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**North Northamptonshire HELAA: Site Assessment Criteria**

**1. Introduction**

1.1 North Northamptonshire Council is developing a new Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for the local authority area. This paper outlines an initial approach to the assessment of sites as part of the HELAA, including a set of assessment criteria, and welcomes feedback to this via the Questions within (found from page 19 onwards within this document and also as a separate document available on the Council’s [consultation hub](https://northnorthants.citizenspace.com/planning/north-northamptonshire-council-s-call-for-sites/)). We are particularly seeking feedback in terms of the appropriateness of the proposed approach in respect of legislation, policy and guidance both at the national and local level as well as any submissions on potential new criteria which may come from an organisational perspective (for example, statutory undertakers) or best practice as identified from other areas.

1.2 The initial set of assessment criteria are outlined within Section 4 of this paper. These have been developed through reference to the Sustainability objectives produced as part of the [Sustainability Appraisal](http://www.nnjpdu.org.uk/publications/sustainability-appraisal-of-the-submission-north-northamptonshire-joint-core-strategy-june-2015/) of the [North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy](http://www.nnjpdu.org.uk/publications/adopted-north-northamptonshire-joint-core-strategy-2011-2031/)[[1]](#footnote-2) and augmented by subsequent work undertaken by the area’s former local authorities in developing their Part 2 Local Plans. As a result the criteria presented broadly follow those previously consulted on by the former local authorities of North Northamptonshire although some amendments, and new entries, are included to reflect feedback received to Part 2 Local Plan consultations. It is anticipated that the criteria within shall be subject to further amendment though feedback to the current paper and as a revised Sustainability Appraisal is produced.

**2. Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)**

2.1 North Northamptonshire Council is at the early stages of developing a new Part 1 Local Plan[[2]](#footnote-3) for the area and is reviewing and updating its evidence base as part of this. A key part of this evidence base is the production of a [Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment#method--stage-5-final-evidence-base) (HELAA).

2.2 The HELAA is a technical document which local planning authorities are required to prepare to inform development of their Local Plans. The purpose of the HELAA is to identify a future supply of land and consider its suitability, availability and achievability for housing, economic development[[3]](#footnote-4) uses over the Local Plan time-period. To do this it is necessary for the Council to assess sites which have been promoted, or identified, for their future development potential, with the [Call for Sites](https://northnorthants.citizenspace.com/planning/north-northamptonshire-council-s-call-for-sites/), a concurrent and linked consultation to this paper, marking the start of the process of developing the HELAA. The HELAA shall culminate with a list of sites that are considered to be deliverable and developable and it is from this list that sites may be selected for inclusion in the NNSP.

2.3 The HELAA is an important input into the development of the NNSP and other policy documents but will not itself determine whether a site should be allocated for development. Nevertheless, it is the starting point for the selection of sites within the NNSP because it:

* Identifies sites and broad locations with potential for development (and excludes those sites which are not considered to have potential);
* Assesses their suitability for development;
* Assesses the likelihood of development coming forward (availability and achievability).

**3. Other HELAA work areas**

3.1 The Council is preparing the HELAA in accordance with the Government’s [National Planning Practice Guidance](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment) (NPPG)[[4]](#footnote-5). As part of this, North Northamptonshire Council is concurrently seeking input on two linked areas:

(i) a [Call for Sites](https://northnorthants.citizenspace.com/planning/north-northamptonshire-council-s-call-for-sites/) which invites interested parties to submit potential development sites to the Council for assessment and inclusion in the HELAA.

(ii) a [Methodology paper](https://northnorthants.citizenspace.com/planning/north-northamptonshire-council-s-call-for-sites/) which seeks feedback on a proposed approach to developing the HELAA locally

3.2 The above elements, together with this paper on site assessment, represent three distinct elements on which feedback is sought. However, any feedback received to these shall be aggregated to develop the HELAA for North Northamptonshire. The decision to run these elements separately is one of looking to manage the HELAA process efficiently and enable each distinct element to be considered in full before being integrated into the overarching HELAA. In doing so it is also hoped to reduce consultation fatigue and provide flexibility to interested parties by enabling them to respond to elements of consultation as they require without needing to engage with all documentation if not necessary to do so.

