

Housing Site Assessment Report October 2023



Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Site assessment process.....	5
3. Site Assessment Methodology	8
4. Assessment of Sites.....	20
5. Sustainability appraisal process	24
Appendix A: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site details	25
Appendix B: Site Assessment Proformas – Towns (see separate pdf)	33
Appendix C: Site Assessment Proformas – Larger Villages (see separate pdf) ..	34
Appendix D: Links between plan making process, sustainability appraisal process and site assessment process.....	35

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Rutland County Council is preparing a new Local Plan. This will update the following “Development Plan Documents” (DPDs) and replace them with a single local plan:
 - Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD (October 2010)
 - Core Strategy DPD (July 2011)
 - Site Allocations and Policies DPD (October 2014)
- 1.2 The Local Plan will cover the plan period to 2041 and allocate sites for any new housing or other development that may be required to meet requirements over the plan period.
- 1.3 Allocating sites is integral to the Local Plan as it is these sites which will facilitate the Local Plan’s strategic policies and objectives. The Council is seeking to identify an appropriate range of sites to accommodate the expanding population, creating new places and spaces reflecting the needs and priorities of the community. The assessment will include economic, social and environmental factors responding to the key principles of sustainable development.
- 1.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the requirements for producing a Local Plan and states that a fundamental part of the Local Plan is to allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bring forward new land where necessary and provide detail on development where appropriate. In order to do this the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides clarity in the production and deliverability of local plans. Planning authorities are required to provide sufficient detail about nature, location, and scale of development when proposing allocations.
- 1.5 The NPPF identifies that local plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies of what will or will not be permitted and where, whilst taking into account economic, social and environmental factors. Local Plans should also identify areas to limit change, where development is inappropriate and enhance natural, built and historic environments.
- 1.6 This document sets out the methodology which has been used for assessing the potential allocation of sites in the Rutland Local Plan. Appendices A and B to this document set out the details of the site assessment of all sites submitted through the Call for Sites undertaken between 2021-2022 which are located in and close to the towns (Oakham,

Uppingham and Stamford) and the 21 Larger Villages which have been identified in the draft Local Plan as the locations where new housing development will be focussed.

2. Site assessment process

- 2.1 The aim of the site assessment process is to help determine which sites are the most suitable for allocating for development in the Local Plan. The process has been undertaken in the following stages.
- 2.2 Stage 1 is the preparation of a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) assessment to provide the “long list” of sites for assessment.
- 2.3 Stage 2 is an initial assessment of SHLAA sites to screen out those with a “show -stopper” constraint or which are not located in accordance with the emerging spatial strategy.
- 2.4 Stage 3 comprises a detailed assessment of remaining sites not screened out by stage 2 above

Stage 1 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

- 2.5 All known sites submitted through the Call for Sites process have been assessed, initially through the SHLAA process. The SHLAA is a survey of potential development sites. It identifies a list of sites that are considered to be potentially suitable, when the sites would be available and whether they would be achievable. It does not, however, determine which sites should be allocated, that is a matter for the Local Plan and hence this site assessment report. The inclusion of a site within the SHLAA, and any evidence relating to it, does not imply that planning permission will be granted. Many of the sites assessed are contrary to current development plan policy and might only be considered appropriate for permission if they are allocated in the new Local Plan. All SHLAA sites are listed in Appendix A.

Stage 2 SHLAA site assessment

- 2.6 The Local Plan seeks to locate allocations adjacent to or within the most sustainable settlements in the county. The main towns of Oakham and Uppingham along with Stamford which is within South Kesteven District but abuts the County are the largest settlements which provide the widest range of employment opportunities, services and facilities and are therefore considered to be the most appropriate, sustainable, locations for new development.
- 2.7 The spatial strategy has been reviewed as part of preparing the new local plan. It is proposed that the new local plan will include 21 Larger Villages with Planned Limits to Development. Together with the towns, these

settlements are where some form of allocation might be considered acceptable in the emerging local plan. Therefore, sites located away from these 24 settlements have been screened out through stage 2.

