Appendix 3, Call for Sites

The Call for Sites and their Assessment

Sites have been identified from several sources:

a. BDC's SHELAA

b. A public call for sites which was published in the parish magazine, which is delivered to 1650 households in the parish.

c. An invitation to individual landowners to put forward sites for development.

d. Third parties who were aware of sites that could be considered.

e. NPT, who identified some sites.

In all cases landowners and third parties were made aware at this stage that all sites would be subject to detailed evaluation and that there was no commitment to any site being allocated for development.

33 sites were put forward and they were subject to three successive rounds of evaluation:

1. A Strategic assessment (Table 1 a-d below) against three criteria: greenfield vs brownfield; distance on foot to the centre of the village (the centre being taken as the Co-op or Budgens, whichever is the nearer) and heritage impact (based on the Heritage and Settlement Report, 2018, by Essex Place Services and commissioned by the joint councils).

2. A detailed assessment (Table 2 a-d below) based on the Council's mapping of constraints (15 criteria) together with eight additional criteria specific to Long Melford and mainly related to the accessibility of village facilities.

3. An assessment of the deliverability of sites, sometimes drawing on the advice of developers who had shown suitable experience and capability to work in Long Melford.

The Heritage and Settlement Report is particularly significant for Long Melford. The report assesses settlements with some heritage significance according to the value of their heritage features, to the susceptibility of those features to further development and to the combined effect of value and susceptibility. Long Melford is one of only two settlements in Babergh District to be scored "High" on all three counts, meaning that the heritage assets of the village are highly valuable, they are highly susceptible to detriment attributable to development and the combination of these factors makes Long Melford especially vulnerable. The report gives guidance on the location and significance of heritage assets and on areas of the village where assets are particularly at risk.

Results and Provisional Allocations

Scores were given to sites in the first and second rounds of evaluation, but they were not the only factors influencing whether a site was taken forward. Other issues were the balance of sites between different parts of the parish, the size of sites (given the NPPF policy to provide small sites suitable for smaller developers), the opportunity for affordable housing, the desirability of maintaining a Local Green Space between Sudbury and Long Melford and the potential for public benefits related to a site. Whilst most residents acknowledge the need for more housing, they are very aware of the scale of housing under construction and reluctant to see much more being developed. There has also been a strong and articulate reaction against the large (150 dwellings) development proposed on "Skylark Fields."

In order to assess the capacity of sites to accommodate additional housing, a standard density of 25 dwellings per hectare has been used, a figure derived from the BDC Core Strategy. Clearly in practice this will vary from site to site. It is considered to be a reasonable average for present purposes.

It is proposed that the plan will cover an eighteen-year period starting in 2019, matching the emerging Joint Local Plan.

It should be noted that four sites identified in the SHELAA relate more to Sudbury and the proposed Chilton extension than to Long Melford. These have been recorded, but, whilst they will inevitably make some contribution to meeting housing need in Long Melford, they have not so far been counted towards meeting that need.

The key findings of the assessment of sites are summarised here:

- The sites put forward include very few brownfield sites and very few sites within walking distance of the village centre; the latter has not been counted as a compelling constraint given the famous 'long' character of Long Melford. However, we have looked for opportunities to provide additional amenities in the more distant parts of the village.
- Heritage constraints impose limits on development over large parts of the parish.
- Partly because of the shortage of brownfield sites, which often offer a ready-made access, access is a constraint on the development potential of many sites.
- This constraint together with heritage and other significant constraints mean that few sites are capable of being delivered within the first five years of the Plan.
- However, in the context of the committed supply identified in the parish and of the desirability of meeting particular needs in the parish, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) have identified a number of sites to be allocated in the first five years:
  - Three brownfield sites in the centre of the village, which can be brought forward quite readily and which can provide housing for those needing to have easy access to village facilities; their capacity will flow from detailed designs; we have estimated that they can provide provisionally seven units.
  - An exception site at the north end of the village, which is owned by a charity and which could provide 100% affordable housing; this could accommodate 20-38 houses (possibly some being market housing if a larger scheme is brought forward). The developer will be encouraged to provide a public amenity for the northern end of the village, possibly a green linked to the adjacent public footpath.
  - an allocation for retail and/or leisure use on the site adjacent to Nethergate Brewery, which the Brewery is committed to buying; the brewery has already provided a focus for the southern end of the village and this could be enhanced on a modest scale provided it does not compete with the services of the village centre.