**4. Site Assessment**

4.1 Site assessment is a key element of the HELAA and will help the Council determine whether sites are suitable, available or achievable as required by national planning guidance. It will also help identify those sites which are considered in accordance with the development strategy and objectives.

4.2 However, although the current consultation marks the start of developing a new study for the local area, the HELAA is not starting from a blank sheet of paper as a number of linked studies exist locally which can be used to inform its development. It is therefore proposed that the HELAA will be based upon existing approaches to site assessment for consistency but also augmented where it is considered necessary to do so (in part identified through consultation feedback to previous work undertaken by the former local authorities).

4.3 In this respect It is proposed that the HELAA site assessment criteria are linked to Sustainability Appraisal as doing so allows specific consideration to be given to how each potential site will contribute to meeting sustainability objectives[[5]](#footnote-6) which are established as a recognised way to test the social, economic and environmental effects of the local plan (and potential sites) and have been developed in response to key issues identified in the local area.

4.4 The site assessment criteria proposed at Table 2 are therefore based upon, the sustainability objectives developed for the [Sustainability Appraisal](http://www.nnjpdu.org.uk/publications/sustainability-appraisal-of-the-submission-north-northamptonshire-joint-core-strategy-june-2015/) of the Joint Core Strategy (adopted 2016) and widely used in the development of Part 2 Local Plans. However, it is also recognised that since this time there have been a number of changes to legislation, policies and guidance which are not currently reflected within the work of the former Councils (for example, the [Climate and Environment Emergency, which the Council declared in July 2021](https://www.northnorthants.gov.uk/news/tackling-climate-change-north-northamptonshire)). It is therefore the intention that this shall be rectified as both the HELAA, and NNSP, is developed, with the current document, and the opportunity it provides consultees to provide feedback, considered an opportunity to shape these.

4.5 **To facilitate development of the approach to assessment, and to both front load the process and gather immediate feedback, North Northamptonshire Council welcomes comments on both the following “sustainability assessment criteria” and scoring system with a view to developing the HELAA in an inclusive manner**. This would be particularly welcomed in the form of feedback from statutory organisations as well as examples of best practice from other areas (e.g., in respect of criteria relating to consideration of climate change / net zero objectives)[[6]](#footnote-7).

Criteria and Rating system

4.6 Further to the above, an initial set of sustainabilityassessment criteria are proposed (set out overleaf at Table 2). As outlined at paragraphs 4.2, these “sustainability assessment criteria” are proposed to enable a consistent and comparable assessment which can help determine which sites should be put forward for inclusion in the NNSP and other policy documents. These criteria have been worked up with consideration of [National Planning Practice Guidance in respect of HELAAs](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment)[[7]](#footnote-8), being grouped to align with the key themes of ‘Suitability’, ‘Availability’ and ‘Achievability’. Within each theme a range of sustainability criteria are proposed to gauge the potential impacts of development at a particular location. These include potential effects upon landscapes, nature and heritage conservation as well as physical limitations such as access, infrastructure, ground conditions, flood and hazardous risks, amongst others.

4.7 To help identify how a site performs relative to the assessment criteria, a colour coded rating system is proposed, as outlined at Table 1 below. This system aligns with past work undertaken by the former local authorities of North Northamptonshire[[8]](#footnote-9) and is considered appropriate as it has proved to be robust and ensures a continuity of approach (as outlined at para 4.2).

4.8 This system is colour coded to outline the severity of any site constraints and, taken as a whole, to indicate how well a site performs against the sustainability assessment criteria outlined in Table 2.