- 2.8 This removes any sites that are not considered to be in line with the spatial strategy and key locational policies, ensuring that any sites that progress through the process are in the most sustainable locations across the County.
- 2.9 Sites already with the benefit of planning permission were also screened out from further assessment. These sites are expected to be developed during the course of the plan period and do not therefore need to be allocated in the new local plan. Sites with planning permission are monitored through the annual Five Year Land Supply Report.
- 2.10 Sites which are subject to nationally designated constraints have also been screened out at this stage. This includes sites:
 - within SSSI, SPA, or Ramsar site,
 - Scheduled Monument designations
 - Where more than 50% of the site is within flood risk zone 3
- 2.11 Where sites were found to be unavailable or promoted for an alternative use to residential, they have not been carried through to stage 3. This enabled a focused stage 3 assessment process.
- 2.12 Screening sites out through stage 2 means that only the most potentially suitable sites are carried through to the full assessment at stage 3.
- 2.13 As a result of the work carried out in the SHLAA there is a comprehensive list of sites considered to be either deliverable or developable that will be carried through to this site allocation assessment process. Inevitably there are a number of sites found to be deliverable or developable through SHLAA stage 2 assessment that will not be considered to be appropriate for development either in isolation or cumulatively with other sites within a settlement. In addition, some sites may not fulfil national planning policy requirements for sustainable development. This assessment process will refine those sites identified as deliverable or developable through the SHLAA and provide a more in depth assessment resulting in a list of sites that will be appropriate for allocation.

Stage 3 Detailed Site Assessment

- 2.14 Stage 3 of the process provides a much more detailed assessment of sites, in terms of on and off site constraints, designations, the impact of development on a range of factors and, where appropriate, specialist

consultation responses have been requested, town and parish council comments where available, and a planning officer assessment. The environmental, social and economic information already identified in the SHLAA and through the GIS assessment undertaken as part of the Sustainability Appraisal Technical Annex has been brought forward into the assessment. In addition, further information about the accessibility of each of the sites to services and facilities and public transport connections has been gathered.

- 2.15 The detailed assessment includes a Red, Amber Green (RAG) rating for each factor in line with the methodology set out in section 3 below. The rating is not designed to select sites for allocation on a quantitative assessment only. It is to provide a guide on how sites perform against one another. Applying a RAG rating system in parallel to the overall commentary and planning judgement allows each site to be assessed as a potential allocation. It may be that a site could rate comparatively well against other sites, but there is in fact one criteria that causes significant concerns meaning that the site is not suitable for allocation. Therefore, alongside each site assessment a commentary is provided about the site, concluding whether the site is considered suitable for allocation or not.
- 2.16 Not all sites which are identified as potentially being appropriate for allocation will be allocated in the new local plan. A separate process considering the scale of housing need and required distribution of development has been carried out and only sufficient sites to meet the need including an appropriate buffer will be allocated. Therefore, at the final stage an assessment of the sites found appropriate has been carried out, to compare sites against one another in each particular settlement to establish which of those sites would be the best option to carry forward to allocation.

Uppingham

- 2.17 Uppingham Town Council is preparing a review of its Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan. The County Council has agreed that the neighbourhood plan is an appropriate vehicle to allocate sites for housing development to meet the needs of Uppingham. Therefore, whilst this site assessment report includes an assessment of sites in and around Uppingham the decision to allocate them or not will be deferred to the Neighbourhood Plan process.
- 2.18 The Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted to RCC and is currently out for Regulation 16 consultation. The independent Examination of the plan will begin once consultation closes.

3. Site Assessment Methodology

Previously Developed Land

- 3.1 Encouraging the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (also known as brownfield land) provided that it is not of high quality for biodiversity or environmental value is a key principle identified within the NPPF. Therefore, sites that are previously developed are identified as being preferable for development (unless they have been identified through the Phase 1 habitat study as being of high biodiversity value see criteria on biodiversity value below) and have a green RAG rating, whilst a mixed use site where it is brownfield only in part attract an amber RAG rating and purely greenfield sites have a red RAG rating. This reflects the need to look to brownfield sites first for development ahead of greenfield sites.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Is the site an efficient use of land?		Brownfield
		Partially Brownfield
		Greenfield

