

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Pennsylvania Lane – Brook Meadows CO5 0UD
Reference number	TIP03 (CO19)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	11.17 Ha (335 dwellings stated).
Proposed use/s	Residential, affordable housing, open space
Site Owner	Mrs J Bonnet, 67 Maldon Road
Agent / Promoter	Granville Developments/ John Finch Partnership

Planning history / context
<p>This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.</p> <p>Adjacent to sites TIP01, TIP21, TIP32 so may need to be considered as part of a composite-site/area if this site progresses. Located on the western boundary of the existing village envelope towards the Grange Road Pits area.</p> <p>Note that TIP32 granted permission for 7 properties in 2017 (former Brook House site)</p> <p>There are no previous planning applications or permissions for TIP03 apart from a 2001 application to relocate Tiptree United FC which was refused.</p>

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>11.17x30x0.85 = 285 houses</i>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	A	Mapping	There is direct access to Pennsylvania Lane and also via Brook Meadows which is a formed cul-de-sac off Maldon Road, but Pennsylvania Lane is a restricted byway, being a footpath to the north and a private road to the south. Perry Road and Brook Meadows are both narrow local residential roads – 285 houses.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Call for sites Submission 2014. Proforma states site is under option by a developer.	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Single	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	No	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

There are no major issues identified but site is currently under option to a developer (dated 2014).

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner		
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	None identified	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) highlights the 'Farm Wildlife Package' as being relevant to this site.	
3.4	If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	None mentioned in proforma	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base	None identified	

3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	805m to Tiptree Heath and St. Luke's both without capacity.	
3.9	Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable capacity forecast shows a surplus capacity.	
3.10	Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions? G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal	No. Search of Colchester Planning site using post code of nearest landmarks (Ship Inn CO5 0PQ and Tiptree Heath School CO5 0PB) didn't highlight any items of concern.	
3.11	Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?	G		None known	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) 'Farm Wildlife Package' is relevant to this site.

No site in Tiptree has been selected as part of the Replacement Waste Plan. This can be confirmed for Tiptree as a whole.

Tiptree Heath School, the nearest primary, lacks capacity whereas Baynards and Milldene, which are much further away, have capacity, this could increase the 'school run' problems.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Adjacent to existing boundary	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	It will make proximity closer to settlement area that is currently separated by Pennsylvania Lane	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	A	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Via Pennsylvania Lane restricted byway (which is a narrow lane / private road) or Perry Road / Brook Meadows narrow residential road hardly suitable for 285x2 cars.	

4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites proforma	Proforma states all available, but as it is greenfield with no direct connection to Maldon Road and the brownfield sites with habitation in Pennsylvania Lane are missing gas and sewerage, the issue could be understated. Pennsylvania lane is part private road and entirely restricted byway, Blue Road is private and a significant part of Brook meadows is unadopted.	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites proforma, mapping, site visit	None identified	
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites proforma, mapping, site visit	Currently farmland so assumed Greenfield.	
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Magic Map Grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	A	Call for Sites proforma, mapping, site visit	May impact Pennsylvania Lane as a quiet country lane and footpath.	

4.9	<p>Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area?</p> <p>G – Yes R – No</p>	G	TPC response to call for sites	On west side of village and in area considered for potential development and/or possible location for trunk road to remove traffic from village centre.	!
4.10	<p>Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits?</p> <p>G – Yes R – No</p>	A	Feedback from village surveys	Location E deemed middle preference	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	Borders onto Gravel Pit and is part of Co10 Inworth Grange Pits (TL885159) area as identified on local wildlife sites. This area has recently been added to Co10.	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Borders onto Gravel Pit and is part of Co10 Inworth Grange Pits (TL885159) area as identified on local wildlife sites. This area has recently been added to Co10.	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	No	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	A	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	PRoW transgresses this site and block current open space views for those currently living close to settlement boundary. Pennsylvania Lane on one side and footpaths on other boundaries.	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	River Water Flood map doesn't highlight any risk.	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Large area near the course of the brook in Brook Meadows is considered high/medium risk	
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>	A	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Will impact views from Pennsylvania Lane as a quiet country lane and footpath	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping, bus timetables	Nearest bus stop is at the junction of Spring Road and Station Road. Distance is 482m from middle of Brook Meadows.	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	Distance to Kelvedon Station is 3.6miles (5,796m)	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	Distance to Tiptree Heath is 0.5miles (804m)	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	A	Mapping	Distance to Thurstable is 0.8 miles (1,287m)	

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	Distance to Medical Centre is .6 miles (965 m)	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	Uses same distance to Medical Centre i.e. .6 miles (965 m)	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	Distance to Tiptree Jam Factory is .7 miles (1,126m) or village centre 965m	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	Distance to Thyme Road / Caxton Close is 0.5miles (805m), but large site so it is likely.	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	Distance to Windmill Green is .6mile (965m)	
------	--	---	---------	---	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

This site may have issues in relation to proximity to Pennsylvania Lane and Gravel Pits. Access could be a problem given restricted byway, private roads and part adopted roads, Perry Road is a narrow local road hardly suitable for a large increase in vehicles. This could be alleviated by combination with neighbouring sites.

This site could be considered in relation to TIP01,09,27 and possibly TIP12 to accommodate a large number of dwellings.

However, this site was included in a Local Wildlife Site during a re-assessment in 2015 and has become a part of Co10, on account of rare species. The Local Plan and National Planning Policy is not to build on a Local Wildlife Site, which rules this site out.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Oak Road CO5 0NS
Reference number	TIP04 (CO20)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	2.686 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential, affordable housing, open space
Site Owner	Mrs J Bonnet, 67 Maldon Road
Agent / Promoter	Granville Developments/ John Finch Partnership

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

Adjacent to **TIP17** (also referred to as Oak Road) so may need to be considered as part of a composite-site/area if this site progresses.

Located on the northern boundary of the existing village envelope towards Messing. It is close to Baynards Primary School.

There are no previous planning applications or permissions for this site.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>2.686x30x0.85 = 68 houses CBC pro-forma states 25-30</i>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public	G	Mapping	There is direct access to Oak Road between No.32 and the Oak

	highway?			PH. Exact width for suitable creation of entrance road would need to be checked.
--	----------	--	--	--

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Promoted by Granville Developments and John Finch Partnership	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Sole Owner- Mrs J Bonnet of 67 Maldon Road, Tiptree	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Currently in agricultural use	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

No issues with respect to availability

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner		
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Looking at map and site entrance area to Oak Road there does not appear to be any obvious dependency on another site if developed in isolation	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Baynards	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G			

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

Healthcare and education capacity considerations common to all sites considered under SLAA process therefore site classed at GREEN

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Site adjacent to current settlement boundary	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	Would result in extension of the village boundary towards Messing village but not significantly so	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	There is direct access to Oak Road between No.32 and the Oak PH. Exact width for suitable creation of entrance road and sight lines would need to be checked	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Assumption that as utilities are provided to other properties along Oak Road that there would not be a problem to extend services to TIP04. Capacity at sewage works TBC	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Telegraph pole to side of entrance track. Unlikely to limit development.	

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Currently greenfield and in agricultural use	
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	A	Magic	Agricultural land classification 3	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	1.	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites		!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	G	Feedback from village surveys	Location A	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	LWS – Eden Wood (Co13) is to the north of the site, potentially ancient woodland. Privately owned. Development of CO4 unlikely to cause harm. Nearby but not adjoining The northern part of the site is within “Woodland Priority Habitat Network No other designations are apparent.	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	Historic Environment Characterisation Report refers to Tiptree Heath and Tiptree Urban Area but it is not obvious if development of this site will have any impact	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PROW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	OS map shows path around the west and north of the site but not clear if this is a PROW, bridleway, etc. site visit required. As path is around the outside of site have assumed would not prohibit development	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	View from gardens of properties along north side of Oak Road would be affected. Unlikely to be a factor to prevent development	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1 mile	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1 mile	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	965m to Business Park	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	321m to Walnut Tree Way play area	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	Nearest public open space is Windmill Green which is less than 800m away	
------	--	---	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability
Overall classification Amber – distance to village centre

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

--

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Grove Road
Reference number	TIP05 (CO55)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	1.4 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mr & Mrs V Pomphrett, Oakfield House, Grove Road
Agent / Promoter	BDG Design (South) Limited

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

There are previous planning applications related to change of use of outbuildings.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	R	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>Proposed 4 houses</i>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	Set back from Grove Road therefore not adjacent to existing village boundary
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public	G	Mapping	There is direct access on to Grove Road.

	highway?			
--	----------	--	--	--

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	R	
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development		Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)		Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?		Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	<i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping		
3.3	<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx</p>		Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>		Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?		Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)		GP Capacity Info	[refer to separate report]	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>		Call for Sites proforma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>				

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

--

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
	Physical constraints				
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?		Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?		Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?		Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC		
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?		Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)		Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)		Magic		
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?		Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No		TPC response to call for sites		!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No		Feedback from village surveys		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0		Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?		Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m		Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m		Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m		Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
------	--	--	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	West End Road
Reference number	TIP07 (CO73)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	1.95 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mr Anthony Eden, West End House, West End Road
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

Currently part developed with bungalow, garages and wooden stables. In use as equine paddocks. Immediately adjacent to TIP13 (Nurseries Field). Landowners appear to be working together.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>1.95 x 30 x 0.85 = 49 houses</i> <i>Proforma states 24 larger properties plus affordable</i>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public	G	Mapping	There is direct access to West End Road. Exact width for suitable

	highway?			creation of entrance road would need to be checked.
--	----------	--	--	---

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	R	At a later call for sites round in 2017, this site became joined up.
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma	Submitted by owner	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Single	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Submitted by owner for development	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

There are no major issues identified.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	All utilities available to site <i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	no	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) highlights the 'Farm Wildlife Package' as being relevant to this site.	

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites proforma	None mentioned in proforma	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites proforma & Local Plan evidence base	None identified	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Tiptree heath - no	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable - yes	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal	No. Search of Colchester Planning site using didn't highlight any items of concern.	
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G		None known	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) 'Farm Wildlife Package' is relevant to this site.