Table 1 shows the strategic assessment; the 33 sites being presented in Tables 1a - 1d.

Table 2 shows the detailed assessment; the 33 sites being presented in Tables 2a - 2d.

Strategic Assessment

Table 1a

Assessment Criteria/Sites	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	F1
Brownfield 3/greenfield 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1
Distance on foot to Coop/Budgens										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	3	1

Assessment Criteria/Sites	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	F1
Heritage Settlement Sensitivity Assessment: 1 = affected by report recommendations; 3 = not affected; 2 = indirectly or partially	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	2	3	3
Totals: Top scores (7-9) yellow; score 6 blue	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	6	9	5
Table 1b										
Assessment Criteria/Sites	**Q1**	**C1**	**D1**	**M1**	**A1**	**L1**	**N1**	**R1**	**J1**	**K1**
Brownfield 3/greenfield 1	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	1
Distance on foot to Coop/Budgens 1150m or less 3; more 1	1	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1
Heritage Settlement Sensitivity Assessment: 1 = affected by report recommendations; 3 = not affected; 2 = indirectly or partially	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Totals: Top scores (7-9) yellow; score 6 blue	4	6	7	5	9	9	9	9	9	4
Table 1c										
Assessment Criteria/Sites	**C2**	**P1**	**G1**	**W1**	**C3**	**SS0967**	**SS0811**	**SS0557**	**SS1028**	**H10**
Brownfield 3/greenfield 1	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Distance on foot to Coop/Budgens 1150m or less 3; more 1	3	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	3
Heritage Settlement Sensitivity Assessment: 1 = affected by report recommendations; 3 = not affected; 2 = indirectly or partially	3	3	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1.5
Totals: Top scores (7-9) yellow; score 6 blue	9	9	9	3	6	3	3	3	3	5.5
Table 1d										
Assessment Criteria/Sites	**S1**	**F2**	**W2**							
Brownfield 3/greenfield 1	1	1	3							
Distance on foot to Coop/Budgens 1150m or less 3; more 1	1	1	1							
Heritage Settlement Sensitivity Assessment: 1 = affected by report recommendations; 3 = not affected; 2 = indirectly or partially	3	3	1							
Totals: Top scores (7-9) yellow; score 6 blue	5	5	5							

Detailed Assessment

Table 2a

Assessment Criteria/Sites	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	F1
Brownfield 3/greenfield 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1
Safe & satisfactory access:										
Cars: Yes 3; No 1	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Pedestrians: Yes 3; No 1	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	3
Cycles: Yes 3; No -1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Distance on foot to bus stop										
580m or less 3; more 1	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Distance on foot to LM primary school										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	3	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
Distance on foot to surgery										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	3	1	1	1	3	3	1	3	1
Distance on foot to Coop/Budgens										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	3	1
Sufficient utilities capacity										
Yes 3; No 1										
Site affected by constraints:										
measured under impacts below										
Impacts										
For each impact occurring: 1 = direct; 2 = indirect/partial; 3 = none										
Site extends beyond defensible boundary & offers no new defensible boundary	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	3	1
Conservation Area	2	3	3	3	2	1	1	2	3	3
Special Landscape Area	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
Built Up Area Boundary	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	1
Ancient Woodland	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
County Wildlife Sites	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Flood risk high, Zone 3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Local Nature Reserves	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Protected Species*										
SSSI	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Agric land quality: Grades 1 and 2 (out of 5)	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
Historic Gardens	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3
Listed Buildings	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2