Topography

- 3.2 Topography is a constraint in parts of Rutland. The most viable sites are likely to be the flatter sites, therefore the following scores apply. It should be noted that any site identified as having a red RAG rating through the SHLAA assessment was screened out at stage 2 as it was considered that any sites identified with a red RAG rating could not be mitigated.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Are there any topographical constraints?		Relatively flat
		Gentle slope/ undulations
		Steep slope/ undulations

Agricultural Land

- 3.3 The quality of agricultural land is a key consideration in Rutland due to the nature of the County and the amount of farmland currently in use. The NPPF requires the protection of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land which is defined as Grade 1, 2 and 3a land when utilising the Agricultural Land Classification system. Unfortunately, the majority of Rutland has not been reassessed to subdivide Grade 3 land into either 3a and 3b, therefore the scoring does not distinguish between the two and all Grade 3 is treated as amber. Large parts of the County are classed as

BMV being either grade 2 or 3 (with some smaller areas of Grade 1), if the Council is to meet its housing need in the most sustainable locations it may be necessary to allocate land which is considered to be BMV. This is particularly the case around Oakham and Uppingham.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Is the land identified as being the best and most versatile farmland?		Within grade 4 or 5 and urban
		Within grade 3
		Within grade 1 or 2

Biodiversity

- 3.4 Sites will be assessed against the presence of international, national and locally designated biodiversity or geological sites and based on consultation responses utilising the interactive Natural England tool on the MAGIC GIS layers which identifies whether a type of development would require further consultation with them or not and evidence contained within the new Phase 1 Habitat Survey (2023). In addition, consultation responses from the team at the Leicestershire & Rutland Environmental Records Centre (LERC) will enable the RAG rating to be established regarding the locally designated sites.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Will the development of the site have an impact on a SSSI, SAC, SPA or Ramsar site?		Not within a Natural England Impact Zone, or within a Natural England Impact Zone but is unlikely to have an adverse impact on any designated site, meaning that Natural England consultation not required.
		Site is within a Natural England Impact Zone – Impact Zone indicates that Natural England required to be consulted on likely risks
		Site is a designated SSSI/SAC/SPA or Ramsar Site

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Will the development of the site have an impact on a locally designated site?		Site not designated as Local Wildlife Site, protected species and BAP priority habitats, and will not impact on a designated site
		Site adjoins or may impact on a Local Wildlife Site, protected species and BAP priority habitats, but which can be accommodated through mitigation and avoidance of harm and/or further surveys required. only partial development of the site may be acceptable
		Site is a designated Local Wildlife Site, protected species and Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitats are likely. Mitigation is unacceptable; only partial development of the site may be acceptable.

Trees protected by Preservation Orders

- 3.5 Trees play an important role in the environment in Rutland and where these trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) it is important that this is assessed as a constraint to a site coming forward. The following scoring is therefore applied based on the TPO GIS records held by the Local Authority. Where GIS reveals development may impact on a protected tree the Council's Tree Officer will be consulted.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Will the development of the site have an impact on protected trees?		No Tree Preservation Orders on or adjacent to the site
		Tree Preservation Orders – but impact can be mitigated.
		Significant adverse impact on Tree Preservation Orders (e.g., blanket)

Relationship to settlement

- 3.6 In order to establish which sites are more logical in terms of an extension to an existing settlement it is important to identify which are better associated with the existing built form by looking at the planned limits of development boundaries which are identified around settlements and how the site relates to existing built form. It should be noted that sites not connected to a planned limit of development were screened out as part of the SHLAA assessment process and were not carried through to this stage of the assessment. Further commentary will be made on this particular factor through the Planning Officer assessment of the site as whilst a site maybe connected to an existing settlement it may still not form a logical extension to a settlement.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Is the site a logical extension to the settlement?		Within settlement or edged on 3 sides
		Edged on 1-2 sides
		No relationship