No site in Tiptree has been selected as part of the Replacement Waste Plan. This can be confirmed for Tiptree as a whole.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	R	Mapping	Outside existing boundary, but connected via other sites	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	No	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Via West End Road	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No.	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None identified	

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Agriculture. Greenfield	
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	No issues identified.	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites	West	
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	Location E	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	None identified. <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	None identified <i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	No <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	No risk shown	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Surface Water Flood map doesn't highlight any risk.	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Open land	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables	Assumed that nearest bus stop is Ship Inn Distance is 0.2m (322m)	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	Distance to Kelvedon Station is 4.4 miles (7,084m)	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	Distance to Tiptree Heath is 0.4 miles (644m)	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	R	Mapping	Distance to Thurstable is 1.4 miles (2,254m)	

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	Distance to Medical Centre is 1.3miles (2,093m)	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	Uses same distance to Medical Centre i.e. 1.3miles (2,093m)	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	Distance to Tiptree Jam Factory is 1.3 miles (2,093m) or village centre	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	Distance to Caxton Close is 1770m	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	West End Road is open space	
------	--	---	---------	-----------------------------	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

No major issues identified.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

--

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available
A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty
R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Kelvedon Road (Land between The Gables-Stourton) CO5 0LU
Reference number	TIP08 (C074)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	1.6 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mr N T Clayton, 3 Langlaagte Terrace, St Andrews Road, Knodishall, Saxmundham
Agent / Promoter	Owner developer

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

There are no previous planning applications. The site partially adjoins the northern section of an application for Vine Farm which has exiting planning permission for 48 homes and is also within the wider area of TIP33. No title deeds submitted. Also close to TIP15, TIP16 and TIP48

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1, low risk of surface water flooding on Kelvedon Road
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	$1.6 \times 30 \times 0.85 = 40$ $1.6 \times 7 \times 30 = 33$
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	No
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	No
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	There is direct access on to Kelvedon Road.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	This site in conjunction with the north Grange Road site (TIP20) that has current planning permission and suitable layout and TIP15 might provide part of a north-western relief road for Tiptree to avoid increasing amounts of traffic at the Vine Road / Kelvedon Road junction, which has poor sight lines and are further exacerbated by proximity to Baynards school. An opportunity to enhance foot/cycle way.
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	The owner is currently developing residential property in Suffolk.	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	A	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	3 part owners and other owners support proposal. (2 have same surname).	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Stated immediately available for development.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

On the basis of the call for sites form, it is available.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	Mains water. No electricity, gas, landline / broadband, query sewerage. No streetlighting in the area.	Close to main road all should be easily achievable
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Unsure of access to public highway.	Site against highway's verge, so no obvious problem
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	No	
3.4	If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	Currently grazing land, no apparent reason why it shouldn't change use.	

	Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0				
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Unsure	Unlikely as used for Grazing
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base	No	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info	No, needs expansion of £820,00 already and additional £933,000 forecast. Top 20 need now, top 9 need of 103 in 2021.	
3.8	Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Baynards / Milldene – Yes, St. Luke’s / Tiptree Heath marginally no	
3.9	Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable School - Yes	

3.10	Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions? G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?	G		Part of the site might be needed to improve the connection of Grange and Kelvedon Roads to improve safety for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists at the existing junction.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s achievability

No insurmountable problems apart from problems in Tiptree generally.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
	Physical constraints				
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Yes, on Kelvedon Road within the village envelope	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	No	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Kelvedon Road. No	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	On a main road in Tiptree	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Grazing land	

4.7	<p>What is the agricultural land classification?</p> <p>G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more)</p> <p>A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories)</p> <p>R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)</p>	A	Magic	<p>This land is on the boundary of grade 2 and 3. Magic map no longer includes the garidings on its map and offers a download because of concerns about the mapping. This land has not been cultivated for a long time, being a small irregular shaped grazing plot between to domestic properties. Hence Amber.</p>	
4.8	<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?</p>	G	<p>Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit</p>	<p>None apparent prior to site visit.</p>	
4.9	<p>Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>	G	<p>TPC response to call for sites</p>		!
4.10	<p>Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>	G	<p>Feedback from village surveys</p>		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Farmland Wildlife Package Area; Nitrate Vulnerable zone – surface water; Drinking Water (Surface Water) Protected and Safeguard Areas; Farmland Birds.	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report		
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No designated open space, no Prow, no bridleway.	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1.	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Low risk of surface water flooding on Kelvedon Road between Vine Road and Oak Road. Any loss of bare land will contribute to surface water flooding unless adequate drainage measures are undertaken.	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	None stated, unlikely.	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping, bus timetables	160m to number 91 service, but not particularly frequent. 600m to number 75 service. All of Tiptree could benefit from a more regular service to the railway stations in Kelvedon and Witham.	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	4500m from northern limit of Tiptree.	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	350m to Baynards with capacity	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping	800m to Thurstable	
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1448m to Medical Centre. A second facility to the north of the village would provide some balance.	

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1448m to The Centre.	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	321m to Business Park	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	643m to Trees Estate playground.	
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	321m to Windmill Green. A new park in the NW of Tiptree would offer an alternative walking and recreation area and take pressure off Tiptree heath.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

This site is close to Baynards School which has capacity and in conjunction with TIP48 and TIP15 and current developments, would be suitable for development, affording an opportunity to develop a spine road that would connect to Kelvedon Road, hence bypassing the current difficult Vine / Grange Road junction with Kelvedon Road and reduce traffic near Baynards School. With improvements at the Tiptree Road junction with Braxted Park Road, a NW bypass for Tiptree could be created for traffic from the west wanting to reach the A12 in the Colchester direction, avoiding it passing Tiptree Heath (a difficult car park to exit) and feeding along Maldon Road and the junction at Windmill Green.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available
A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty
R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Bull Lane (22) CO5 0BG
Reference number	TIP10/C113
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	3.05 HA
Proposed use/s	Residential and Affordable Housing
Site Owner	Mr D. Clough
Agent / Promoter	Edward Gittins / EG Associates

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

No recent planning on site. No title deeds submitted.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1, some low risk of surface water flooding.
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	3.05x.85x30=77 3.05x.7x30=64 Stated up to 100
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	No
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	No
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	A	Mapping	Bull Lane, nature of road. 2003 planning doubts about the suitability of adding a single extra house nearby – application refused.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	No
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	No
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		No

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	A	Access point needs to be carefully chosen, Bull Lane has approx. 20 properties and Brookland approx. 40 properties. Possibly some road widening at the access point to enhance safety, consideration of retaining hedge to keep local character.
Stage 1B	G	Easy access to public transport, bus stop 2-5 minutes walking distance. Possible gains from removing chicken farm and provided much needed public open space / play equipment in south of Tiptree.

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Has agent / promoter	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Current use is Chicken Farm and Grazing (Proforma). Submitted by owner for development. Bull Lane Livery is enveloped by TIP10.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

Impact on Bull Lane Livery will need to be determined.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	All utilities available <i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Bull Lane Livery may be impacted.	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) highlights the 'Farm Wildlife Package' as being relevant to this site.	

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	Employment Land Needs Report suggests there is no available employment land in Tiptree	
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites proforma	Proforma states NO	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites proforma & Local Plan evidence base	None identified	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Tiptree heath - no	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable - yes	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	A	Call for Sites proforma & CBC planning portal	Bull Lane, nature of road. 2003 planning doubts about the suitability of adding a single extra house nearby – application refused	
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G		None identified	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

No Major issues but some concerns re access off Bull Lane (or need to widen access road) plus possible impact to Bull Lane Livery.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Within current settlement boundary	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	A	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Bull Lane – Road already used for access to households e.g. Brookland	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Within settlement area and surrounded by dwellings.	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Proximity to Bull Lane Livery although not part of TIP10	
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Chicken Farm, Grazing	

4.7	<p>What is the agricultural land classification?</p> <p>G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more)</p> <p>A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories)</p> <p>R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)</p>	G	Magic	Predominately urban	
4.8	<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Site already surrounded by dwellings and within settlement area.	
4.9	<p>Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>	A	TPC response to call for sites	South	
4.10	<p>Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>	R	Feedback from village surveys	Location D	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	Site already surrounded by dwellings and within settlement area <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	No <i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	No <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	None	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Removal of grazing field will impact views but removal of chicken farm will improve views and reduce odour.	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables	322m	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	6601m	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	644m	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	A	Mapping	1932m	
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1127m	

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	1127m to centre of village	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	804m to Jam Factory	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	804m to Caxton Close	
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1449m to Tiptree Heath	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

No issues with site but proximity to other items such as open space and play parks are AMBER and RED

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Grove Road
Reference number	TIP11 (C134)
Settlement	(a) 13.5 dwellings @ 30 dwellings per ha (b) 19.8 dwellings @ 30 dwellings per ha (Proforma states 8 to 10 houses)
Size	(a) 0.45ha - CBC Site List (b) 0.66ha - Proforma
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mrs D Morrall
Agent / Promoter	Edward Gittins & Associates

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

TIP 11 is in very close in proximity to TIP05, TIP22 and TIP23 which could suggest this site be considered as part of a composite area for development. The owners/status of the land in-between TIP11 and TIP05 is not known at this stage.

TIP11 borders onto the section of Grove Road that is a small country lane. Additional traffic could have a significant impact on safety without improvement of the road and provision of pavements for walkers and school children (who use the lane to get to Mildene School and Thurstable School).

Size of site needs to be agreed as CBC Site List and Proforma differ by space for 6 dwellings.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	NO. There are two different sizes provided (see above)
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	<p>Site outside but adjoins current boundary; using CBC Local Development Framework's proposal map (Oct 2010) for Tiptree.</p> <p>Site adjacent to other developments in Grove Road and opposite the Grove Road Estate.</p>

1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	<p><u>Landscape Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site.</p> <p><u>Historical Environment Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site other than generic statement on potential of below ground deposits in undeveloped areas (of which this is one).</p> <p><u>Wildlife Sites</u> No obvious reference to this site.</p>
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	Yes - Directly from Grove Road.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO. Search of Colchester Planning site did not highlight any current applications.
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	NO. CBC Planning Portal does not highlight any current planning applications. Magic does not highlight any concerns for this site.
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment	G		No.

	of this site would not be necessary?		
--	--------------------------------------	--	--

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	This site adjoins the eastern boundary limit of the current development area. It is in very close proximity to existing houses in Grove Road and is only separated from the Grove Road Estate by a small country road section of Grove Road. This site is very close to other proposed sites adjoin Grove Road such as TIP05, TIP22 and TIP23.
Stage 1B	G	No current planning applications or intended land use was identified.