4.9 It is likely that site assessments will be undertaken through a combination of council planning officers using both desk-based information (including that received via the [Call for Sites](https://northnorthants.citizenspace.com/planning/north-northamptonshire-council-s-call-for-sites/) process) and from site visits. These may also require expert advice being procured in respect of some matters outlined in the proposed criteria including highways, archaeology, biodiversity and environmental health and viability.

**Table 1: Proposed HELAA Assessment Rating system**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment** | **Definition** |
|  | No constraints identified, development acceptable in principle or development would have a positive impact |
| **-** | Neutral impact or there may be constraints, but mitigation is possible |
|  | Significant constraints, although mitigation should be possible |
|  | Severe constraints where mitigation is unlikely to be possible and development is probably unacceptable |
| **?** | Uncertainty of impact or lack of information |

4.10 It is proposed that as a result of assessment, each criterion in Table 2 shall be assigned a rating in line with those specified above. When a site has been assessed as having a number of constraints it will be assigned a single cross (x). This will not necessarily mean it is unsuitable for development, rather that mitigation measures will be required[[9]](#footnote-10). Sites with a double cross (xx) are considered to have more severe constraints and are therefore more likely to be unsuitable and less deliverable.

Secondary site assessment

4.11 Following the site assessment process, as outlined, it is proposed that sites will only be put forward as potential Local Plan allocations if they score well in terms of suitability, availability and achievability. It is likely that the outputs of assessment will deliver sites which are of varying suitability and availability so it is likely that those which most closely match the strategy and objectives of national and local policies, as well as those most likely to deliver development in the plan period, will be prioritised. This form of secondary site assessment is a long-term approach adopted in local studies, first introduced in the [2009 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment](http://www.nnjpdu.org.uk/publications/north-northamptonshire-strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment-shlaa/) and revised more recently in the Corby Employment Land Review (May 2018). At present we are still to determine the exact approach to this albeit we welcome feedback with a view to developing this area**.**

**Next steps**

5.1 The Council would welcome your feedback on its approach to developing a local HELAA either as a standalone response to the site assessment proposals within or as part of wider thoughts you may have (linked to the concurrent [Call for Sites and Methodology papers](https://northnorthants.citizenspace.com/planning/north-northamptonshire-council-s-call-for-sites/) on which feedback is sought (as outlined at para 3.1)).

5.2 In relation to the current consultation paper, we have set a number of questions which we seek any feedback you may have on the approach outlined. **These are available from page 19 onwards of this paper and also on the Council’s** [**consultation hub**](https://northnorthants.citizenspace.com/planning/north-northamptonshire-council-s-call-for-sites/). If you do wish to provide feedback please can completed questions be returned to the Council at [planningpolicy@northnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@northnorthants.gov.uk) by Monday 25th April 2022.

5.3 If you have any queries on this form, or the other linked consultations, please can these be sent to [planningpolicy@northnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@northnorthants.gov.uk)

