Does landowner/developer have control over access?: Site has Planning Permission
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Occupied or vacant?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Availability summary

Is the site available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter estimated first year of delivery?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Achievability summary

Is the site achievable?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.51

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Weedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Weedon Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Brownfield site situated within the village confines. Policy BN6 of the JCS is supportive of reuse of this site for the following uses: Museum (D1), Employment (B1), Retail (A1), Restaurant/Café/Drinking Establishment (A3, A4, A5), Other leisure, tourism and recreation uses or residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-Brownfield site that is a grade 2* listed building. Opportunity for re-use. Social-access to services and facilities in the village and opportunity for further facilities within this site. Economic-opportunity for economic development in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is a grade 2* listed building. Any redevelopment would need to be sensitive to this status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>The Local Wildlife Site (Weedon Depot canal) is located within the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Brownfield site within the village confines whose redevelopment is supported by JCS policy WN6. Any redevelopment would need to be sensitive to the grade 2* listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Suitable - Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Yes, in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there an ownership constraint the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Redevelopment of existing site. Likely to be a mix of uses including employment uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land north of A45 High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the village confines. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - greenfield site. Social - Access to services and facilities is limited due to access across the A45. Economic - some additional use of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes but would require a new access point from the A45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village. Would require a crossing point over the A45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site is situated in the open countryside and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The predominantly greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, the majority of the site is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant? Occupied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop site? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access? Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available? Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If yes, how long and level of interest N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? 2016/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete? 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved? Not stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable? Achievable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF: Not Developable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present. However a small part of the site is brownfield land that is within the confines of the village and may result in environmental improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 4.89           |        |
| Density applied (dph) 30                                              |        |
| Development ratio applied (%) 60                                      |        |
| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 88                      |        |
| Notes                                                                  |        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Welford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Woodford Glebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>The site is outside the confines of the village and contrary to policy W2 of the Welford Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Access to limited services and facilities in the village, Economic-some additional use of limited services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary to the East the site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - Residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is also outside the existing confines. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Are there other owners/agents of the site?
- **No**

### Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?
- **N/A**

### Does landowner/developer have control over access?
- **Yes**

### Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?
- **No**

### Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?
- **Not to owners knowledge**

### Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?
- **No**

### Occupied or vacant?
- **Vacant**

### Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?
- **No**

### When does promoter expect site to be available?
- **0-5 years**

### Available summary
- Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

### Is the site available?
- **Available**

### Has site been marketed for proposed use?
- **No**

### If yes, how long and level of interest
- **N/A**

### Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?
- **No**

### Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?
- **Not stated**

### Promoter - how many years to complete?
- **Depends on scale and form**

### Promoter - how many developers involved?
- **Not stated**

### Achievability summary
- There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Is the site achievable?
- **Achievable**

### Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?
- **Not Developable**

### How to overcome constraint
- It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

### Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)
- **0.62**

### Density applied (dph)
- **30**

### Development ratio applied (%)
- **80**

### Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
- **15**

### Notes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Welford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land south of Newlands Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>DA/2014/0824 - Approved 16/06/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does owner/developer have control over access? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available? Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved? Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable? Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF Deliverable

How to overcome constraint N/A

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.56

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
Settlement Name: Welton

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Source of site: 2016 Call for Sites

Site Location: Land at Old Manor Court

Does site have current planning permission?: No

Does site have relevant planning history?: No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS?: Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?: No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

Is the site consistent with National policy?: Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Access to limited services and facilities in the village via footpath, Economic-some additional use of limited services and facilities in the village.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?: Yes

Is the site within a flood risk zone?: No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?: None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities?: Yes. Footpath provides access to the heart of the village

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?: Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary to the West, the site is relatively enclosed by existing development to the East.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations?: Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?: None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?: No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?: No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?: Grade 3

Summary - residential: The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is also outside the existing confines. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

Is the site suitable?: Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint:</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAA Ref</strong></td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Kiln Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Access to limited services and facilities in the village via footpath, Economic-some additional use of limited services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Footpath provides access to the heart of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is also outside the existing confines. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Not Currently Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Not Currently Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Watford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site lies largely outside the confines of the village and is not a conversion of an existing building, a single dwelling for proven individual need or in accordance with R1. It is therefore contrary to policy WH11 of the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Access to services and facilities in the village via footpath, Economic-some additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Not currently. There is no footpath to provide pedestrian access to the heart of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is also outside the existing confines. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2017/2018