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>Edward Gittins & associates.</i>	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	<i>Owned by Mrs D.Morrall</i>	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Immediately available	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	<i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Adjoins site TIP24 – should perhaps be considered as 1 large site	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	No restrictions on the site	
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	<i>Milldene yes</i>	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable yes	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites proforma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G		Site should be assessed along side site TIP24	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

--

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	A	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Grove Road – very narrow lane access better via other sites.	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	greenfield	
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	A	Magic	Grade 3	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Heritage lane	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	A	TPC response to call for sites	Location B. Sites in E, F, A graded Green as in North or West, all other sites graded Amber.	!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	sites in locations A & F have been graded Green; B & E graded Amber; C & D graded Red	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping, bus timetables	1.2KM TO CHEAP SHOP BUS STOP	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1.1KM TO MILLDENE	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	A	Mapping	.1.6KM	

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1.5KM	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	1.2KM TO CHEAP SHOP	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	804m to Alexander Cleghorn	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1.1KM TO GROVE PARK	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	260M Park Lane	
------	--	---	---------	----------------	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Ship Field, Maldon Road
Reference number	TIP12 (C146)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	3.33 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mrs Jane Grant, 18 Red Hill, Wateringbury, Maidstone and Mrs Susan Tod (nee Birkin)
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

There are no previous planning applications.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	$3.33 \times 30 \times 0.85 = 85$
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	There is direct access on to West End Road.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma	Call for Sites Submission 2014	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Proforma states co ownership with support from both co-owners	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Agriculture and market garden. Greenfield.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

No issues identified

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	All utilities are available to site according to proforma <i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	No	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) highlights the 'Farm Wildlife Package' as being relevant to this site.	

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites proforma	Proforma states No	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites proforma & Local Plan evidence base	None identified. Proforma states that a report by Haakon Property Services Ltd is available for more information.	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Tiptree heath - no	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable - yes	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites proforma & CBC planning portal	No. Search of Colchester Planning site using post code of nearest landmarks (Ship Inn CO5 0PQ and Tiptree Heath School CO5 0PB) didn't highlight any items of concern.	
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G		None identified.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) 'Farm Wildlife Package' is relevant to this site.

ECC Minerals Map is not detailed enough to see if this site is covered. This can be reviewed once for ALL of Tiptree rather than per site.

No site in Tiptree has been selected as part of the Replacement Waste Plan. This can be confirmed for Tiptree as a whole.

School capacity impact can be assessed for Tiptree (as a single exercise) or guidelines are needed as how forecast is to be calculated per site (if necessary).

Proforma states that a report by Haakon Property Services Ltd is available for more information (not available for this review).

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Outside current boundary but in close proximity to existing boundary.	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	From West End Road	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	No	

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Greenfield	
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	No issues identified.	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites	On west side of village and in area considered for potential development	
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	Location E	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	Close to Tiptree Heath and borders on Inworth Grange Pits (TL885159) but should not impact them directly <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Close to Tiptree Heath and borders on Inworth Grange Pits (TL885159) but should not impact them directly <i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	No <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	

4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRow, or a bridleway?	A	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	Public footpath enters at gateway and runs diagonally across site.	
4.15	Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	No	
4.16	Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere? Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Surface Water Flood map doesn't highlight any risk.	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Visible from private gardens and road. Gated entrance to site and PRow	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables	Tiptree Heath school	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	Nearest train stations are Kelvedon (4.1m - 6,598m) and Witham (6.4m -10,300m).	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	Tiptree Heath School is 300m.	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	A	Mapping	It is 1.2m (1931m) to Thurstable School.	

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	It is 1.0m (1609m) to Tiptree Medical Centre.	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	It is 1.0m (1609m) to Tiptree Medical Centre which is in centre of the village.	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	It is 1.0m (1609m) to Tiptree Medical Centre which is assumed to represent centre of the village. Distance measured using Google Maps (from Ship Inn). It is 1.8m (2896m) to Perrywoods and 0.9m (1448m) to Jam Factory. It is 10.1m (16,254m) to Colchester Town Hall which is assumed to represent centre of town.	

4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site)? G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1287m to Caxton Close	
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	It is assumed that Tiptree Heath is the nearest public open space/park. Distance is 0.4m (644m)	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

There does not appear to be any major obstacles to developing this site. If also joined with Peakes Close (TIP01,09 and 27 that can accommodate 500 dwellings) it is possible these areas combined could take the full quota of housing being imposed.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	West End Road, Nurseries Field
Reference number	TIP13 (CO147)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	1.66 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mrs Jane Grant, 18 Red Hill, Wateringbury, Maidstone
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

In use as grazing land. Immediately adjacent to TIP07 (West End Road). Landowners appear to be working together

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>1.6 x 30 x 0.85 = 42 houses</i> <i>Proforma states 20 larger properties plus affordable</i>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public	G	Mapping	There is direct frontage to West End Road.

	highway?			
--	----------	--	--	--

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	R	Since this assessment another call for sites 2017 has yielded sites that connect this site with the boundary.
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma	Submitted by owner	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Single	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Submitted by owner for development	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

There are no major issues identified.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	All utilities available to site <i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	no	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) highlights the 'Farm Wildlife Package' as being relevant to this site.	

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites proforma	None mentioned in proforma	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites proforma & Local Plan evidence base	None identified	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Tiptree heath - no	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable - yes	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal	No. Search of Colchester Planning site using didn't highlight any items of concern.	
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G		None known	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) 'Farm Wildlife Package' is relevant to this site.

No site in Tiptree has been selected as part of the Replacement Waste Plan. This can be confirmed for Tiptree as a whole.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	R	Mapping	Outside existing boundary, but connected via other sites	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	No	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Via West End Road	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No.	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None identified	

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Agriculture. Greenfield	
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	No issues identified.	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites	West	
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	Location E	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	None identified. <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	None identified <i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	No <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	No risk shown	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Surface Water Flood map doesn't highlight any risk.	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Open land	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables	Assumed that nearest bus stop is Ship Inn Distance is 0.2m (322m)	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	Distance to Kelvedon Station is 4.4 miles (7,084m)	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	Distance to Tiptree Heath is 0.4 miles (644m)	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	R	Mapping	Distance to Thurstable is 1.4 miles (2,254m)	

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	Distance to Medical Centre is 1.3miles (2,093m)	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	Uses same distance to Medical Centre i.e. 1.3miles (2,093m)	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	Distance to Tiptree Jam Factory is 1.3 miles (2,093m) or village centre	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	Distance to Caxton Close is 1770m	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	West End Road is open space	
------	--	---	---------	-----------------------------	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability
No major issues identified.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available
A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty
R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Waterworks, Grange Road (6 WW Cottages) CO5 0UG
Reference number	TIP15 / C166
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	None given / .838ha on area map. Now part of a 1.907ha plot comprising Essex & Suffolk Water land
Proposed use/s	Residential & Affordable Housing
Site Owner	Mr P Hiller
Agent / Promoter	Raymond Stemp Assocs

Planning history / context
This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.
6 Waterworks Cottages refused extension partly on grounds of open character of surrounding countryside, 2004. 2001 development on junction Grange Road and Windmill Hill refused, character and highway considerations (safety). 2000 Grange Road / Kelvedon Road, refusal of housing in employment area. No title deeds attached. Close to TIP08, TIP16 (both enclosed in TIP33) TIP48. Adjacent to north Grange Road site, which has planning permission for 48 houses.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1, surface water flooding site low, Grange Road low-high
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	.838x.85x30=21 .838x.7x30=17
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	No
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	No. Local lowland dry acid grassland, lowland meadows, HC11 – Other neutral grasslands, HC12 – heathland Acid grassland Fairy Flax (Essex Red Data List), Common Sedge (EDRL). Higher spatial priority woodland
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	Grange Road

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	No
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	No
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		No

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	Set back from Grange road to retain character of the area and to allow for any future road widening needed. Possible use as a part of a route to connect Grange Road directly to Kelvedon Road, avoiding difficult Grange/Vine Road junction with Kelvedon Road near Baynards School.
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Part of site owned by Essex & Suffolk Water, support stated.	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Stated available immediately	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

On the basis of the call for sites form, it is available.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	Mains water, electricity, landline / broadband, sewerage; query gas. No streetlighting in the area.	Close to road and developments underway should be achievable
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	States public highway available.	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	No	

3.4	If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use? Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	Currently vacant land, no apparent reason why it shouldn't change use.	
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base	No	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	R	GP Capacity Info	No, needs expansion of £820,00 already and additional £933,000 forecast. Top 20 need now, top 9 need of 103 in 2021.	
3.8	Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlaceinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Baynards / Milldene – Yes, St. Luke's / Tiptree Heath marginally no	

3.9	Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlaceinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable School - Yes	
3.10	Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions? G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal	No recent history.	
3.11	Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?	G		Part of the site might be needed to improve the connection of Grange and Kelvedon Roads to improve safety for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists at the existing junction.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

No insurmountable problems, except those of Tiptree in general.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Close to existing residential developments and outlying dwellings	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	No	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Could link to Grange Road directly.	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No, in an area were there are several outlying buildings and near to some current developments.	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Vacant parcel of land.	

4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	A	Magic	Grade 3, has not been cultivated for many years.	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites		!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	G	Feedback from village surveys		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Farmland Wildlife Package Area; Nitrate Vulnerable zone – surface water; Drinking Water (Surface Water) Protected and Safeguard Areas; Farmland Birds. Close to Hill Wood, but there are already dwellings closer. A small part of the site has been recorded: Local lowland dry acid grassland, lowland meadows, HC11 – Other neutral grasslands, HC12 – heathland Acid grassland Fairy Flax (Essex Red Data List), Common Sedge (EDRL). Higher spatial priority woodland.	The majority of the site is not designated.
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report		
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	A	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No designated open space. Footpath on eastern boundary.	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1.	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Low / medium / high risk of surface water flooding on Grange Road increasing eastwards towards the Football Training ground entrance. Any loss of bare land will contribute to surface water flooding unless adequate drainage measures are undertaken.	Development taking place further along the road with similar risk.
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	None stated, unlikely.	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping, bus timetables	500m to number 91 service, but not particularly frequent. 965m to number 75 service. All of Tiptree could benefit from a more regular service to the railway stations in Kelvedon and Witham.	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	4500m from northern limit of Tiptree.	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	650m to Baynards with capacity	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping	1125m to Thurstable	
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1770m to medical centre. A second facility to the north of the village would provide some balance.	