**Table 2: Proposed Sustainability Assessment Criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| **SUITABILITY** | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.**  **Accessibility** | To improve accessibility and transport links from residential areas to key services, facilities and employment areas and enhance access to the natural environment and recreation opportunities | **1. Accessibility:** | | | | | | | |
| **Employment** | **Healthcare** | **Primary**  **School** | **Leisure Centre or attraction** | **Local Shops** | **Overall Score** |  |
| Walkable – employment close by | Within 1 mile of doctors | Within 1 mile | Within 1 mile | Within 1 mile | 10 – 15 = Good proximity to services |  |
| Employment on bus stop (30 mins frequency or better) | Between 1-3 miles of doctors and/or bus stop | Between 1-3 miles | Between 1-3 miles of leisure centre /attraction on a bus stop | Between 1-3 miles of shops and / or on a bus stop | 6 – 10 = Medium proximity to services |  |
| Access difficult without a car | Greater than 3 miles from doctors and not directly on bus route | Greater than 3 miles | Greater than 3 miles of leisure centre /attraction | Greater than 3 miles from shops | 5 = Poor Proximity to services |  |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| *Housing* | *Ensure that new housing provided meets the needs of the area, provide affordable and decent housing for all* | *All sites are likely to offer similar opportunities to meet this objective; it is not therefore a criterion for choosing between sites.* | | | | | | *N/A* | |
| **2. Health** | Improve overall levels of physical, mental and social well-being and reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas | **2.1 Recreational facilities:** | | | | | | | |
| 2.1.1 Would provide new existing sporting or recreational facilities, including allotment land | | | | | |  | |
| 2.1.2 Not result in the loss of any indoor or outdoor sporting or recreational facilities | | | | | | **-** | |
| 2.1.3 Result in the loss of existing indoor or outdoor sporting or recreational facilities, including allotment land, but could be mitigated | | | | | |  | |
| **2.2 Health and Safety:** | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.1 Not within a specified consultation zone of a notifiable installation (Health and Safety Executive) | | | | | |  | |
| 2.2.2 Within the specified consultation zone of a notifiable installation (development however is unlikely to be precluded) | | | | | |  | |
| 2.2.3 Within the specified consultation zone of a notifiable installation (development is likely to be precluded) | | | | | |  | |
| ***Crime*** | *To improve community safety, reduce the incidences of crime and the fear of crime – a safe place to live* | *All sites are likely to offer similar opportunities to meet this objective; it is not therefore a criterion for choosing between sites.* | | | | | | *N/A* | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| **3. Community** | Value and nurture a sense of belonging in a cohesive community whilst respecting diversity | **3.1 Impact on community facilities:** | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.1 Results in an increase in facilities | | | | | |  | |
| 3.1.2 Site will have no specific impact on community facilities other than those specified by Criterion 2.1 (e.g., village halls, community centres, scout huts, church etc) | | | | | | **-** | |
| 3.1.3 Development would result in the loss of a community facility | | | | | |  | |
| ***Skills*** | *To improve overall levels of education and skills* | *Not relevant to this assessment. It will not assist in choosing between sites* | | | | | | *N/A* | |
| **4. Liveability** | To create healthy, clean and pleasant environments for people to enjoy living, working and recreating in and to protect and enhance residential amenity | **4.1 Liveability – Noise and Odour** | | | | | | | |
| 4.1.1 Be > 1km away from any source of noise (trunk road, railway or other major source) or odour or major source of air pollution | | | | | |  | |
| 4.1.2 Be > 100m but < 1km from any source of noise. Be unlikely to be affected by any source of unpleasant odour or major source of air pollution | | | | | | **-** | |
| 4.1.3 Be < 100m from any source of noise. Be affected by any source of unpleasant odour and major air pollution | | | | | |  | |
| **4.2 Residential amenity** | | | | | | | |
| 4.2.1 Development would be positive to the existing surrounding residential amenity by removing disruptive features associated with the current use(s) of the site (e.g., noise and/or odour; disruptive to the existing residential amenity or surrounding vehicular or pedestrian traffic | | | | | |  | |
| 4.2.2 The site is within a predominantly residential area and therefore likely to have good residential amenity | | | | | |  | |
| 4.2.3 The site is within a mixed-use area | | | | | | **-** | |