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

1

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

1

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

2.06

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

37

**Notes**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land at Watford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site lies largely outside the confines of the village and is not a conversion of an existing building, a single dwelling for proven individual need or in accordance with R1. It is therefore contrary to policy WH11 of the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Access to services and facilities in the village via footpath, Economic-some additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Not currently. There is no footpath to provide pedestrian access to the heart of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is also outside the existing confines. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary

#### Availability Summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

#### Achievability Summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

### Site Details

- **Occupied or vacant?** Occupied
- **Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?** No
- **When does promoter expect site to be available?** 0-5 years

### Site Availability

- **Is the site available?** Available
- **Has site been marketed for proposed use?** No
- **If yes, how long and level of interest?** N/A
- **Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?** No
- **Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?** 2017/2018
- **Promoter - how many years to complete?** 2 to 3
- **Promoter - how many developers involved?** Unknown

### Site Achievability

- **Is the site achievable?** Achievable
- **Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?** Not Developable
- **How to overcome constraint?** It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

### Site Details

- **Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha):** 9.22
- **Density applied (dph):** 30
- **Development ratio applied (%):** 60
- **Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio:** 166

### Notes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>West Haddon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Guilsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2013/0626 - Refused 20/11/2013 and dismissed at appeal 18/08/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site lies largely outside the confines of the village and is not a conversion of an existing building, a single dwelling for proven individual need or in accordance with R1. It is therefore contrary to policy WH11 of the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Access to services and facilities in the village via footpath, Economic-some additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Yes. Footpath provides access to the heart of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, it is also outside the existing confines. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability summary</td>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievability summary</td>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 14 August 2018
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Former Nursery Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Site</td>
<td>Planning permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>Yes - DA/2012/0071 for outline and reserved matters DA/2014/0559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Deliverable

N/A

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

0.87

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

14 August 2018
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>191</th>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>West Haddon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land between Guilsborough Road and A428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>Planning permissions</td>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>Yes - DA/2014/0218 Refused but allowed on appeal 24/12/2014. REM application DA/2015/0774 approved 22/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint:

N/A

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

5.73

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio


LAA Ref: 228

Settlement Name: West Haddon

Land Use Proposed: Residential

Site Location: The Banks

Source of site: 2012 SHLAA

Does site have current planning permission? No

Does site have relevant planning history? No

Does site support the delivery of the JCS? Greenfield site located within the confines of the village. The site has been agreed through an adopted neighbourhood plan.

Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan? The West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan include this site within the village confines. Policy WH10 allocates this site for small-scale housing development.

Is the site consistent with National policy? Environmental-greenfield site, Social-Access to services and facilities in the village via footpath, Economic-some additional use of services and facilities in the village.

Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided? Yes

Is the site within a floodrisk zone? No

Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination? None declared via desktop assessment.

Accessible to existing services and facilities? Yes-footpath provides access to the heart of the village

Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets? By virtue of its location within village, the site is considered to be relatively enclosed by existing development and playing fields.

Impact on environmental or other open space designations? Not on any formal designations

Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers? None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers? No

Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected? No

Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land? Grade 3

Summary - residential: The greenfield site is situated within the village confines and the site is allocated in the adopted West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan.

Is the site suitable? Suitable - Residential
**Availability summary**

Site was not resubmitted in the latest Call for Site process therefore information on availability is unknown. However the site was submitted as part of the call for sites for the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan and was allocated for development within the plan period which would suggest that the site is achievable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

Site was not resubmitted in the Call for Site process therefore information on achievability is unknown. However the site was submitted as part of the call for sites for the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan and was allocated for development within the plan period which would suggest that the site is achievable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)                  | 0.15   |
| Density applied (dph)                                                   | 30     |
| Development ratio applied (%)                                           | 100    |

<p>| Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio                           | 5      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>West Haddon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>The Vicarage, West End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site is greenfield situated outside the confines of the village and part contains an existing dwelling. Unlikely the site would result in environmental improvements nor is it demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site is outside the settlement boundary and is not a conversion of an existing building, a single dwelling for proved individual need or in accordance with R1. It is therefore contrary to policy WH11 of the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan. Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Part greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site is designated as local green space in the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The part greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village, partly within and partly outside the existing confines and part of the site is a designated local green space. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? Not Currently Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint: It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 0.56

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 13

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LAA Ref</strong></th>
<th>230</th>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>West Haddon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2012 SHLAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Yelvertoft Road</td>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2013/0480 - Refused 22/09/2014 and dismissed at appeal 27/08/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site is outside the settlement boundary and is not a conversion of an existing building, a single dwelling for proven individual need or in accordance with R1. It is therefore contrary to policy WH11 of the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan. Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Footpath provides access to the heart of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape.</td>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Part of the site is designated as local green space in the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - residential** The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is outside the existing confines and part of the site is a designated local green space. The site is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan at present.
Is the site suitable? Not Suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site? Unknown

Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Unknown

Does landowner/developer have control over access? Unknown

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Unknown

Occupied or vacant? Unknown

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? Unknown

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? Unknown

When does promoter expect site to be available? Unknown

Availability summary: Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? Not Currently Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown

If yes, how long and level of interest Unknown

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? Unknown

Promoter estimated first year of delivery? Unknown

Promoter - how many years to complete? Unknown

Promoter - how many developers involved? Unknown

Achievability summary: Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF: Not Developable

How to overcome constraint: It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 14.84

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 267

Notes: 14 August 2018
| **LAA Ref** | 231 |
| **Settlement Name** | West Haddon |
| **Land Use Proposed** | Residential |
| **Site Location** | 2 Yelvertoft Road |
| **Source of site** | 2012 SHLAA |
| **Does site have current planning permission?** | No |
| **Does site have relevant planning history?** | No |
| **Does site support the delivery of the JCS?** | Greenfield site including residential garden situated largely outside the confines of the village. Unlikely the site would result in environmental improvements nor is it demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat. |
| **Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?** | Site lies largely outside the confines of the village and is not a conversion of an existing building, a single dwelling for proven individual need or in accordance with R1. It is therefore contrary to policy WH11 of the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan. |
| **Is the site consistent with National policy?** | Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - access to services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village |
| **Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?** | Yes |
| **Is the site within a flood risk zone?** | No |
| **Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?** | None declared via desktop assessment. |
| **Accessible to existing services and facilities?** | Yes. Footpath provides access to the heart of the village |
| **Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?** | Site largely situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. |
| **Impact on environmental or other open space designations?** | Not on any formal designations |
| **Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?** | None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout. |
| **Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?** | No |
| **Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?** | No |
| **Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?** | Grade 3 |
| **Summary - residential** | The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is largely outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS or the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan at present. |
| **Is the site suitable?** | Not Suitable |

14 August 2018
### Availability Summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any owners supporting the proposal for the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary

Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors that could restrict delivery?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Is the site achievable?

Not Currently Achievable

### Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Not Developable

### How to overcome constraint

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS and West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan could be overcome at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</th>
<th>0.43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

14 August 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAA Ref</td>
<td>077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Whilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Brington Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village and location is detached from the village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None declared via desktop assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is detached from the village and there is no footpath to access limited services and facilities in Whilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is detached from the village, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Site has potential impacts on landscape, is relatively remote from the heart of the village and therefore access to its services and facilities would be limited from sustainable modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Name</strong></td>
<td>Whilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land at Whilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - no footpath to provide access to limited services and facilities in village, would have an impact on the form and character of the village Economic - some additional use of limited services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities in Whilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Site is adjacent to Kunda Cottage, a grade 2 listed building. Development would need to mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of the heritage asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It's enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land owner/developer have control over access to the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>Yes, in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does land owner/developer have control over access to the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Settlement Name:** Woodford Halse

**Source of site:** 2016 Call for Sites

**Land Use Proposed:** Residential

**Site Location:** Pool Farm Field

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - no footpath to provide access to services and facilities in village, would have an impact on the form and character of the village Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Not currently. There is no footpath to provide pedestrian access to the heart of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

**Is the site available?**

Available

**Has site been marketed for proposed use?**

No

**If yes, how long and level of interest?**

N/A

**Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**

No

**Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**

2016/2017

**Promoter - how many years to complete?**

5

**Promoter - how many developers involved?**

Not stated

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

**Is the site achievable?**

Achievable

**Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**

Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint?**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

**Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**

7.85

**Density applied (dph)**

30

**Development ratio applied (%)**

60

**Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**

141

**Notes**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Woodford Halse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Phipps Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of site</strong></td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Brownfield site situated outside the village confines. Unlikely that the site would result in environmental improvements due to its current use as woodland, nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support the retention of existing services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Environmental - Brownfield site however current use is as woodland, Social - Good access to service and facilities in the village. Likely to impact on the character of Woodford by developing in between two district character areas of the village. Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Eastern edge of the site is within flood zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>By virtue of its location in the centre of the village, the site is considered to be relatively enclosed by existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>The whole site is a designated Local Wildlife site named Woodford Halse new plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Industrial use to the North however this could be mitigated through design and layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>The site features a public right of way. It’s enjoyment and use could therefore be affected and would require mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Brownfield site located outside the confines of the village. The site is designated as a Local Wildlife site and part of the site is within flood zone 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the site suitable? Not Suitable