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1770m Village centre.	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	965m to Tiptree Business Park	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	800m to Trees Estate playground.	
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	643m Windmill Green. A new park in the NW of Tiptree would offer an alternative walking and recreation area and take pressure off Tiptree heath.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

This site is close to Baynards School which has capacity and in conjunction with TIP08 and TIP48 and current developments, would be suitable for development, affording an opportunity to develop a spine road that would connect to Kelvedon Road, hence bypassing the current difficult Vine / Grange Road junction with Kelvedon Road and reduce traffic near Baynards School. With improvements at the Tiptree Road junction with Braxted Park Road, a NW bypass for Tiptree could be created for traffic from the west wanting to reach the A12 in the Colchester direction, avoiding it passing Tiptree Heath (a difficult car park to exit) and feeding along Maldon Road and the junction at Windmill Green.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Towerend CO5 0LX
Reference number	TIP16 (C171)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	3.544 Ha
Proposed use/s	Multiple uses nominated
Site Owner	Mr Gary Carlile, Towerend, Kelvedon Road
Agent / Promoter	Strutt and Parker / Marden Homes

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

Currently domestic residential dwellings. Close to existing business area. No title deeds provided. Proposed use for residential / affordable housing / office / R&D / light industrial / general industrial / retail / community facilities / sports & leisure / open space. Minor planning application in 2006.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1, no significant surface water flooding risk shown.
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	3.544x0.85x30 = 90 3.544x0.70x30 = 74
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	No
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	No
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	There is direct access to Kelvedon Road.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	This site in conjunction with the north Grange Road site (TIP20) that has current planning permission and suitable layout and TIP15 might provide part of a north-western bypass for Tiptree and avoid increasing amounts of traffic at the Vine Road / Kelvedon Road junction, which has poor sight lines and are further exacerbated by proximity to Baynards school.
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Owner submitted. Strutt and Parker / Marden Homes promoting now.	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Single owner on form, no longer certain with enlarged area.	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	The owner states it is available for development immediately.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

Could enlarge current business area and provide leisure and local convenience stores. On the basis of the call for sites form, it is available.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	Mains water, electricity, landline / broadband, sewerage; no gas. No streetlighting in the area.	Close to road should be achievable
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	States public highway available.	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	No	
3.4	If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	Not applicable	

	Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0				
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base	No	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info	No, needs expansion of £820,00 already and additional £933,000 forecast. Top 20 need now, top 9 need of 103 in 2021.	
3.8	Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Baynards / Milldene – Yes, St. Luke’s / Tiptree Heath marginally no	
3.9	Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable School - Yes	

3.10	Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions? G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal	No recent history.	
3.11	Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?	G		Part of the site might be needed to improve the connection of Grange and Kelvedon Roads to improve safety for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists at the existing junction.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s achievability

No insurmountable problems, except those of Tiptree in general.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
	Physical constraints				
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Yes, on Kelvedon Road within the village envelope	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	No	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Kelvedon Road. No	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	On a main road in Tiptree	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Residential and outbuildings	

4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	A	Magic	Grade 3	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites	North and West	!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	G	Feedback from village surveys	Location F	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Farmland Wildlife Package Area; Nitrate Vulnerable zone – surface water; Drinking Water (Surface Water) Protected and Safeguard Areas; Farmland Birds.	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report		
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No designated open space, no Prow, no bridleway. Prow adjacent to SW boundary.	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1.	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Low risk of surface water flooding on Kelvedon Road between Vine Road and Oak Road. Any loss of bare land will contribute to surface water flooding unless adequate drainage measures are undertaken.	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	None stated of significant value, unlikely.	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping, bus timetables	100m to number 91 service, but not particularly frequent. 800m to number 75 service. All of Tiptree could benefit from a more regular service to the railway stations in Kelvedon and Witham.	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	4500m from northern limit of Tiptree.	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	321m to Baynards with capacity	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping	950m to Thurstable	
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1609m to Medical Centre. A second facility to the north of the village would provide some balance.	

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1609m to Centre.	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	321m to Business Park.	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	482m to Trees Estate playground.	
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	482m to Windmill Green. A new park in the NW of Tiptree would offer an alternative walking and recreation area and take pressure off Tiptree heath.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

This site is close to Baynards School which has capacity and in conjunction with TIP08 and TIP15 and current developments, would be suitable for development, affording an opportunity to develop a spine road that would connect to Kelvedon Road, hence bypassing the current difficult Vine / Grange Road junction with Kelvedon Road and reduce traffic near Baynards School. With improvements at the Tiptree Road junction with Braxted Park Road, a NW bypass for Tiptree could be created for traffic from the west wanting to reach the A12 in the Colchester direction, avoiding it passing Tiptree Heath (a difficult car park to exit) and feeding along Maldon Road and the junction at Windmill Green.

Could enlarge current business area and provide leisure and local convenience stores, parking for a commuter shuttle / shuttle to centre. Day time parking for business could double up as leisure parking in the evening.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Pennsylvania Lane Culver Farm CO5 0UD
Reference number	TIP18 (C199)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	4 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mr Andrew Bryant, Culver Farm, Pennsylvania Lane
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

There are previous planning applications related to the existing residential property on the site. The site is immediately opposite the CUFC Florence Park training facility. 2001 development on junction Grange Road and Windmill Hill refused, character and highway considerations (safety). Has restricted development.

Owners have indicated that will be working in conjunction with the owners of TIP34 which is immediately adjacent. Also adjacent to TIP45 and TIP55, close to TIP54.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1, low to medium surface water flooding risk on Pennsylvania Lane adjacent to linked site TIP34.
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<p>4x0.85x30 =102</p> <p>4x0.7x30 =84</p> <p>The application states 10+ Executive Properties.</p>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	It is a plot with a dwelling, but remote from other dwellings.
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	A	Mapping	There is direct access on to Pennsylvania Lane. Suitability for access will need to be assessed. Pennsylvania Lane is a restricted byway, which means no use by mechanically propelled vehicles.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	A	<p>Access via Pennsylvania Lane (single track) is dubious for a possibly large development. It is also near a bend in Grange Road, which is becoming busier with other approved developments. Site inspection would be important to establish whether a one-way system using the track between Vitkin farm and The Chalet might ameliorate any road safety issues. This would depend on other landowners, similarly a better access might be established near Vitkin Farm and Wind Mill Hill. The proposal is for 10+ executive style properties, which would considerably reduce vehicle pressure, but in that case an upper limit should be established.</p>
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Single owner	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Owner states it is available immediately	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

On the basis of the call for sites form, it is available.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RA G	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	Mains water, electricity, landline / broadband, no sewerage; no gas. No streetlighting in the area. Currently remote from major habitation.	There are other properties nearby, need to check sewerage
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	States public highway available.	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	No	
3.4	If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use? Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	Currently equestrian and residential. No apparent reason why it shouldn't change use.	

	http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0				
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base	No. Several sites proposed along Pennsylvania Lane, this one is nearest to Grange Road.	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info	No, needs expansion of £820,00 already and additional £933,000 forecast. Top 20 need now, top 9 need of 103 in 2021.	
3.8	Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Baynards (.6 mile) / Milldene – Yes, St. Luke’s / Tiptree Heath marginally no	
3.9	Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable School - Yes	
3.10	Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a	G	Call for Sites pro-	No recent history.	

	<p>history of unimplemented permissions? G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>		<p>forma & CBC planning portal</p>		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	A		<p>The site has restrictions on development. ApplicationNumber95/1362 ApplicationDate22/11/1995 - Change of Use AddressCulverdeck, Pennsylvania Lane, Tiptree CO5 0TU DescriptionChange of use of land from industry and agriculture to garden and menage and former agricultural building to stables and hay store DecisionApprove Conditional - 04/01/1996 DevelopmentType SiteArea0.498630688 RestrictionsWhen permitted development rights are removed certain work cannot be carried out to the building or land because the Council has removed normal rights to make changes without the need for planning permission. F/COL/06/1831 has a decision notice F/COL/02/1206 has a decision notice</p>	

<p>Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability</p>
<p>No insurmountable problems apart from problems in Tiptree generally.</p>

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
	Physical constraints				
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	A	Mapping	Close to existing residential developments, in the vicinity of a few isolated dwellings.	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	No	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	A	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Pennsylvania Lane and Grange Road. It would be better if the cluster of proposed sites to the west of Pennsylvania Lane could be joined to Grange Road by a new road rather than destroy a traditional country lane.	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma	No, it would be hoped that the cluster of proposed sites to the west of Pennsylvania Lane justify easy cost effective connection to main services.	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Equestrian and one residence.	

4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Predominately grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites	North and West	!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	Location E third most popular	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Farmland Wildlife Package Area; Nitrate Vulnerable zone – surface water; Drinking Water (Surface Water) Protected and Safeguard Areas; Farmland Birds.	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report		
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRow, or a bridleway?	A	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No designated open space. There is a footpath running through it and a restricted byway on the eastern boundary. Old byway pathway with considerable wildlife under a high hedge canopy popular with walkers. Sustrans cycle route.	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1.	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Some risk in this area. Any loss of bare land will contribute to surface water flooding unless adequate drainage measures are undertaken.	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	View from rear of Grange Road properties, other properties along Pennsylvania Lane, Harrington Close and Perry Road.	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping, bus timetables	800m to number 91 service, but not particularly frequent. 1126m to number 75 service. All of Tiptree could benefit from a more regular service to the railway stations in Kelvedon and Witham.	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	4500m from northern limit of Tiptree.	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	965m to Baynards with capacity	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	A	Mapping	1500m to Thurstable	
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1609m to Medical Centre. A second facility to the north of the village would provide some balance.	