| 4.2.4 The site is within a predominantly non-residential area where there is potential for disruption to residential amenity | | | | | |  | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| **5.**  **Biodiversity** | To protect, conserve and enhance Biodiversity, Geodiversity, wildlife habitats and green infrastructure to achieve a net gain and to avoid habitat fragmentation | **5.1 Impact of development on biodiversity (RNRP assessment)** | | | | | | | |
| 5.1.1 Not within an area of sensitivity or within an area of low sensitivity | | | | | | **-** | |
| 5.1.2 Within an area of medium sensitivity | | | | | |  | |
| 5.1.3 Within an area of high sensitivity | | | | | |  | |
| **5.2 Impact of development on a protected species or in a site recognised for its wildlife or geological importance** | | | | | | | |
| 5.2.1 The site has no known wildlife or geological interest | | | | | |  | |
| 5.2.2 The site has some biodiversity interest (e.g., contains natural or semi natural habitat or is identified as a Potential Wildlife Site). Mitigation will allow development of at least some of the site | | | | | | **-** | |
| 5.2.3 The site is designated as a Local Wildlife Site. It may be possible for some of the site to be developed with appropriate mitigation | | | | | |  | |
| 5.2.4 Significant constraint such that it is not considered appropriate for development to take place. Lead to permanent disturbance of known protected species and extensive land take of their habitat or significant impact on SSSIs. Fragment acknowledged areas of habitat | | | | | |  | |
| **5.3 Impact on the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area** | | | | | | | |
| 5.3.1 The site is more than 3km from the SPA – no impact anticipated | | | | | |  | |
| 5.3.2 The site is within 50m to 3km of the SPA -a recreational impact on the SPA is anticipated. Mitigation measures will be necessary in accordance with the SPA Supplementary Planning Document: Mitigation Strategy | | | | | |  | |
| 5.3.3 The site is 0 to 50m from the SPA – a severe impact may be likely. Mitigation may not be possible | | | | | |  | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| **6.**  **Landscape** | To protect and enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the natural and cultural landscape and the built environment | **6.1 Impact on visual landscape** | | | | | | | |
| 6.1.1 Within an area of low sensitivity or not within an area of sensitivity | | | | | | **-** | |
| 6.1.2 Within an area of medium sensitivity | | | | | |  | |
| 6.1.3 Within an area of high sensitivity | | | | | |  | |
| **6.2 Impact on existing form of the settlement** | | | | | | | |
| 6.2.1 Development of the site would have a significant positive effect on the existing form and character of the settlement (e.g., opportunities for gateway development, bringing forward the development of derelict land in prominent locations) | | | | | |  | |
| 6.2.2 Development of the site would have a neutral effect on the existing form and character of the settlement | | | | | | **-** | |
| 6.2.3 Development of the site would have a significant negative effect on the existing form and character of the settlement (e.g., the development would adversely affect the setting of a Listed Building or prominent vistas/view lines) but mitigation should be possible | | | | | |  | |
| 6.2.3 There are severe constraints (e.g., development would result in coalescence with neighbouring settlements or is detached from the existing built-up area) | | | | | |  | |
| **6.3 Impact on the Character and setting of the settlement** | | | | | | | |
| 6.3.1 The site would not result in the loss of open space or land which is significant to the form character, form and character of the settlement (e.g., development of LGS or EIOS land) | | | | | | **-** | |
| 6.3.2 The site would result in the loss of open space or land which is significant to the form character, form and character of the settlement (e.g., development of LGS or EIOS land) | | | | | |  | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| **7.**  **Cultural Heritage** | To protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological, architectural and artistic interest and their settings | **7.1 Impact on Cultural Heritage** | | | | | | | |
| 7.1.1 Development would be positive by enhancing a designated historic asset (e.g., removing unattractive features to enhance the setting or ensuring the survival of a designated asset) | | | | | |  | |
| 7.1.2 Have no effect on any cultural assets | | | | | | **-** | |
| 7.1.3 Constraints identified although it may be possible for some development with appropriate mitigation (e.g., development within a conservation area or the setting of a listed building or development affecting a local heritage asset) | | | | | |  | |
| 7.1.4 Significant constraints identified such that it is not considered appropriate for development to take place (e.g., development involving the loss of harm to a designated heritage asset or Scheduled Ancient Monument) | | | | | |  | |