Landscape

- 3.7 Landscape is an important factor to be considered in Rutland and a Landscape Sensitivity Study (2023) has been completed in order to inform the assessment of sites. The study assesses landscape sensitivity using a number of criteria and concludes whether the landscape is sensitive to development based upon a range from high, medium high, medium, medium low and low sensitivity. Detailed description within the study should be used to determine whether a proposed development site is of high medium or low sensitivity. Overall, high and high/medium levels of sensitivity are considered to be a constraint on housing or employment use allocation in terms of landscape and visual factors. In areas with low sensitivity, development would generally be acceptable, whilst some development may be acceptable with areas of medium or medium/low sensitivity. In addition to utilising this study to inform the assessment of this element, consultation with the Landscape Architect who undertook this LSS work will also be carried out in order to fully assess the sites.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Impact on Landscape Sensitivity		Area of Low Sensitivity to development where development is generally acceptable

		Area of medium or medium/low Sensitivity to development where some development may be acceptable
		Area of High or Medium High Sensitivity to development where development should be constrained for landscape and visual factors.

Heritage Assets

- 3.8 There is a significant historic environment in parts of Rutland where a range of heritage assets including conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled monuments, historic parks and gardens and archaeological sites are present. A GIS constraint check is carried out on each site to establish where the nearest heritage assets are located. Where they are found within 50m of the site (or where they are a known constraint from previous information gathered) consultation with the Conservation Officer takes place to inform the assessment and scoring of the site. Archaeological assessment is carried out through consultation with the Leicestershire County Council Principal Archaeologist. Leicestershire Historic Environment Records Centre (LHERC)

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Impact on Heritage Assets?		No impact on heritage asset or setting.
		Some impact which could be mitigated (e.g., affect a heritage asset and/or the setting of a heritage asset).
		Significant adverse impact cannot be mitigated / or would result in the loss of a designated heritage asset

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria Scoring	
Impact on Archaeological Sites?		No impact on archaeological site
		Some impact which could be mitigated (e.g., affect an archaeological site and/or the setting)
		Significant adverse impact on an archaeological site cannot be mitigated

Green and Blue Infrastructure

- 3.9 The Council now has a suite of evidence reports covering Green and Blue infrastructure. This includes the following:

The Rutland Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy (2023) assesses the network of green spaces and water environments that sustains the ecosystems needed for a good quality of life in the County. Using mapping and spatial analysis it identifies Rutland’s highest priorities for GBI as restoring biodiversity and improving networks, protecting and enhancing tree cover; enhancing water and soil quality, incorporating GBI into new development and enabling active lifestyles and access to GBI and then provides a strategy for addressing each objective.

An Open Space Assessment which comprises an assessment of the quantity, accessibility, quality and value of open spaces within Rutland County and for each of the 15 sub-areas and provides standards for open space to inform on and off site requirements for development. This identifies public open spaces and recreation facilities which are important assets in the local and wider area.

A Playing Pitch Strategy is also being prepared which assesses the quality and quantity and future need for playing pitches and outdoor sports facilities.

Sites will be scored to establish whether development would impact on these green and blue infrastructure assets.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Impact on Green Infrastructure?		Not a public open space/recreation facility - so no loss/impact
		Site is public open space/recreation facility but any loss can be mitigated against
		Site is public open space /recreation facility which will be lost

Important Open Space

- 3.10 Important Open Spaces are a constraint which is identified on the Council’s GIS system to make sure they are recorded and taken into consideration when assessing sites. Sites are assessed against this GIS layer to establish whether the development of a site would have an impact on an Important Open Space or the open aspect provided by that space.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Impact on Important Open Space?		Not designated
		Designated site but with no adverse impact
		Loss or adverse impact on the openness of the important space

Water Conservation and Management: Flood Risk & Surface Water

- 3.11 Flood risk is a significant consideration in assessing sites and therefore the flood risk zone is identified for each site and consultation is carried out with the Local Lead Flood Authority in order to establish which sites are constrained by risk of flooding.
- 3.12 Groundwater Source Protection Zones are designated zones around public water supply abstractions and other sensitive receptors that signal there are particular risks to the groundwater source they protect. The zones are based on an estimation of the time it would take for a pollutant which enters the saturated zone of an aquifer to reach the source abstraction or discharge point. The element is therefore taken into account in assessing the sites in order to look at the wider water management impact.
- 3.13 Surface water flooding is also a key consideration and establishing whether a site is within an area where there is a medium or high risk of surface water flooding enables an assessment of the impact of developing a site. There are surface water drainage schemes that can be developed to mitigate in some circumstances and therefore amber includes where mitigation may address the constraint.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Is the site at risk of fluvial flooding?		No flood risk or minimal downstream flood risk
		Moderate flood risk or possible/potential risk to downstream locations
		Significant flood risk or potential to exacerbate flood risk downstream – known issues