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1609m to Centre.	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1287m to Business park	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1125m to Trees Estate playground.	
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	1126m to Windmill Green. A new park in the NW of Tiptree would offer an alternative walking and recreation area and take pressure off Tiptree Heath.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

TIP18, TIP34, TIP41 and TIP54 could form a useful development space. Care needs to be taken to maintain the character of Pennsylvania Lane as a path that residents can use to access open countryside from the central part of the village. As a block, instead of using Pennsylvania Lane as an access route it might prove possible to gain access to Grange Road nearer to Wind Mill Hill. Consideration should be given to preventing Little Oaks, an isolated building in Pennsylvania Lane, becoming hemmed in by possible developments raised by TIP18, TIP34, TIP41, TIP54 and TIP55.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Woodview Farm, Colchester Road
Reference number	TIP19 (C203)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	(a) 0.536ha - CBC Site List (b) 0.46ha - Proforma
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mr G Biggs
Agent / Promoter	Raymond Stemp Associates Ltd

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

This site is on the Colchester Road (access via Woodview Farm ingress) and in close proximity to the Maypole Restaurant and Warriors Rest. The site is adjacent to the existing development boundary for Tiptree.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<p>(a) 16.8 dwellings @ 30 dwellings per ha</p> <p>(b) 13.8 dwellings @ 30 dwellings per ha</p> <p>(Proforma states 4 dwellings)</p>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	<p>Site outside but adjoins current boundary; using CBC Local Development Framework's proposal map (Oct 2010) for Tiptree.</p> <p>Site adjacent to other developments along Colchester Road.</p>

1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	<p><u>Landscape Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site.</p> <p><u>Historical Environment Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site other than generic statement on potential of below ground deposits in undeveloped areas (of which this is one).</p> <p><u>Wildlife Sites</u> Closest site referred to is Co169 Warriors Rest but no impact is expected but there is no direct reference to this site.</p>
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	Possibly from Colchester Road via Woodview Farm ingress/egress.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO. Search of Colchester Planning site did not highlight any current applications or constraints.
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	NO. CBC Planning Portal does not highlight any current planning applications. Magic does not highlight any concerns for this site.

1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		
------	---	---	--	--

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	
Stage 1B	G	No current planning applications or intended land use was identified.

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Raymond Stemp Associates	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Sole owner – Mr G Bigg. Unclear if also the owner of the adjoining Woodview Farm. Assume so because the access is through the existing property	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Current in use as a garden	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner		
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Access via Woodview Farm	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Milldene / Baynards - yes	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable - yes	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G			

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

--

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Adjacent to existing settlement boundary	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Access on to B1022 Colchester Road	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	A	TPC response to call for sites	PC preferred location, Sites in E, F, A graded Green as in North or West, all other sites graded Amber.	!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	Location B locations A & F have been graded Green; B & E graded Amber; C & D graded Red	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Warriors Rest site to the south east. Not adjoining	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report		
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	Walking distance of both Baynards and Milldene approx. 600m	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	Approx. 1km to village centre	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	Approx. 1km to village centre	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	Approx. 1km to village centre	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	322m to 'trees' estate play area	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	Nearest public open space is Windmill Green	
------	--	---	---------	---	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Issues identified relate to proximity to village centre and facilities.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	BT Building, Station Road
Reference number	TIP28 (S0942)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	0.255ha
Proposed use/s	No Proforma
Site Owner	No Proforma
Agent / Promoter	No Proforma

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

This site is on Station Road and within the existing development boundary for Tiptree. The site is the existing Telephone Exchange for Tiptree used by BT, Sky and Talk Talk providers so any disruption in service during developed will require consideration.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	R	Call for Sites pro-forma	0.25 Ha site – considered too small to take forward as a strategic site for development
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	Site is within the existing development boundary; using CBC Local Development Framework's proposal map (Oct 2010) for Tiptree.

1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	<p><u>Landscape Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site.</p> <p><u>Historical Environment Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site other than generic statement on potential of below ground deposits in undeveloped areas although this site already comprises the BT Telephone Exchange.</p> <p><u>Wildlife Sites</u> There is no direct reference to this site.</p>
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	Yes - Directly from Station Road.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO. Search of Colchester Planning site did not highlight any current applications or constraints. The site does adjoin a Development Restricted area (Gate House Mews).
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	NO. CBC Planning Portal does not highlight any current planning applications. Magic does not highlight any concerns for this site.
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment	R		This is working BT exchange so impact assessment on

	of this site would not be necessary?			Broadband/Telephone provision – by various providers such as BT, Sky and Talk Talk, may be needed.
--	--------------------------------------	--	--	--

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	R	Consideration will be needed on impact to Station Road, Church Road and Chapel Road crossroad.
Stage 1B	R	No current planning applications or intended land use was identified but consideration is needed re impact to provision of BT (and other providers such as Talk Talk and Sky) services to Tiptree during development.

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development		Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)		Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?		Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	<i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping		
3.3	<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx</p>		Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>		Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?		Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)		GP Capacity Info	[refer to separate report]	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>		Call for Sites proforma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>				

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

--

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
	Physical constraints				
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?		Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?		Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?		Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC		
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?		Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)		Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)		Magic		
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?		Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No		TPC response to call for sites		!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No		Feedback from village surveys		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0		Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?		Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m		Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m		Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m		Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
------	--	--	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Land surrounding Shell Garage, Maypole Road
Reference number	TIP29 (S0950)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	Not specified
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Assumed to be Shell UK (from previous applications)
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

Site granted outline permission in 2001. Full planning application for 22 houses refused in 2004 due design, layout, highways access, etc. No planning history since.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>No size given but previous application indicated 22 dwellings</i>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public	A	Mapping	Direct access on to Maypole Road and Barbrook Lane. Highways

	highway?			access identified as a reason for 2004 refusal but appears to be based more on lack of detail
--	----------	--	--	---

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	A	
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma	No Proforma but assumed put forward in local Call-Sites.	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Assumed to be Shell UK (from previous applications)	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Not in use. Greenfield.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

No Issues identified. No Proforma available.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	Due to proximity to Shell garage and already within settlement boundary it is assumed there are no issues. <i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	No	

3.3	<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx</p>	A	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	<p>MAGIC - Countryside Stewardship Targeting & Scoring Layers (Biodiversity) highlights the 'Farm Wildlife Package' as being relevant to this site.</p> <p>ECC Minerals Map not detailed enough to see if this site is covered.</p> <p>I could not see that any site in Tiptree has been selected as part of the Replacement Waste Plan. This can be confirmed for Tiptree as a whole.</p>	
3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	Employment Land Needs Report suggests there is no available employment land in Tiptree	
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites proforma	No – Assumption as no proforma.	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites proforma & Local Plan evidence base	No – Assumption as no proforma.	

3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)		GP Capacity Info	<i>[refer to separate report]</i>	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	<p>There are no guidelines as to how the potential impact on primary capacity is to be calculated.</p> <p>It is not guaranteed that all children on a new development will attend the closest local primary school (Tiptree Heath)</p> <p>Primary schools capacity forecast shows deficit placings for Tiptree Heath and Mildene but a surplus for Baynards.</p> <p><i>Should this question be answered as a single statement for Tiptree rather than be site specific?</i></p>	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	<p>There are no guidelines as to how the potential impact on Secondary capacity is to be calculated.</p> <p>It is not guaranteed that all children on a new development will attend the closest secondary school (Thurstable).</p> <p>Thurstable capacity forecast shows a surplus capacity.</p> <p><i>Should this question be answered as a single statement for Tiptree rather than be site specific?</i></p>	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	R	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal	<p>Site granted outline permission in 2001. Full planning application for 22 houses refused in 2004 due design, layout, highways access, etc. No planning history since</p>	
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	A		<p>Only if the reasons for rejection above (in 3.10) are still relevant</p>	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

No obvious issues but investigation into planning history may be prudent. Site exists within current settlement boundary.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping	Within current boundary	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	Within current boundary	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Barbrook Lane and/or Maypole Road via Shell Garage	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro- forma	No	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit	None identified	

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Assumed Greenfield	
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	G	Magic	This is not agricultural land. Defra Map suggests that agricultural land in Tiptree is GOOD	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Already within settlement boundary and developed land	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites	As already within settlement boundary	!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	R	Feedback from village surveys	Questionnaire results not available	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	No <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	No <i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	No <i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Low risk according to Environment Agency	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Low Risk	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	No. surrounding area already developed.	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping, bus timetables	483m to Windmill Green	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	5474m to Kelvedon Station	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	644m to Baynards Primary School	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping	16m to Thurstable School	

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	644m to Tiptree Medical Centre	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	As above to centre of village	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1288m to Tower Park	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1127m to Grove Road Park	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1288m to Grange Road / Florence Park area (assumed nearest open countryside)	
------	--	---	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

No major issues identified.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available
A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty
R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	67 Maldon Road (CO5 0BW)
Reference number	TIP30
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	Unknown
Proposed use/s	
Site Owner	
Agent / Promoter	

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

No recent planning history.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1, low-medium risk of surface water flooding on Maldon Road
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	R	Call for Sites pro-forma	Already within planning envelope and considered too small to be of strategic significance.
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	No
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	No. Local Farm wildlife package area (whole Tiptree)
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	Maldon Road

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	No
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	No
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		No

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	R	No proforma provided, site size estimated. Considered to be too small to be of strategic significance
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development		Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)		Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?		Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	<i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping		
3.3	<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx</p>		Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>		Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?		Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)		GP Capacity Info	[refer to separate report]	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>		Call for Sites proforma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>				

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s achievability

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?		Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?		Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?		Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC		
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?		Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)		Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.7	<p>What is the agricultural land classification?</p> <p>G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more)</p> <p>A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories)</p> <p>R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)</p>		Magic		
4.8	<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?</p>		<p>Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit</p>		
4.9	<p>Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>		<p>TPC response to call for sites</p>		!
4.10	<p>Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>		<p>Feedback from village surveys</p>		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0		Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?		Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>		<p>Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea</p>		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>		<p>Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map</p>		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>		<p>Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit</p>		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m		Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m		Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m		Mapping		
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m		Mapping		

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

--

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Land West of Newbridge Road
Reference number	TIP31 (C179)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	3.79 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential plus B1 (light industrial) and B2 (general industrial)
Site Owner	JF & CM Strathern, Park House Farm, Layer Marney
Agent / Promoter	Whirledge & Nott, Bullbanks Farm, Halstead Road, Colchester

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

Land to north of Newbridge Road. Immediately opposite Alexander Cleghorn site.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>3.79 x 30 x 0.85 = 97 houses</i>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public	G	Mapping	Frontage on to Newbridge Road

	highway?			
--	----------	--	--	--

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	R	Not adjacent to existing development boundary
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development		Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)		Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?		Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	<i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping		
3.3	<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx</p>		Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>		Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?		Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)		GP Capacity Info	[refer to separate report]	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>				

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

--

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
	Physical constraints				
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?		Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?		Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?		Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC		
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?		Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)		Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)		Magic		
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?		Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No		TPC response to call for sites		!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No		Feedback from village surveys		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0		Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?		Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m		Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m		Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m		Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
------	--	--	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Plot North of Fourwinds, Pennsylvania Lane CO5 0UE
Reference number	TIP34 (C228)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	1.6 ha
Proposed use/s	Residential, Affordable Housing, Office, Research & Development, Light Industrial, Sport / Leisure
Site Owner	Mr Paul Mitchell
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

This site is on Pennsylvania Lane and adjacent to the existing development boundary for Tiptree which is demarcated by Pennsylvania Lane. This site is adjacent to TIP18 (Culver Farm, Pennsylvania Lane) where owners (Andrew & Lisa Bryant) have expressed a wish to consider this site as a composite site. There is no evidence to prove that TIP34 owner (Mr Paul Mitchell) has agreed to this so it will require formal confirmation if this is to happen, but refers to other owner by name.

