

Alford Neighbourhood Plan



Housing Site Assessment Methodology



**A vision for this
Lincolnshire Market Town**



Housing Site Assessment Methodology

Alford is defined as a town in the East Lindsey Core Strategy-Submissions Modifications Draft's "Strategic Policy 1 (SP1) – A Sustainable Pattern of Places", and East Lindsey District Council's Core Strategy establishes that the town of Alford should provide sufficient land to build a minimum of 161 dwellings within the plan period (2016-2031). According to the calculations of East Lindsey District Council (ELDC) as at 1st March 2017, existing commitments amounted to 95 homes with planning permission, leaving a requirement of 66 homes to be found for the relevant plan period. From the 1st March 2017 until the finalisation of the Allocation Policy, planning applications for a further 110 dwellings were granted permission, adding to the existing commitment identified by ELDC. This effectively means that the minimum requirement of 161 dwellings to be developed in Alford within the Local Plan period has already been reached and exceeded by 44 units

To promote sustainable development in the town, support redevelopment of brownfield sites and deliver necessary affordable homes, the Alford Neighbourhood Plan decided to allocate additional residential sites. To ensure the most appropriate sites that would benefit the future development of the Town are prioritised, the Steering Group prepared the following methodology and criteria.

A list of all potential sites within the town was compiled from those identified by East Lindsey District Council as possibilities for future housing development in the "Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2012", together with others identified by the Alford Neighbourhood Plan Group / Committee. Each site on the list was scored against the set of criteria set out in the table below.

Besides each element is a "weighting factor" or "measure of importance" out of 20, which indicates the importance the group felt each particular criterion should carry. The group then made judgements about how much each potential site matched up to these criteria, awarding marks from 0-4 depending how well or otherwise they met the criteria (see the descriptors for each score for each criterion) below. The higher the mark the better the site met the demands of the criteria. These scores were achieved through group consensus, after considered and often protracted, but at all times, constructive debate. The marks were then multiplied by the "importance multiplier" to give a weighted score for each criterion. The marks for each site were then totalled. The higher the overall score for the site, the higher up the "priority order" it came for development.

As far as was practical, landowners of each allocated site within the plan were contacted to confirm the "deliverability" of their particular site.

ANP Housing Assessment Weighted Criteria Explanation

| Important Criteria | Justification for criteria | Measure of Importance (Multiplier) |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Brownfield Site/ Greenfield Site | ANPG is in agreement that the prioritising of brownfield sites for development is the most important criteria. This is reflected in comments made at public consultations, and reflects National Government policy. | 20 |
| Safeguarding of conservation area, listed/important buildings & natural features. | Developments in or next to the conservation area can have an adverse effect on the conservation status of that area. Nearby development can also have an adverse effect on listed/important buildings & valued natural features/amenities. Careful design of property could mitigate some of this risk. | 18 |
| Visual & Environmental impact. | The entrances to the town are important and any development should not have a negative impact on views of the town as you enter it. This is reflected in comments made at public consultations. In addition open and attractive views within, across and out of the town should be protected. Developments should have no negative impact on their immediate environment. | 15 |
| Connectivity | The ability to enhance connections between various areas of the town in terms of walking, cycling and road traffic. | 15 |
| Proximity to Town Centre | Residents, particularly the elderly, on developments too far from the town centre, have complained about feeling isolated. This is reflected in comments made at public consultations. Development closer to the town centre will encourage sustainable journeys, enhance the sense of community & encourage use of town centre shops. | 10 |
| Traffic, Transport & Access | A new development can affect the movement of traffic through the town e.g. the need to turn right into a development could cause traffic & road safety problems. Access to and from a site for vehicles and pedestrians needs careful consideration. | 10 |
| Geographical balance across the town | Due to a good deal of development to the west & south of town, the Market Place, the historic town centre, is no longer so centrally placed. New development to the east & north would address this issue. This is reflected in comments made at public consultations. The infill of town centre areas would also be an advantage. | 5 |