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Groundwater Source protection zone?		Not within an SPZ
		Within a zone 2 or 3 SPZ
		Within a zone 1 SPZ

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Is the site at risk of surface water flooding?		No areas of surface water flood risk are present in the site
		Areas of surface water flood risk is present in the site; mitigation techniques may be required
		Areas of high surface water flood risk is present in the site. Development should be avoided

Access, highway safety, wider road network and rights of way

- 3.14 The provision of additional homes and employment sites will inevitably have an impact on the local highway and sometimes on the wider surrounding road network. The sites have been assessed by the Local Highway Authority to determine the impact of the access of the site and the impact on the wider road network. This assessment is made without technical details of the exact point of access being identified for each site and provides an initial assessment of the possible impact.
- 3.15 In addition, a consideration of the impact on existing public rights of way is also identified to establish whether there are constraints to a sites development with the need to re-route or design in a public right of way into a scheme.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Site access?		No access concerns
		Potential access concerns which are resolvable
		No access achievable – sever impact on highway

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Impact on wider road network?		No significant impact on the wider road network
		Impact on the wider road network requiring mitigation
		Significant impact on the wider road network with no possible mitigation

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
-------------------	--------------	--

Impact on right of way?		No public rights of way affected
		Permissive footpaths/Public rights of way affected – requiring mitigation.
		Public rights of way affected no mitigation possible

Employment Sites

- 3.16 A key consideration in assessing the impact of the development of a site for new homes is the loss of the land for other existing uses which may also play an important role in the local community in terms of the economy and the provision of jobs. The sites are therefore assessed on whether the redevelopment for housing would see the loss of an allocated employment site. There is no amber rating allocated for this element of the assessment, it is identified as either being a loss or not.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Loss of allocated employment site?		No loss of allocated employment site
		Loss of allocated employment site

Minerals Safeguarding

- 3.17 The purposes of Mineral Safeguarding Areas is to protect known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance, ensuring they are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development. Designation of Minerals Safeguarding Areas do not carry a presumption that any resources will be worked, nor do they preclude other forms of development taking place. Sites are assessed to identify whether they are within safeguarded area or not as this will need to be taken into account when developing a scheme. There is no red RAG rating category for this element of the assessment as whilst it will form a consideration, it does not rule a site out from other forms of development.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Does the site intersect with a Minerals Safeguarding Area?		Does not intersect with a Minerals Safeguarding Area
		Intersects with a Minerals Safeguarding Area

Accessibility

- 3.18 Accessibility to local services, facilities and public transport are also considered through the assessment process. A key objective of

sustainable development is to ensure new homes have access to services, facilities and employment. This element of the assessment can also flag up where access and public transport links could be improved. With regard to distances to town or local centres, schools, doctors or health centre and other key facilities the Department for Transport guidance¹ is used which identifies that 800m is a walkable distance to these types of facilities.

- 3.19 No distance is provided in this guidance as to a walkable distance to a railway station. Through the work carried out in setting assessment parameters, it is identified that in the rural context of Rutland that 2500m is an appropriate walkable distance to a railway station. There is however, only one railway station in Rutland located in Oakham, therefore most sites will not be able to meet this criteria. The guidance does however suggest that an acceptable walkable distance to a bus stop is 400m. This is therefore used for assessing the distances to bus stops in this assessment.
- 3.20 The distances to both public rights of way and cycle routes are identified as it is considered that the closer a site is to these, the more opportunity there is to enhance linkages and create more accessible developments.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Access to facilities and services including pub, shop, school, GP		Less than 400m
		400-800m
		Greater than 800m