This site is in close proximity to TIP21 (Little Oaks, Pennsylvania Lane), TIP41 (land surrounding Little Oaks) and TIP54 (Fourwinds) so it may be prudent to consider this site in any composite-site deliberations concerning Pennsylvania Lane development. In addition, this site is in close proximity to current planning application for Florence Park (Colchester United's Training Ground) and it may be that a decision on this site is influenced by the outcome e.g. provision of ingress/egress. It was originally believed that the Florence Park application has been wrongly placed on the map and refers to the Vine farm site and that to the north of Grange Road, but a valid submission form TIP55 has now been submitted for Florence Park.

Persimmon has expressed an interest (unsolicited letter) to purchase this site (not sure if this also applies to other sites within the Pennsylvania Lane proximity).

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	1.6x.85x30= 40 1.6x.7x30=33 (31 proposed)
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	Site outside but adjoins current boundary; using CBC Local Development Framework's proposal map (Oct 2010) for Tiptree. Site adjacent to other developments in Pennsylvania Lane.
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	<u>Landscape Character Assessment:</u> No obvious reference to this site. <u>Historical Environment Character Assessment:</u> No obvious reference to this site other than generic statement on potential of below ground deposits in undeveloped areas (of which this is one). <u>Wildlife Sites:</u> There is no direct reference to this site.
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	A	Mapping	Directly from Pennsylvania Lane off Grange Road although this lane is not suitable for heavy traffic and widening may be problematic or subject to objection from current occupiers of dwellings adjoining it. The Maldon Road end is a private road and is separated from the Grange Road end by a narrow path.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO. Search of Colchester Planning site did not highlight any current applications or constraints. The adjoin site TIP18 (Culver Farm) - that is a suggested composite site - appears to have Development Restrictions applied which will need to be considered.
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	NO. CBC Planning Portal does not highlight any current planning applications. Proforma states that there is a Public Rights of Way crossing/adjoining the site. This appears to delineate between this site and TIP18 (Culver Farm) Magic does not highlight any concerns for this site.
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		No unless impact to Pennsylvania Lane is considered impractical/prohibitive or Public Right of way impacted by including site as part of a composite site for Pennsylvania Lane. Florence Park decision may impact suitability of this site.

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	Consideration will be needed on impact to existing narrow Pennsylvania Lane and whether it will be required from Grange Road or Maldon Road end (or both)
Stage 1B	G	No current planning applications or intended land use was identified but consideration is needed to ingress/egress via Pennsylvania Lane. Decision on Florence Park may influence suitability of this site e.g. providing ingress/egress.

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma	Persimmon has expressed an interest (unsolicited letter) to purchase this site	
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Joint owned by married couple	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Have had outline development plans drawn up.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

On the basis of the call for sites form, it is available.

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	Mains water. No electricity, landline / broadband, sewerage; gas. Not close to road.	There are other properties nearby, need to check sewerage
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Not stated. Close to restricted byway and local road.	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	No	

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	Grazed to 2013 currently not in use. No apparent reason why it shouldn't change use.	
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base	No. Several sites proposed along Pennsylvania Lane, this one is second nearest to Grange Road, hence more infrastructure improvement needed than TIP18.	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info	No, needs expansion of £820,00 already and additional £933,000 forecast. Top 20 need now, top 9 need of 103 in 2021.	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Baynards (.6 mile) / Milldene – Yes, St. Luke's / Tiptree Heath marginally no	

3.9	Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?) Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable School - Yes	
3.10	Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions? G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal	No recent history.	
3.11	Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?	G		No	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

No insurmountable problems apart from problems in Tiptree generally.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
	Physical constraints				
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	A	Mapping	Close to existing residential developments, in the vicinity of a few isolated dwellings.	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping	No	
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	A	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Pennsylvania Lane and Grange Road. It would be better if the cluster of proposed sites to the west of Pennsylvania Lane could be joined to Grange Road by a new road rather than destroy a traditional country lane. Sustrans cycle route. Restricted byway.	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma	No, it would be hoped that the cluster of proposed sites to the west of Pennsylvania Lane justify easy cost effective connection to main services.	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Grazing land, outbuildings and one residence.	

4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Predominantly grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	None apparent prior to site visit.	
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	G	TPC response to call for sites	North and West	!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	Location E third most popular.	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Farmland Wildlife Package Area; Nitrate Vulnerable zone – surface water; Drinking Water (Surface Water) Protected and Safeguard Areas; Farmland Birds.	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report		
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRow, or a bridleway?	A	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report	No designated open space. There is a footpath running on the western boundary and a restricted byway on the eastern boundary. Old byway pathway with considerable wildlife under a high hedge canopy popular with walkers. Sustrans cycle route.	

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1.	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Low to medium along this stretch of Pennsylvania Lane. Any loss of bare land will contribute to surface water flooding unless adequate drainage measures are undertaken.	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	View from rear of Grange Road properties, other properties along Pennsylvania Lane, Harrington Close and Perry Road.	

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping, bus timetables	800m to number 91 service, but not particularly frequent. 1200m to number 75 service. All of Tiptree could benefit from a more regular service to the railway stations in Kelvedon and Witham.	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	4500m from northern limit of Tiptree.	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	965m to Baynards with capacity	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	A	Mapping	1300m to Thurstable	
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1609m to Medical Centre. A second facility to the north of the village would provide some balance.	

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1609m to Centre.	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1448m to Business Park.	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1287m to Trees Estate playground.	
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	965m to Windmill Green. A new park in the NW of Tiptree would offer an alternative walking and recreation area and take pressure off Tiptree Heath.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

TIP18, TIP34, TIP41 and TIP54 could form a useful development space. Care needs to be taken to maintain the character of Pennsylvania Lane as a path that residents can use to access open countryside from the central part of the village. As a block, instead of using Pennsylvania Lane as an access route it might prove possible to gain access to Grange Road nearer to Wind Mill Hill. Consideration should be given to preventing Little Oaks, an isolated building in Pennsylvania Lane, becoming hemmed in by possible developments raised by TIP18, TIP34, TIP41, TIP54 and TIP55.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available
A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty
R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Sun House, Kelvedon Road CO5 0LY
Reference number	TIP35
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	0.55 ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mr Michael Garwood
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

This site is the Coal Yard on Kelvedon Road. The site resides just outside the current development area but is opposite Tower Park and very close to Oak Road.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	0.55 x30 x 0.85 = 14
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	<p>Site outside but close to current boundary; using CBC Local Development Framework's proposal map (Oct 2010) for Tiptree.</p> <p>Site in close proximity to Tower Park and Oak Road.</p>

1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	<p><u>Landscape Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site.</p> <p><u>Historical Environment Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site other than generic statement on potential of below ground deposits in undeveloped areas (which this is NOT one as already used for Coal Yard).</p> <p><u>Wildlife Sites</u> There is no direct reference to this site.</p>
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	Yes - Directly from B1023 (Kelvedon Road).

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	<p>NO. Search of Colchester Planning site did not highlight any current applications or constraints.</p> <p>The site adjoins Highland Nursery which does have a Development Restriction applied.</p>
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	<p>NO. CBC Planning Portal does not highlight any current planning applications.</p> <p>Magic does not highlight any concerns for this site.</p>

1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		No.
------	---	---	--	-----

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	A	This site is currently just outside current development area (opposite Tower Park and close to Oak Road)
Stage 1B	G	No current planning applications or intended land use was identified.

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Currently in use as a small coal yard	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner		
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping		
3.3	<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx</p>	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma	Used as coal yard – may be some low level ground contamination	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info	[refer to separate report]	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G			

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s achievability

Healthcare and education capacity common to all sites in Tiptree therefore classified as GREEN

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Frontage on to Kelvedon Road	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	G	Magic		
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	R	TPC response to call for sites		!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	TBC	Feedback from village surveys		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit		
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report		
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping		
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	R	Mapping	1200m+	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	Under 800m to business park	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	New play area being developed as part of Grange Road housing	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	Village green being developed as part of Grange Road housing. Over 400m to Walnut Tree Way play area, but new facilities would be provided as part of a large block.	
------	--	---	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Distance from village centre and amenities - AMBER

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available
A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty
R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Hall Road
Reference number	TIP36
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	0.2 ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mr and Mrs Coghlan
Agent / Promoter	Joseph Greenhow Planning Ltd

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

This site resides off Hall Road which is a narrow country lane at present.

Although the dwelling algorithm means that this site can support 6 dwellings the owners have expressed a desire (on Proforma) to build two or three 3-4 bedroom chalet/bungalows - which fails the criteria at this stage for a 5 dwelling minimum. *The owners have not been approached to determine if they are willing to amend their statement on the proforma.*

The owners suggest that this site be included with current/future planning allowed for the International Farm Camp which is situated c200m to the north of this site.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	R	Call for Sites pro-forma	Smaller than minimum criteria. Proforma states 2-3 chalet bungalows
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	Site outside the current boundary; using CBC Local Development Framework's proposal map (Oct 2010) for Tiptree.