Assessment Criteria/Sites	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	F1
Sched Anc Monuments	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Historic Environmental Record (not assessed)										
Open spaces, playing fields, greens, allots	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
(now NPPF) **										
Transport capacity; no data available										
Neighbouring uses: compatible w res devt 3;	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
incompatible 1										
Utilities, pipeline, STW; to check with										
undertakings										
Total score	54	56	50	54	52	59	59	57	59	55
Rank	19=	15=	27=	19=	23=	10=	10=	14	10=	18
	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	H7	H8	H9	F1
Table 2b										
Assessment Criteria/Sites	**Q1**	**C1**	**D1**	**M1**	**A1**	**L1**	**N1**	**R1**	**J1**	**K1**
Brownfield 3/greenfield 1	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	1
Safe & satisfactory access:										
Cars: Yes 3; No 1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Pedestrians: Yes 3; No 1	1	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3
Cycles: Yes 3; No -1	1	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3
Distance on foot to bus stop										
580m or less 3; more 1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Distance on foot to LM primary school										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	3	1	1	3	3	1	3	3	1
Distance on foot to surgery										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1
Distance on foot to Coop/Budgens										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1
Sufficient utilities capacity										
Yes 3; No 1										
Site affected by constraints:										
measured under impacts below										
Impacts										
For each impact occurring: 1 = direct; 2 =										
indirect/partial; 3 = none										
Site extends beyond defensible boundary &										
offers no new defensible boundary	2	1	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	2
Conservation Area	1	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1
Special Landscape Area	1	3	1	1	3	3	1	3	3	1

Assessment Criteria/Sites	**Q1**	**C1**	**D1**	**M1**	**A1**	**L1**	**N1**	**R1**	**J1**	**K1**
Built Up Area Boundary	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	3	3	1
Ancient Woodland	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
County Wildlife Sites	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Flood risk high, Zone 3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Local Nature Reserves	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Protected Species*										
SSSI	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Agric land quality: Grades 1 and 2 (out of 5)	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2
Historic Gardens	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Listed Buildings	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	2
Sched Anc Monuments	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Historic Environmental Record (not assessed)										
Open spaces, playing fields, greens, allots	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
(now NPPF) **										
Transport capacity; no data available										
Neighbouring uses: compatible w res devt 3;	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
incompatible 1										
Utilities, pipeline, STW; to check with										
undertakings										
Total score	47	58	54	52	67	67	60	66	65	51
Rank	31	13	19=	23=	1=	1=	9	3=	5	26
	Q1	C1	D1	M1	A1	L1	N1	R1	J1	K1
Table 2c										
Assessment Criteria/Sites	**C2**	**P1**	**G1**	**W1**	**C3**	**SS0967**	**SS0811**	**SS0557**	**SS1028**	**H10**
Brownfield 3/greenfield 1	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Safe & satisfactory access:										
Cars: Yes 3; No 1	3	3	3	3	1	0	0	3	0	1
Pedestrians: Yes 3; No 1	3	3	1	3	3	0	0	3	0	3
Cycles: Yes 3; No -1	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	3	0	3
Distance on foot to bus stop										
580m or less 3; more 1	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	1	3	3
Distance on foot to LM primary school										
1150m or less 3; more 1	3	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	3
Distance on foot to surgery										
1150m or less 3; more 1	3	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	3
Distance on foot to Coop/Budgens										
1150m or less 3; more 1	3	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	3
Sufficient utilities capacity										

Assessment Criteria/Sites	**C2**	**P1**	**G1**	**W1**	**C3**	**SS0967**	**SS0811**	**SS0557**	**SS1028**	**H10**
Yes 3; No 1										
Site affected by constraints:										
measured under impacts below										
Impacts										
For each impact occurring: 1 = direct; 2 = indirect/partial; 3 = none										
Site extends beyond defensible boundary & offers no new defensible boundary	3	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	1
Conservation Area	2	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Special Landscape Area	1	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1
Built Up Area Boundary	1	3	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	1
Ancient Woodland	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
County Wildlife Sites	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1
Flood risk high, Zone 3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Local Nature Reserves	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
Protected Species*										
SSSI	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Agric land quality: Grades 1 and 2 (out of 5)	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3
Historic Gardens	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Listed Buildings	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3
Sched Anc Monuments	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Historic Environmental Record (not assessed)										
Open spaces, playing fields, greens, allots (now NPPF) **	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Transport capacity; no data available										
Neighbouring uses: compatible w res devt 3; incompatible 1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Utilities, pipeline, STW; to check with undertakings										
Total score	63	66	62	52	61	48	49	56	50	56
Rank	6	3=	7	23=	8	30	29	15=	27=	15=
	C2	P1	G1	W1	C3	SS0967	SS0811	SS0557	SS1028	H10