| **7.2 impact on non-designated or local heritage assets** | | | | | | | |
| 7.2.1 Site has no known non-designated or local heritage assets | | | | | |  | |
| 7.2.2 Site has potential for non-designated or local heritage assets, but development is possible with appropriate surveys and/or mitigation | | | | | | **-** | |
| 7.2.3 Site has significant heritage assets that is not considered appropriate for development | | | | | |  | |
| **7.3 Archaeology** | | | | | | | |
| 7.3.1 Site has no archaeology or archaeological activity, or the site has had archaeology excavated in advance of current buildings or previous quarrying practices | | | | | |  | |
| 7.3.2 No known archaeology or archaeological activity. Site may have some potential for activity but the area has never been archaeologically investigated | | | | | | **-** | |
| 7.3.3 Site has real potential for archaeological activity due to any visual features found on the land (e.g., cropmarks, significant artefact finds, etc) | | | | | |  | |
| 7.3.4 Site has significant archaeological activity such that it is not considered appropriate for development to take place | | | | | |  | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| *Climate Change* | *Reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and the impact of climate change (adaptation)* | *All sites are likely to offer similar opportunities to meet this objective – it is not therefore a criterion for choosing between sites. Other objectives such as Water Conservation and Management contribute to addressing climate change.* | | | | | | *N/A* | |
| **8. Air** | **To maintain or improve local air quality** | **8.1 Air quality** | | | | | | | |
| Not in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) | | | | | |  | |
| In an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) | | | | | |  | |
| **9.**  **Water** | Maintain or improve the quality of ground and surface water resources and minimise the demand for water | **9.1 Impact on water resources** | | | | | | | |
| 9.1.1 Not located on a “Major High” permeable strata | | | | | | **-** | |
| 9.1.2 Located on a “Major High” permeable strata | | | | | |  | |
| **10.**  **Natural Hazard** | Reduce the impact of flooding and avoid additional risk | **10.1 Impact on flood risk** | | | | | | | |
| 10.1.1 The site is located in Flood Zone (FZ) 1 | | | | | |  | |
| 10.1.2 The site is entirely located in, or is partially located in FZ 2 and/or partially located in FZ 3 | | | | | |  | |
| 10.1.3 The site is entirely located in FZ 3 or more than 50% of the site is located in FZ 3 | | | | | |  | |
| **10.2 Impact on surface water flood risk** | | | | | | | |
| 10.2.1 Not located within an area of surface water flood risk | | | | | |  | |
| 10.2.2 Partially impacted by surface water flood risk | | | | | |  | |
| 10.3.3 Significant surface water flood risk | | | | | |  | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| **11. Soil and Land** | Ensure the efficient use of land and maintain the resource of productive soil | **11.1 Agricultural land** | | | | | | | |
| 11.1.1 Development would not affect any agricultural land | | | | | |  | |
| 11.1.2 Development is not likely to result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a) | | | | | | **-** | |
| 11.1.3 Development is likely to result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a) | | | | | |  | |
| **11.2 Previously Developed Land** | | | | | | | |
| 11.2.1 The site is Brownfield | | | | | |  | |
| 11.2.2 A significant proportion of the site is Brownfield | | | | | | **-** | |
| 11.2.3 The site is predominantly Greenfield | | | | | |  | |
|  |  | **11.3 Land Stability** | | | | | | | |
| 11.3.1 There are no known land stability issues in the area | | | | | |  | |
| 11.3.2 There are potential land stability issues in the area | | | | | | **-** | |
| 11.3.3 There are known land stability issues in the area | | | | | |  | |
| **11.4 Land Contamination** | | | | | | | |
| 11.4.1 There are no known land contamination issues | | | | | |  | |
| 11.4.2 There are potential land contamination issues | | | | | | **-** | |
| 11.4.3 There are known land contamination issues | | | | | |  | |
| **12.**  **Minerals** | Ensure the efficient use of minerals and primary resources | **12.1 Impact on minerals stock** | | | | | | | |
| 12.1.1 The site is located outside of land allocated for mineral extraction and outside an area of sand and gravel safeguarding area as stated in the Northamptonshire Minerals & Waste Local Plan | | | | | |  | |
| 12.1.2 The site is partially located on land allocated for mineral extraction and/or a sand and gravel safeguarding area as stated in the Northamptonshire Minerals & Waste Local Plan | | | | | | **-** | |