1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	<p><u>Landscape Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site.</p> <p><u>Historical Environment Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site other than generic statement on potential of below ground deposits in undeveloped areas (which this is).</p> <p><u>Wildlife Sites</u> There is no direct reference to this site.</p>
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	A	Mapping	<p>Yes – from Hall Road but this is a small country lane at present.</p> <p>Proforma mentions provision of new/replacement vehicular access - in Planning Application 130294 - that was rejected as site lies outside settlement boundary.</p>

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	<p>NO. Search of Colchester Planning site did not highlight any current applications or constraints.</p> <p>The site does adjoin Hall End which does have a Development Restriction applied.</p>

1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	NO. CBC Planning Portal does not highlight any current planning applications. Magic does not highlight any concerns for this site.
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		No.

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	R	Owners have expressed wish to limit dwellings to 2 or 3 chalet/bungalows. The site is off Hall Road which currently is a narrow country lane. The site is outside the current development boundary and has already had a planning request (PA 130294) - to improve vehicular access - denied.
Stage 1B	G	No current planning applications or intended land use was identified.

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development		Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)		Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?		Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner	<i>[check pro-forma for any comments, gas, electricity, telecommunications, broadband, etc]</i>	
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping		
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx		Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>		Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?		Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?		Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)		GP Capacity Info	[refer to separate report]	
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>		Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>				

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s achievability

--

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
	Physical constraints				
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?		Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?		Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?		Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC		
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?		Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)		Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)		Magic		
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?		Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No		TPC response to call for sites		!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No		Feedback from village surveys		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0		Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?		Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?		Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>		Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?		Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m		Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m		Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m		Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m		Mapping		

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m		Mapping		
------	--	--	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available
A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty
R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Colchester Road
Reference number	TIP37 (C251)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	3.2 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential plus B1 (light industrial) and B2 (general industrial)
Site Owner	Mr F Cottee
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

Land to south of Colchester Road in Colchester direction on the B1022 away from the Maypole junction. The end part of the block made up of sites TIP19, TIP40 and TIP37.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	<i>3.2 x 30 x 0.85 = 82 houses</i>
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	End part of the block made up of sites TIP19, TIP40 and TIP37. Furthest from the existing development boundary
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public	G	Mapping	Frontage on to Colchester Road

	highway?			
--	----------	--	--	--

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO – based on search of CBC planning portal
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	Assumed NO
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		Assumed NO

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	A	Currently outside of existing development boundary but if developed in conjunction with neighbouring TIP19 site would be directly linked
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner		
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Direct frontage to B1022	
3.3	<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx</p>	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Baynards / Milldene - yes	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Thurstable - yes	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G			

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	A	Mapping	Not adjacent to development boundary. Would have to be developed in conjunction with adjoining sites TIP19 and TIP40	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC		
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro- forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro- forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	A	TPC response to call for sites	Location B. Sites in E, F, A graded Green as in North or West, all other sites graded Amber.	
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	sites in locations A & F have been graded Green; B & E graded Amber; C & D graded Red	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>Near to Warriors Rest, Pods Wood, Coneyfield Wood but not adjacent to</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping		
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping		
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping		
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping		
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	500m to 'trees' estate play area	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping		
------	--	---	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Distance to village centre and amenities is issue

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Land to rear of 30-70 Newbridge Road, CO5 0HX
Reference number	TIP38 / C252
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	3.1 HA
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 46 owned by Mrs E. Bell – used for access • 50 owned by 2 partners Mark Don and Pelandepatirage Dias (dwelling remaining) • 58 owned by Mrs H Moulton
Agent / Promoter	Agent: Mark Plummer, Jackson Land Ltd (possibly part owner too) – developers interested in 2015

Planning history / context
This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.
<p>06/07/1992 granted change of use. 50 Newbridge Road, 30 Jan 2003 extension refused basis character and amenity value of area to be preserved. Restrictive covenant imposed to prevent further development. Overlaps with TIP38.</p> <p>Has been put forward in the past for inclusion in the village envelope.</p>

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences? Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Zone 1, low-medium surface water risk
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	3.1x.85x30=79 3.1x.7x30=65 60-70 stated
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	No
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	No, but Park Lane is a high spatial priority deciduous woodland and behind 46 is a priority habitat traditional orchard. Park Lane forms a woodland corridor linking a cluster of local wildlife sites. Park Lane is an ancient track, which provides access to Park Lane Nature reserve and is popular with walkers.
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	A	Mapping	Newbridge Road, but entails passing through traditional orchard as stated above.

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	No
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	No
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		No

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	A	Landscape designation, habitats and proximity to Park Lane ancient track concerns. Any building should be set back from Park Lane and the hedge preserved to preserve the character of Park Lane. Park Drive houses too close to lane.
Stage 1B	G	Concerns about restrictive covenant on 50 Newbridge Road

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	<p>Has the site been promoted for development?</p> <p>G – Yes it's been promoted</p> <p>A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process</p> <p>R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	<p>Site ownership</p> <p>G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership</p> <p>A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known</p> <p>R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)</p>	A	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Ownership a little unclear based on submissions in TIP02 and TIP38 could be 3 or 4 plus the agent.	
2.3	<p>Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Unused field and paddock area. All owners support the development and are willing to sell.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner		
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Access from Newbridge Road	
3.3	<p>Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))?</p> <p>Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx</p>	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan	‘Nitrate Vulnerable Site (NVZ)’ for whole Tiptree/Essex area so presumably not a barrier to development	

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Currently greenfield and light domestic use.	
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base	Land adjacent to housing GREEN it is assumed that this site does not require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support development on its own	
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	A	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	1.77km safe walking to Milldene 1.13km to St Luke's hence amber	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	A	Call for Sites proforma & CBC planning portal	<p>The site is part of Rowans which is a care home which was granted change of use 06/07/1992 ref:COL/92/0818</p> <p>When Rowans was extended in 1991 a section 106 agreement was imposed to prevent further development at the time – Source proforma</p>	
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G			

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

Site is constrained by a previous covenant – would need to find out if this could be lifted prior to completing stage 4 sieve.

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Via Newbridge Road	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	Available in Newbridge Road	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit	Greenfield	

4.7	<p>What is the agricultural land classification?</p> <p>G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more)</p> <p>A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories)</p> <p>R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)</p>	G	Magic	Small site close to habitation.	
4.8	<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	<p>Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>	A	TPC response to call for sites		!
4.10	<p>Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits?</p> <p>G – Yes</p> <p>R – No</p>	R	Feedback from village surveys		

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	Close to Park Lane	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	Close to local to Park Lane Nature Reserve	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	Close to ancient drovers way – Park Lane	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map	Some surface water flood risk on part of the site.	
4.17	Views – are there any key views to or from the site?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping, bus timetables	960m to Cheap Shop	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping	6.8km	
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1.13km to St Lukes	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	A	Mapping	1.93km	
4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m –800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	1.1km	

4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	1km to The Cheap Shop	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	Distance to Cleghorns	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping	965m to Grove Park	
4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping		

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's suitability and sustainability

--

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

--

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Grove Road (Land behind no71) CO5 0JG
Reference number	TIP39 (C265)
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	1.9 Ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Ms L Ross
Agent / Promoter	Raymond Stemp Associates, Wakes Colne

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

No previous planning history. Parcel of land adjacent to TIP22 and TIP61 on Barbrook Lane, to the rear of existing properties on the north side of Grove Road. Access would require the demolition of No.71 Grove Road.

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	$1.9 \times 30 \times 0.85 = 48$
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	
1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	G	Mapping	Currently not without demolition of 71 Grove Road or in conjunction with adjoining land

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?	G	CBC Planning Portal, Magic	
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	G	
Stage 1B	G	

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry		
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Residential and agricultural. It has been promoted to be redeveloped.	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner		
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Assumed no – site should be considered with other Barbrook Lane / Grove Road sites	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report	No restrictions on the site	
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info	The GP surgery doesn't have satisfactory capacity for the current Tiptree. The commissioning group recognise this and have estimated large sums needed to ameliorate the current situation and for expansion in the future. A site has already been offered to Tiptree. On this basis all sites have been graded Amber.	

3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Milldene - yes	
3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	There is only one secondary school in Tiptree and it has spare capacity. Students attend it from as far away as West Mersea, so for Tiptree all sites have been graded Green.	
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal	None found.	

3.11	Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?	G			
------	--	---	--	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s achievability

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	G	Mapping		
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC	Through the property 71 Grove Road or via access to the large block	
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	No utilities at the site currently, but there are many residential properties in the area	
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	A	TPC response to call for sites	Location B Sites in E, F, A graded Green as in North or West, all other sites graded Amber.	!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	locations A & F have been graded Green; B & E graded Amber; C & D graded Red.	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Landscape Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>[Local Wildlife Sites – via link. Local Sites are listed for Tiptree CO4, CO5, CO7, CO10, CO13, CO16, CO19, CO21, CO25, CO32, CO37 and CO169]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	Surface water flood risk at north west corner of the site	
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping, bus timetables	Bus stops on Church Road 643M	
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	Closest schools – Milldene 321m	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping	804m	

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	804M –	
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	804M TO Village centre (existing medical centre)	
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping	804M TO Village centre	
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping	321m to Grove Park	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	G	Mapping	321m grove Park	
------	--	---	---------	-----------------	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Site name	Colchester Road (adjacent to Woodview Farm)
Reference number	TIP40
Settlement	Tiptree
Size	2 ha
Proposed use/s	Residential
Site Owner	Mr Michael Mitchell
Agent / Promoter	None

Planning history / context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to and information relating to the neighbourhood plan process where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment of the site.

This site is located on the Colchester Road adjacent to Woodview Farm (not clear if land is part of Woodview Farm).

Stage 1A: Initial sieve

A red rating for any of the assessment criteria within this section means the site will not be taken further in the assessment process. A red rating in Stage 1 means that a site is considered to be unsuitable for development at the current time, in accordance with national and local policy, or that the site is too small to be taken through the SLAA process.

1A	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1A.1	<p>Is the site greenfield and within flood zone 3 (more than 50%) without flood defences?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea	
1A.2	Is the site for fewer than 5 dwellings or less than 0.25ha?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma	2X30x.85=51 dwellings @ 30 dwellings per ha
1A.3	Is the site physically separate from an existing development boundary	A	Call for Sites pro-forma, village boundary map	Site outside the current boundary; using CBC Local Development Framework's proposal map (Oct 2010) for Tiptree.

