

SITE :

SITE SIZE :

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA:

Red = Criteria not met

Green = Meets criteria

Amber = Criteria partially met/Unknown

-1 = Not Desirable

-2 = Poor

+1 = Fair

+2 = Good

0 = Unmarked/No weight figure

The scoring system allows a consistent comparison across all sites. The weighting, which gives a higher score to questions 1 (e), 2, 3 (a), 3 (b), 3 (f), 4 (h), 5 (e), and 7 (a), identifies factors that are key to the achievement of the Plan's aims and objectives.

Total: Red, Green, Amber. Weight Figure

1. LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT		
a. Is it a previously developed site?		
b. Is it contained within the existing built confines of Egerton Forstal (Local Plan, HOU3a), or adjoining or close to the existing built-up confines of Egerton (Local Plan HOU5) or meets local needs housing requirement (Local Plan HOU2)		
c. Is the site within easy walking distance of facilities such as a shop, bus stop, school, recreation area, village hall, place of worship? (400 m or under, no difficult or busy crossing points = green; up to 800 m = amber; over 800m =red)		
d. If developed, would it avoid the creation of stretches of ribbon development?		
e. If developed, would it maintain green gaps that would preserve the distinctive character of Egerton's settlements (as defined in the Egerton Parish Design statement)?		
2. TYPE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT Is there scope for affordable/local needs housing?		
3. CHARACTER AND VISUAL IMPACT		
a. Would development of the site maintain a key view and/or vista of the parish landscape - notably the Greensand Ridge and uphill beyond to the North Downs; downhill to the Low Weald and beyond to the High Weald?		
b. If developed, would it be sensitive to the current settlement pattern as set out in the Parish Design Statement?		

c. If developed, would it avoid an adverse impact on grass verges, hedges, trees, ditches or other key features in the landscape?		
d. If developed, would there be scope to soften - with planting and green spaces - the “hard” edges of existing building in the village? (new building will have conditions placed on it under NP or ABC policies)		
e. If developed, would there be scope for sensitive boundaries between existing (and between new) properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy?		
f. Would development on this site avoid adverse impacts on neighbouring (adjacent, opposite, rear) properties? For example, would it avoid an overbearing addition to the built-up area and a visual intrusion in the landscape.		
g. If developed, would it preserve the setting of the Conservation Area;		
h. If developed, would it preserve the setting of historic & listed buildings and archaeological sites, (e.g. would it preserve the key views of the Church)? -		
4. ACCESS, PARKING, FACILITIES AND UTILITIES		
a. Does the site have access to the current road network, with scope for adequate sight lines and splays at its junction with the existing highway?		
b. Would the introduction of a new access avoid visual impacts on the street scene?		
c. Does the site allow access for waste & recycling removal, deliveries, fire and ambulance services?		
d. Can the site accommodate off-street parking for residents and visitors to avoid overspill onto adjacent streets?		
e. Can the site accommodate additional off-street parking to ease congestion/obstruction in nearby roads?		
f. Do the networks of water supply, sewerage, gas, electricity, telephone & broadband have the capacity to serve this site? <i>or can the site be served by investment of new infrastructure provision? (The answers may be “unknown” at this stage)</i>		

g. Does the site provide ease of access to other facilities for cyclists, pedestrians, people with disabilities, wheelchair users, prams? (Such as accessible public footpaths, or scope for improved footpaths or bridleways)		
h. Would development on the site have minimal impact on traffic congestion?		
i. If developed, would the site avoid adverse impact on public rights of way? (footpaths, bridleways etc.)		
j. Does the site have scope for recreation/leisure/green space amongst new housing proposals?		
5. ENVIRONMENT		
a. The site is not designated for nature conservation importance (e.g. Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIS), Local Nature Reserve, (LNR), Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) now known as Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) <i>Note: There are none of these within the Parish.</i>		
b. Does the site provide opportunities to enhance or replace habitats for flora and fauna (notably protected species such as bluebells, primroses, bats, newts)? Would building still give scope to retain trees, hedges, ditches, ponds, streams, springs and grass verges?		
c. Is the site at minimal risk of flooding (what is likely to be the source of flooding - ground water saturation or excessive storm water?)		
d. Is it on low quality agricultural land? (Categories and grades of land attached) [Also a need for Special Landscape Area maps]		
e. Is there scope to mitigate environmental impact of development on existing housing – avoiding overshadowing, daylight deprivation, light pollution.		
f. Is the site free of contamination?		
6. AVAILABILITY		
a. Has the site been suggested following a call for sites?		
b. Is the site a suggestion from the NP group?		

c. Is the site in single ownership?		
d. Is the site likely to become available within the future timeframe of the Plan?		
e. Are there no restrictive covenants on the site?		
f. If not required or not suitable for housing or commercial use, could the site be used for purposes such as recreation?		
7. ACHIEVABILITY		
a. Does the site location and its associated features generally conform to local and national planning policy (ABC's 2030 Plan and NPPF)?		
b. Is there scope for the investment of additional infrastructure that would be required above and beyond what would normally be required?		
8. SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH, EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS (for commercial development only)		
a) Is there evidence that the site has been developed in the recent past (i.e. visible and significant remains of former structures) or is no longer in use (redundant buildings) or not in full use? (i.e. is it a "brownfield" site?)		
b) Is the site being promoted for greater business /employment space?		
c) Does the proposal provide more job opportunities?		
d) If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?		
e) Does the proposal include an educational component/learning opportunities?		
f) Does the site avoid adverse impact on residents in relation to anticipated traffic movements and associated noise and pollution?		
g) Would it help support sustainable tourism?		