| 12.1.3 The site is entirely located on land allocated for mineral extraction and/or a sand and gravel safeguarding area as stated in the Northamptonshire Minerals & Waste Local Plan | | | | | |  | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| ***Energy Use*** | *To mitigate climate change by minimising carbon-based energy usage by increasing energy efficiency and to develop North Northamptonshire’s renewable energy resource, including dependency on non-renewable resources* | *All sites are likely to offer similar opportunities to meet this objective – it is not therefore a criterion for choosing between sites.* | | | | | | *N/A* | |
| ***Waste*** | *To reduce waste arising and increase reuse, recycling and composting* | *All sites are likely to offer similar opportunities to meet this objective – it is not therefore a criterion for choosing between sites.* | | | | | | *N/A* | |
| **13. Employment** | Maintain and enhance employment opportunities and to reduce the disparities arising from unequal access to jobs | **13.1 Impact on employment** | | | | | | | |
| 13.1.1 Site will have no impact on employment provision | | | | | | **-** | |
| 13.1.2 Development on the site will result in loss of employment (e.g., will involve the loss of jobs from any use currently on site or result in the loss of employment land from an existing employment estate) | | | | | |  | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| ***Wealth Creation*** | *Retain and enhance the factors which are conductive to wealth creation, including personal creativity, infrastructure and the local strengths and qualities that are attractive to visitors and investors* | *Not relevant to this assessment. It will not assist in choosing between sites.* | | | | | | *N/A* | |
| **14.**  **Town Centres** | Protect and enhance the vitality and viability of town centres and market towns | **14.1 Impact on town centre** | | | | | | | |
| 14.1.1 The site will provide housing in the town centre which will increase the vitality of the area (for example by introducing an active frontage or utilising under-used space) | | | | | |  | |
| 14.1.2 The site will have no impact on the town centre | | | | | | **-** | |
| 14.1.3 The site would result in the loss of a main town centre use (e.g., active primary retail frontage) | | | | | |  | |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | | | | | | **Symbol** | |
| **15.**  **Physical Limitations** | N/A | **15.1 Physical Constraints** | | | | | | | |
| 15.1.1 The site has no obvious physical constraints | | | | | |  | |
| 15.1.2 The site has physical constraints that can be mitigated (e.g., Tree Preservation Orders, existing buildings) | | | | | | **-** | |
| 15.1.3 The site has constraints that cannot be mitigated (e.g., extremely steep slopes, gas pipeline) | | | | | |  | |
| **15.2 Ease of Utility Provision** | | | | | | | |
| 15.2.1 Very easy to service (score of 5 from SHLAA) | | | | | |  | |
| 15.2.2 Easy, average or moderately easy to service (score of 4, 3 or 2 from SHLAA) | | | | | | **-** | |
| 15.2.3 Least easy to service (score of 1 from SHLAA) | | | | | |  | |
| **15.3 Existing Use** | | | | | | | |
| 15.3.1 The site is vacant | | | | | |  | |
| 15.3.2 Site is in active use but will not need to be relocated (e.g., existing residential garden) | | | | | | **-** | |
| 15.3.3 Site is in current active use which may need to be relocated (e.g., business or community use includes recreational open space) | | | | | |  | |
| **15.**  **Physical Limitations** | N/A | **15.4 Vehicular access** | | | | | | | |
| 15.4.1 No known constraints to vehicular access | | | | | |  | |
| 15.4.2 Vehicular access unsuitable and or restrictive but possible through effective mitigation | | | | | |  | |
| 15.4.3 Vehicular is very constrained and would require a very high level of mitigation/is not possible | | | | | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | **Symbol** |
| **AVAILABILITY** | | | |
| **16 Availability** | N/A | **16.1. Site Ownership** | |
| 16.1.1 The site is held by a developer or landowner willing to develop the site or already has planning permission (score of 5 from SHLAA in the absence of new information) |  |
| 16.1.2 Ownership is unknown or owner has not been contactable (score of 3 of 2 from SHLAA in the absence of new information) | **-** |
| 16.1.3 Site is known to be in complex or multiple ownership (score of 0 from SHLAA in the absence of new information) or there are ownership issues that need to be resolved (e.g., tenancy agreements) |  |
| 16.1.4 Site is owned by a landowner who is known to be unwilling to develop their land |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SA Topic** | **SA Objective** | **Decision Making Criteria** | **Symbol** | |
| **ACHIEVABILITY** | | | | |
| **17**  **Achievability** | N/A | **17.1 Achievability** | | |
| 17.1.1 The site is expected to be viable |  |
| 17.1.2 Viability of the site is expected to be marginal | **-** |
| 17.1.3 Viability of the site is expected to be challenging |  |