1A.4	Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site nationally or internationally designated for its landscape, biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic	<p><u>Landscape Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site.</p> <p><u>Historical Environment Character Assessment</u> No obvious reference to this site other than generic statement on potential of below ground deposits in undeveloped areas (which this site is).</p> <p><u>Wildlife Sites</u> There is no direct reference to this site but in close proximity to Co19 (Pods and Conyfield Woods).</p>
1A.5	Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the public highway?	A	Mapping	Yes – from Colchester Road (if ingress/egress used for Woodview Farm).

Stage 1B: Second sieve

This sieve tests sites in terms of their existing status and use. Sites are sieved out at this stage where there is sufficient information in relation to their existing status and use that renders further assessment unnecessary. A yes in the stage 1B sieve means further assessment is not required. A conclusion and details of site capacity and delivery should be given where appropriate.

1B	Assessment criterion	R/G Rating	Data Source	Comments
1B.1	Is the site allocated with extant planning permission, or is it allocated with a strong likelihood of a planning application being submitted in the near future?	G	CBC Planning Portal	NO. Search of Colchester Planning site did not highlight any current applications or constraints.
1B.2	Is the site protected for another use (with no reason to suggest it should be otherwise), or is it in use with a	G	CBC Planning	NO. Magic does not highlight any concerns for this site.

	likelihood that that use will continue for the foreseeable future?		Portal, Magic	
1B.3	Is there another reason why it is clear that full assessment of this site would not be necessary?	G		No.

Stage 1 Assessment	R/G Rating	Comments <i>If site is assessed "Red" at either stage then no further assessment is necessary</i>
Stage 1A	A	The site is outside the current development boundary and close to Pods and Conyfield Woods). Ingress/Egress needs to be verified in terms of (a) is it direct from Colchester Road or (b) via Woodview Farm which may not be part of site.
Stage 1B	G	No current planning applications or intended land use was identified.

Stage 1 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 2: Availability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
2.1	Has the site been promoted for development? G – Yes it's been promoted A – No, but it was submitted by the site owner through the call for sites process R – Site has not been put forward for allocation by the landowner, or promoted for development	A	Call for Sites pro-forma		
2.2	Site ownership G – Single or joint (max 2) known ownership A – site owned by 3 or more different parties or intensions of a part owner not known R – ownership not known / multiple ownership (more than 3)	G	Call for Sites pro-forma / Land Registry	Jointly owned	
2.3	Is the site currently in use and is it likely to continue to be used for the foreseeable future / would that use prevent development on the site from coming forward?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit	Currently in use as grazing pasture	

Summary and conclusion in relation to site availability

--

Stage 2 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 3: Achievability

	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comment	Mitigation measures
3.1	Viability – is development of the site economically viable? Are there any factors which could limit its viability?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma and additional information from site promoter / owner		
3.2	Ransom strip – does the development of, or access to, the site rely on another piece of land, and has that land been put forward for development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & mapping	Direct frontage to Colchester Road	
3.3	Is the land currently protected for an alternative use (including minerals allocations and waste allocation (and proposed allocations))? Refer to ECC 2014 Minerals Plans – http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/minerals-development-document/Pages/Default.aspx Refer to ECC Replacement Waste Plan - http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Pages/Replacement-Waste-Local-Plan.aspx	G	Mapping, Magic, ECC 2014 Minerals Plans, ECC Replacement Waste Plan		

3.4	<p>If protected for a particular use (other than that proposed), is there evidence to suggest that the site could or should be released for an alternative use?</p> <p>Employment Land Needs Report - Appendix 2 http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16831&p=0</p>	G	Local Plan evidence base - Employment Land Needs Report		
3.5	Contamination – is the site contaminated or partially contaminated?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
3.6	Infrastructure requirements – does the site require the provision of any unique or large infrastructure to support its development?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & Local Plan evidence base		
3.7	Does a local GP surgery have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)	A	GP Capacity Info		
3.8	<p>Does the local primary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021	Baynards / Milldene - yes	

3.9	<p>Does the local secondary school have the capacity to accommodate development of the site? (or would development be likely to provide new facilities?)</p> <p>Schools capacity 2016/2021 – https://www.essex.gov.uk/Education-Schools/Schools/Delivering-Education-Essex/School-Organisation-Planning/Documents/CommissioningSchoolPlacesinEssex-2016-2021.pdf</p>	G	Commissioning School Places in Essex 2016-2021		
3.10	<p>Unimplemented permissions – does the site have a history of unimplemented permissions?</p> <p>G – No unimplemented permissions A – one (maybe two) recent lapsed permissions R – a history of unimplemented permissions</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & CBC planning portal		
3.11	<p>Are there any other known reasons why the development of this site for the specified purpose could raise issues not covered in the assessment criteria, or have unintended consequences – such as impeding the delivery of future infrastructure projects?</p>	G			

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site's achievability

--

--

Stage 3 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments
--

--

Stage 4: Suitability and sustainability

4	Assessment criterion	RAG	Data Source	Comments	Potential mitigation measures
Physical constraints					
4.1	Is the site within or adjacent to the settlement boundary (or could it form part of a new settlement within the identified growth areas)?	A	Mapping	Outside of existing settlement boundary – linkage possible if developed in conjunction with adjoining TIP19	
4.2	Would development of the site lead to coalescence between settlements?	G	Mapping		
4.3	What is the main access point/s to the site? Are there any highway constraints?	G	Mapping, Transport Planners & ECC		
4.4	Utilities – is there any evidence that it would not be possible to deliver the necessary utilities?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma		
4.5	Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons) – are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		

4.6	Nature of the site – is it brownfield or greenfield? G – brownfield (approx. 75% plus) A – part brownfield, part greenfield R – greenfield (approx. 75% plus)	R	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.7	What is the agricultural land classification? G – Grades 4-5 (50% or more) A – Grades 3a or 3b (50% or more, or a mix of categories) R – Grades 1-2 (50% or more)	R	Magic	Grade 2	
4.8	Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell, amenity) – would development be likely to be negatively impacted by, or to cause negative impact on, neighbouring areas?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, mapping, site visit		
4.9	Is the site within an area that has previously been identified by the parish council as a potentially preferred area? G – Yes R – No	A	TPC response to call for sites	Location B. Sites in E, F, A graded Green as in North or West, all other sites graded Amber.	!
4.10	Is the site within an area that has been identified by the village questionnaire as a potentially preferred area or an area that might provide other additional benefits? G – Yes R – No	A	Feedback from village surveys	sites in locations A & F have been graded Green; B & E graded Amber; C & D graded Red	

Environmental constraints					
4.11	Landscape impact – would development harm landscape character or setting, particularly relevant to any AONB and undeveloped coastal areas (including areas outside of the Borough boundary)?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Landscape Character Assessment,		
4.12	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance – would development be likely to cause harm to these areas / is the site covered, or partially covered, by a local designation? Refer to CBC Local Sites Assessment http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21564&p=0	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Local Sites Assessment, Magic & site visit	<i>Warriors Rest – close to but not adjacent. Pods and Coneyfield Woods – close to be not adjacent</i>	
4.13	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets – would development of the site be likely to cause harm to any such assets or their setting?	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Magic, Historic Environment Character Report	<i>[refer to Tiptree extract from Historic Environment Character Assessment]</i> <i>NB: Hard copy of this report also provided for ease of reference</i>	
4.14	Impact on open space – would development of the site result in the loss of, or partial loss of, designated open space, a PRoW, or a bridleway?	G	Call for Site pro-forma, Urban Fringe Report		

4.15	<p>Flood risk – is the site within, or partially within, an area of flood risk?</p> <p>Refer to Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683.0&y=355134.0&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=_e&topic=floodmap</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Flood Map for Planning Rivers and Sea		
4.16	<p>Drainage – can suitable drainage for the site be provided? Will development of the site increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>Refer to Surface Water Flood map – https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma, Surface Water Flood map		
4.17	<p>Views – are there any key views to or from the site?</p>	G	Call for Sites pro-forma & site visit		

Access to services					
4.18	Distance to bus stop with a frequent service at least six days a week (or could a new bus service be incorporated into the development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m - 800m R – over 800m	G	Mapping, bus timetables		
4.19	Distance to train station with a frequent service at least six days a week G – up to 2,000m A – 2,001m – 4,000m R – over 4,000m	R	Mapping		
4.20	Distance to primary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	Baynards 600m away	
4.21	Distance to secondary school (or could a new school be provided as part of new development) G – up to 1,200m A – 1,201m – 2,000m R – over 2,000m	G	Mapping		

4.22	Distance to health services (or could new health services be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	R	Mapping		
4.23	Distance to town, neighbourhood, rural district or urban district centre (or would it be likely that a new centre will be provided as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping		
4.24	Distance to Local Employment Zone or Colchester Town Centre (whichever is closest) (or would employment opportunities be likely to be created as part of development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping		
4.25	Distance to play area (or would new play facilities be likely to be provided as part of the development of the site?) G – up to 400m A – 401m – 800m R – over 800m	A	Mapping	500m to 'trees' estate play area	

4.26	Distance to park/public open space (or would new open space / parks be incorporated into the development of the site?) G – up to 800m A – 801m – 1,200m R – over 1,200m	A	Mapping		
------	--	---	---------	--	--

Summary and conclusion in relation to the site’s suitability and sustainability

Distance to village centre and amenities is issue.

Stage 4 Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments

Stage 5: Site visit

Notes and observations from site visit (if required)

Stage 6: Outcome of Assessment

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Summarise the findings of the assessment here. Where are the key areas that the site performs well in, and what are the key issues/constraints/questions in relation to whether the site is likely to come forward for development. Example conclusion – “In conclusion, the site shows some suitability for development given its location adjacent to an existing development boundary, although there are issues in relation to landscape impact, agricultural land classification, and distances to facilities and services. Availability and achievability are the key issues in relation to the possibility of the site being developed, as the site has not been promoted for development, nor is there any planning history or details of land ownership.”

Outcome

G – suitable/achievable/available

A – could be suitable/achievable/available, but with some uncertainty

R – the site is not suitable/achievable/available, or is highly unlikely to be so

Final Assessment - Steering Group Decision & Comments