Table 2d										
Assessment Criteria/Sites	**S1**	**F2**	**W2**							
Brownfield 3/greenfield 1	1	1	3							
Safe & satisfactory access:										
Cars: Yes 3; No 1	1	1	3							
Pedestrians: Yes 3; No 1	1	3	3							
Cycles: Yes 3; No -1	1	3	3							
Distance on foot to bus stop										
580m or less 3; more 1	3	3	3							
Distance on foot to LM primary school										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	1	1							
Distance on foot to surgery										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	1	1							
Distance on foot to Coop/Budgens										
1150m or less 3; more 1	1	1	1							
Sufficient utilities capacity										
Yes 3; No 1										
Site affected by constraints:										
measured under impacts below										
Impacts										
For each impact occurring: 1 = direct; 2 = indirect/partial; 3 = none										
Site extends beyond defensible boundary & offers no new defensible boundary	1	1	3							
Conservation Area	3	3	2							
Special Landscape Area	1	1	1							
Built Up Area Boundary	1	1	1							
Ancient Woodland	3	3	3							
County Wildlife Sites	3	3	3							
Flood risk high, Zone 3	3	3	3							
Local Nature Reserves	2	3	3							
Protected Species*										
SSSI	3	3	3							
Agric land quality: Grades 1 and 2 (out of 5)	3	3	3							
Historic Gardens	3	3	2							
Listed Buildings	3	3	2							
Sched Anc Monuments	3	3	3							
Historic Environmental Record (not assessed)										

Assessment Criteria/Sites	S1	F2	W2							
Open spaces, playing fields, greens, allots (now NPPF) **	3	3	3							
Transport capacity; no data available										
Neighbouring uses: compatible w res devt 3; incompatible 1	2	3	3							
Utilities, pipeline, STW; to check with undertakings										
Total score	47	53	56							
Rank	31=	22	15=							
	S1	F2	W2							

The strategic evaluation identified ten sites which scored 7, 8 or 9 out of 9 possible points; all but one scored 9 points. However, in six of these cases the owner has not supported the site being brought forward. Three of the remaining four sites (A1, L1 and G1) scored 57 or more points against the detailed criteria (out of a potential total of 69 points). These sites are small brownfield sites well within the built-up area. The fourth site scored 54 points and is considered suitable for allocation. These sites add up to 25 dwellings.

In line with the approach of taking into account factors other than the evaluation by points, consideration has been given to a further site, which has a particular justification: K1 is owned by a charity which is working with a developer to have the site developed wholly for affordable housing. The site scores poorly on the strategic criteria (4 points), being greenfield and at some distance from the village facilities. Given that sites for affordable housing often have to be in cheaper, off-centre locations and given the purpose of the developer, it is considered a site to be supported for allocation, subject to conditions. The site is appropriate for designation as a Rural Exception Site. The potential capacity is about 30 dwellings, making a total of 55 dwellings with the four sites previously identified.

Three further sites come into play if the threshold on the strategic assessment is lowered to 6 points, but in two cases (H8 and C3) the owner has not supported the allocation of the site. The third site (C1) is a small part of the proposed Skylark Field development, where an appeal is pending, and the owner is unwilling to consider a scale and nature of development that might be acceptable in the Plan (see Policy H9). Finally, in the quest for housing capacity within the parish the NPSG looked at sites that would maintain and reinforce the linear character of Long Melford. One site, F1 on the west side of Rodbridge Hill, has been considered suitable for allocation. This site, subject to detailed layout, could accommodate some 30 dwellings, which would make the total capacity of the sites to be allocated 85.