North Northants Council Logo

The logo of North Northamptonshire Council

**North Northamptonshire HELAA: Site Assessment Criteria (January 2022): Comments and Feedback**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Your Contact Details** | | | | | | | | |
| **1** | | **Title:** | | |  | | | |
| **2** | | **Full Name:** | | |  | | | |
| **3** | | **Position (if relevant):** | | |  | | | |
| **4** | | **Organisation / company:** | | |  | | | |
| **5** | | **Your Address:** | Line 1 | |  | | | |
| Line 2 | |  | | | |
| Line 3 | |  | | | |
| Line 4 | |  | | | |
| **6** | | **Postcode:** | | |  | | | |
| **7** | | **Telephone Number:** | | |  | | | |
| **8** | | **Email address:** | | |  | | | |
| **9** | | **Please select the role(s) which best describes yourself:** | | |  | Owner of the site |  | Registered Social Landlord |
|  | Land Agent |  | Developer |
|  | Planning Consultant |  | Local Builder |
|  | Acting on behalf of the site owner(s) |  | Public land-owning body |
|  | Other\* | | |
| **\*If Other is selected, please specify your role (e.g., a third party; Parish Council etc):** | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| **10** | **Date:** | | |  | | | | |

**General Data Protection Regulations**

To see more about how we record and store your information please see North Northamptonshire Council’s Corporate Privacy Notice: <https://www.northnorthants.gov.uk/your-council/corporate-privacy-notice>

**1. Do you have comments on any of the assessment criteria as proposed? If so, please can you specify the criteria (through reference to the SA Topic or Decision-Making criteria) and provide these comments in the table below:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SA Topic** | **Decision-Making Criteria** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**2. Are you aware of any best practice examples in respect of assessment criteria from other areas and which we should consider for inclusion in the North Northamptonshire HELAA? (For example, can you name a local authority or area which is doing things robustly in your opinion and specify why?):**

**3. Climate Change: do you have any suggestions on how we can specifically consider this area through site assessment (including criteria)?:**

**4. From an organisational perspective, is there a particular criterion you would like to see added to those proposed:**

**5. Is there anything missing from the proposed criteria which you feel should be included? (for example a thematic area such as Biodiversity Net Gain?) If so, please can you provide details below including suggestions of how we may be able to assess this:**

**6. Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to secondary site assessment?**

**7. Is there anything you disagree with within this paper? If so, please provide further details below (making explicit reference to the relevant section/paragraph/table):**

**8. Please provide any other comments or feedback on the proposed approach to assessment which is not covered elsewhere:**

If you do wish to provide feedback please can completed questions be returned by emailing the Council at [planningpolicy@northnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@northnorthants.gov.uk) by **Monday 25th April 2022.**

1. The Joint Core Strategy is the Part 1 Local Plan for North Northamptonshire [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Referred to as the North Northamptonshire Strategic Plan (NNSP) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. This can include other uses such as Retail [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Taking account of constraints and other considerations [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Alongside any other comments interested parties may wish to submit on the current proposals [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. For example, the Town and Rural Housing Methodology Papers published by the Borough Council of Wellingborough (September 2017) and Corby Borough Council’s Site Selection Methodology Background Paper, (June 2018). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Albeit in some instances this may impact on viability and therefore achievability. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)