Are there other owners/agents of the site? Yes
Do any other owners support the proposal for the site? Yes
Does landowner/developer have control over access? No. This site is subject to a ransom strip owned by Northamptonshire County Council

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? No
Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Yes. Agreement from Northamptonshire County Council required as the land was originally sold as woodland
Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site? Yes. Ransom strip owned by Northamptonshire County Council

Occupied or vacant? Vacant
Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed? No
When does promoter expect site to be available? 0-5 years

Availability summary
Any proposal to develop the land would require agreement with NCC (as the land was sold as woodland) and also would require access across a ransom strip owned by Northamptonshire County Council

Is the site available? Not Currently Available

Has site been marketed for proposed use? No
If yes, how long and level of interest? N/A

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery? No
Promoter - estimated first year of delivery? 2017/2018
Promoter - how many years to complete? 1
Promoter - how many developers involved? 1

Achievability summary
There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

Is the site achievable? Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF? Not Developable

How to overcome constraint
It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Woodford Halse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Land Adj Upton Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2012/0860 - Approved for 200 houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other owners/agents of the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are any other owners support the proposal for the site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Does landowner/developer have control over access?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Occupied or vacant?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Availability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site available?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

If yes, how long and level of interest

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Achievability summary

Site has planning permission and is under construction. See HLA.

Is the site achievable?

Site has planning permission and is under construction.

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 10.02

Density applied (dph) 30

Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Settlement Name</strong></th>
<th>Woodford Halse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Grants Hill Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site has current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>DA/2013/0024 - Approved for 40 houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have relevant planning history?</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does site have current planning permission?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site consistent with National policy?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - residential</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the site suitable?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission. See HLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</strong></td>
<td>Site has Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?

Occupied or vacant?

Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?

Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?

When does promoter expect site to be available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Are there any restrictive covenants affecting deliverability?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

If yes, how long and level of interest?

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Availability summary

Is the site available?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Has site been marketed for proposed use?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

If yes, how long and level of interest?

Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?

Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?

Promoter - how many years to complete?

Promoter - how many developers involved?

Achievability summary

Is the site achievable?

Site has Planning Permission. See HLA

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?

Deliverable

How to overcome constraint

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)

1.71

Density applied (dph)

30

Development ratio applied (%)

80

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio

Notes
**Settlement Name**: Woodford Halse

**Land Use Proposed**: Residential

**Site Location**: Farndon Road

**Source of site**: 2012 SHLAA

**Does site have current planning permission?**: No

**Does site have relevant planning history?**
- DA/2013/0916 - Construction of 55 dwellings - Refused 19/02/2014 and dismissed at appeal 01/05/2014
- DA/2014/023 - Construction of 55 dwellings - Refused 05/06/2014

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**
- Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**
- No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**
- Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - footpath provided access to services and facilities in village, would have an impact on the form and character of the village
- Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**: Yes

**Is the site within a floodrisk zone?**: No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**
- None indicated via desktop assessment

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**
- Yes. Footpath provides access to the heart of the village

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**
- Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary however is relatively enclosed by existing development to the North.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**
- Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**
- None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**
- No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**
- No

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**
- Grade 3

**Summary - residential**
- The greenfield site is situated on the edge of the village and shares visual affinity with the countryside beyond, it is outside the existing confines and is not considered to meet the...


Is the site suitable? Not Suitable

- Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability? Unknown
- Are any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of? Unknown
- Occupied or vacant? Unknown

Availability summary

- Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process therefore information on availability is unknown.

Is the site available? Not Currently Available

- Has site been marketed for proposed use? Unknown
- If yes, how long and level of interest? Unknown

Achievability summary

- Site was not submitted in the latest Call for Sites process, therefore information on achieveability is unknown.

Is the site achievable? Not Currently Achievable

Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF: Not Developable

How to overcome constraint

- It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha) 2.73
- Density applied (dph) 30
- Development ratio applied (%) 60

Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio 49

Notes
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**Settlement Name**: Yelvertoft

**Land Use Proposed**: Residential

**Site Location**: Land off Lilbourne Road

**Source of site**: 2016 Call for Sites

| Does site have current planning permission? | No |
| Does site have relevant planning history? | DA/2016/0754 Outline application for 50 dwellings - Refused 24/11/2016 |

**Does site support the delivery of the JCS?**

Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.

**Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?**

No adopted Neighbourhood Plan

**Is the site consistent with National policy?**

- Environmental: Greenfield site, Social: limited services and facilities in village, Economic: some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature

**Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?**

Yes

**Is the site within a flood risk zone?**

No

**Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?**

None indicated via desktop assessment

**Accessible to existing services and facilities?**

Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Yelvertoft.

**Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?**

By virtue of its location on the edge of the village confines, the site is considered to have a degree of enclosure with the school on one side and the village hall on another. The site also shares affinity with the open countryside beyond its boundary.

**Impact on environmental or other open space designations?**

Not on any formal designations

**Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?**

None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.

**Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?**

No

**Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?**

No

**Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?**

Grade 3

**Summary - residential**

The site is situated on the edge of a village, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.

**Is the site suitable?**

Not Suitable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does any other owner support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>The site has been marketed and a number of developers/house builders have shown interest in purchasing the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF:</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint:</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>14 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off Wards Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but limited due to their limited nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to limited services and facilities within Yelvertoft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>By virtue of its location on the edge of the village confines, the site is considered to be relatively enclosed by existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>There are two group TPO's within the site however the site suggestion form indicates that these trees could remain protected and be incorporated into the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/support the proposal the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability Summary

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If yes, how long and level of interest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievability Summary

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF</td>
<td>Not Developable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Name</td>
<td>Yelvertoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Proposed</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Crick Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>DA/2014/0856 - Refused 02/04/2015 and dismissed at appeal 04/08/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have consistent Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but this would be limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a flood risk zone?</td>
<td>Flood zone 3 on the Eastern edge of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Site is accessible to services and facilities within Yelvertoft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present. Part of the site is within flood zone 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>None declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site available?</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has site been marketed for proposed use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is yes, how long and level of interest N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many years to complete?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter - how many developers involved?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the site achievable?</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site deliverable as defined by NPPF Not Developable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome constraint</td>
<td>It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density applied (dph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development ratio applied (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Proposed</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Land off High Street/West of Skew Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site</td>
<td>2016 Call for Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have current planning permission?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site have relevant planning history?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does site support the delivery of the JCS?</td>
<td>Greenfield site located outside the confines of the village. Unlikely that its development would result in environmental improvements nor has it been demonstrated that it is required to support retention of local services that are under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site consistent with adopted Neighbourhood Plan?</td>
<td>No adopted Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site consistent with National policy?</td>
<td>Environmental - Greenfield site, Social - limited services and facilities in village, Economic - some additional use of services and facilities in village but this would be limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the site have suitable access/can it be provided?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site within a floodrisk zone?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any hazardous ground conditions, pollution or contamination?</td>
<td>None indicated via desktop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to existing services and facilities?</td>
<td>Footpath required to provide access to the heart of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on landscape character and/or heritage assets?</td>
<td>Site situated in open countryside and shares a visual affinity with the countryside beyond its boundary. Part of the site is within the Special Landscape Area therefore indicating a higher quality landscape. Grand Union Canal conservation area is adjacent to the South East of the site and development should mitigate any impact on the significance and setting of this heritage asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on environmental or other open space designations?</td>
<td>Not on any formal designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on amenity for existing residents or new occupiers?</td>
<td>None that could not be adequately mitigated through design/layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring land uses which could impact on future occupiers?</td>
<td>Engineering works to the North of the site may create amenity issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any public rights of way and would enjoyment be affected?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include best and Most Versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary - residential</td>
<td>The site is situated on the edge of a village, located outside the confines but does not meet the requirements of the JCS at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site suitable?</td>
<td>Not Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other owners/agents of the site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any ownership constraints the promoter is aware of?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied or vacant?</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any restrictive covenants - affect deliverability?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any other owners support the proposal for the site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ownership need acquiring to develop site?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing uses need to be relocated for site to be developed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does landowner/developer have control over access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does promoter expect site to be available?</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Availability summary**

Evidence submitted indicates that there are no availability factors which would prevent the site being available for development within the next 5 years.

- **Is the site available?**  
  Available

- **Has site been marketed for proposed use?**  
  No

- **If yes, how long and level of interest**  
  N/A

- **Promoter consider any factors the could restrict delivery?**  
  No

- **Promoter - estimated first year of delivery?**  
  201/2018

- **Promoter - how many years to complete?**  
  2

- **Promoter - how many developers involved?**  
  1

**Achievability summary**

There is no evidence to suggest the site is not viable based on the information provided and the assessment of the site.

- **Is the site achievable?**  
  Achievable

- **Is the site Deliverable as defined by NPPF?**  
  Not Developable

**How to overcome constraint**

It is not considered that the constraint regarding the WNJCS could be overcome at present.

- **Total site area available for development from GIS (Ha)**  
  7.79

- **Density applied (dph)**  
  30

- **Development ratio applied (%)**  
  60

- **Estimated number of dwellings using devt ratio**  
  140

**Notes**  
14 August 2018