ANP Housing Matrix Scoring Criteria Descriptors

| Brownfield Site/ Greenfield Site | |
|---|--------------------------|
| ANPG is in agreement that the prioritising of brownfield sites for development is the most important criteria. This is reflected in comments made at public consultations, and reflects National Government policy. | |
| Score | Descriptor |
| | |
| 4 | > 75% brownfield |
| 3 | 50% < x ≤ 75% brownfield |
| 2 | 25% < x ≤ 50% brownfield |
| 1 | 0% < x ≤ 25% brownfield |
| 0 | 100% greenfield |

| Safeguarding of conservation area, listed/important buildings & natural features/ amenities including open/green spaces | |
|---|--|
| Developments in or next to the conservation area can have an adverse effect on the conservation status of that area. Nearby development can also have an adverse effect on listed/important buildings & valued natural features/amenities. Careful design of property could mitigate some of this risk. | |
| Score | Descriptor |
| | |
| 4 | Would have a positive impact on Conservation Area, or on listed/important buildings or natural features |
| 3 | Would have no impact/a neutral impact on Conservation Area, listed/important buildings and/or natural features including open / green spaces |
| 2 | Would have a minor negative impact on Conservation Area, listed/important buildings and/or natural features |
| 1 | Would have a significant negative impact on Conservation Area, listed/important buildings and/or natural features |
| 0 | Would have an unacceptably negative impact on Conservation Area, listed/important buildings and/or natural features |

| Visual & Environmental impact | |
|---|---|
| The entrances to the town are important and any development should not have a negative impact on views of the town as you enter it. This is reflected in comments made at public consultations. In addition open and attractive views within, across and out of the town should be protected. Developments should have no negative impact on their immediate environment. | |
| Score | Descriptor |
| | |
| 4 | Would have no negative impact or a positive impact on the views of the town both approaching and from within the town, and/or would improve the surrounding environment. |
| 3 | Would have only a slightly negative impact on the views of the town on approaches and/or from within the town, and/or make some improvement to the surrounding environment. |
| 2 | Would have some negative impact on the views of the town on approaches and/or from within the town but would neither enhance nor improve the surrounding area. |
| 1 | Would have a serious and/or significant negative impact on the views of the town on approaches and/or from within the town, and/or on the surrounding environment. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 0 | Would have an unacceptably detrimental impact on the views of the town on approaches and/or from within the town, and/or on the surrounding environment. |
|---|--|

| Connectivity | |
|---|---|
| The ability to enhance connections between various areas of the town in terms of walking, cycling and road traffic. | |
| Score | Descriptor |
| 4 | Significantly improves walking, cycling and/or road connections between areas of the town. |
| 3 | Would make a positive contribution to improving walking, cycling and/or road connections between areas of the town. |
| 2 | Would make some contribution to improving walking, cycling and/or road connections between areas of the town. |
| 1 | Would make a small contribution to improving walking, cycling and/or road connections between areas of the town. |
| 0 | Would make no contribution to improving walking, cycling and/or road connections between areas of the town. |

| Proximity to Town Centre | |
|--|---|
| Residents, particularly the elderly, on developments too far from the town centre, have complained about feeling isolated. This is reflected in comments made at public consultations. Development closer to the town centre will encourage sustainable journeys, enhance the sense of community & encourage use of town centre shops. | |
| Score | Descriptor |
| 4 | Less than 250 metres walking distance from town centre (Market Place) |
| 3 | Between 250 metres and 499 metres walking distance from town centre (Market Place) |
| 2 | Between 500 metres and 749 metres walking distance from town centre (Market Place) |
| 1 | Between 750 metres and 1 kilometre walking distance from town centre (Market Place) |
| 0 | More than 1 kilometre walking distance from town centre (Market Place) |

| Traffic, Transport & Access | |
|--|--|
| A new development can affect the movement of traffic through the town e.g. the need to turn right into a development could cause traffic & road safety problems. Access to and from a site for vehicles and pedestrians needs careful consideration. | |
| Score | Descriptor |
| 4 | Development has no effect on traffic flow and access is satisfactory. |
| 3 | Development would cause a slight impediment to traffic flow and/or access is slightly restricted. |
| 2 | Development would cause some impediment to traffic flow and/or access is restricted to some degree. |
| 1 | Development would cause a serious and/or significant impediment to traffic flow and/or access is seriously restricted. |
| 0 | Development would cause an unacceptable impediment to traffic flow and/or access would be unacceptably restricted. |

| Geographical balance across the town | |
|--|--|
| Due to a good deal of development to the west & south of town, the Market Place, the historic town centre, is no longer so centrally placed. New development to the east & north would address this issue. This is reflected in comments made at public consultations. The infill of town centre areas would also be an advantage. | |
| Score | Descriptor |
| 4 | Development is central, to the east or north of the town or has no impact on the existing imbalance. |
| 3 | Development would cause a slight exacerbation of the imbalance of the town to the west or south |
| 2 | Development would cause some exacerbation of the imbalance of the town to the west or south |
| 1 | Development would seriously and/or significantly exacerbate the imbalance of the town to the west or south |
| 0 | Development would unacceptably exacerbate the imbalance of the town to the west or south |