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Proximity to a bus stop/daily bus service		Less than 400m
		Greater than 400m

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Proximity to a public right of way/ active travel		Less than 50m
		Greater than 50m

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Proximity to a cycle route connecting to services		Less than 50m
		Greater than 50m

¹ WebTag (December 2015) Unit A4.2 paragraph 6.4.5, Department for Transport

On site constraints

- 3.21 On site constraints may affect the delivery of site, for example, electricity pylons and pipelines. All those promoting a site are asked to identify if there are such constraints on the site so this source of information along with Ordnance Survey layers and in some cases site visits will be used to identify these potential constraints to development.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
On site constraints – are there any present?		No constraint
		On site constraints which will require mitigation. May affect viability
		Significant constraint may prevent development

Availability of Infrastructure

- 3.22 The ability for sites to be developed and connect to existing infrastructure for services such as electricity, gas and water resources can be key in the viability of a site and also the speed at which a site can come forward. All those promoting a site are asked to identify whether these services are available within the vicinity of the site and consultation will also be carried out with service providers including Anglian Water and Severn Trent Water to establish if there are any specific issues regarding the capacity of water resources with regard to specific sites. In addition, the capacity of the local schools will be identified and taken into account to provide an idea of accessibility of local education services.

Assessment Factor	RAG Criteria	
Availability of infrastructure?		No known constraint to infrastructure capacity
		Known infrastructure capacity constraints which will require mitigation. May affect viability
		significant infrastructure constraint may prevent development

- 3.23 The range of environmental, social and economic factors used to assess each site have been devised to link with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objectives. The site assessments will be recorded in a tabular format which will show the factors assessed and a RAG (red/amber/green) for each of the factors identified for each site. This will enable a comparison

against each of the sites. The purpose of the colour coding or “traffic light system” is to allow visual comparison between the sites in terms of the factors assessed and to highlight any significant constraints.

- 3.24 The sites will be arranged in parish order so that sites within the same settlements can be assessed more easily.

Parish Council Responses

- 3.19 In March 2023 Parish Councils were asked to provide local information about sites to support the site assessment process. Where a response was made by parish councils this has been included in the assessment proforma.

4. Assessment of Sites

- 4.1 A proforma has been prepared for each site, setting out the details of the site location, size and potential capacity along with the RAG ratings for each of the above criterion and, where appropriate, a commentary on how the site has been scored.
- 4.2 The following assessments have been undertaken using GIS mapping and show where a site is wholly or a significant part of the site intercepts with the designation. No commentary is provided for these, although they may be referenced in the Planning Officer comments box at the end of each proforma.
- Brownfield/Greenfield land
 - SSSI Impact Risk Zone
 - Local Wildlife Site
 - BAP priority Habitat
 - Landscape Sensitivity
 - Conservation Area
 - Registered Park and Garden
 - Scheduled monument
 - Listed building
 - Agricultural land quality
 - Fluvial Flood Risk
 - Surface Water Flood Risk
 - Groundwater source protection zone
 - Loss of open space
 - Mineral Safeguarding Area
 - Loss of employment land
 - Tree Preservation order
 - Logical extension to settlement
- 4.3 The following criterion are set out with a commentary and RAG rating:
- Initial Highway Officer comments
 - Relationship to Settlement Comments
 - Topography
 - Green Infrastructure
 - Important Open Space
 - Rights of Way
 - National Ecology designations
 - Local Ecology designations
 - Tree Preservation Orders
 - Agricultural Land Classification
 - Heritage
 - Archaeology

- Landscape
 - Lead Flood Authority Flood Risk
 - Environmental Health & Contamination
 - Highways Authority: Access
 - Highways Authority: Wider Road Network
 - Parish /Town Council comments
- 4.4 The site proformas are included at Appendices B (Towns) and C (Larger Villages)
- 4.5 Once this assessment has been carried out on an individual site basis, the sites have been compared against one another to identify which are the most appropriate to allocate to meet the vision and objectives of the Local Plan.

Sequential Approach

- 4.6 When looking at sites associated with existing settlements, a sequential approach has been applied using the following prioritisation criteria:
- a) Brownfield sites within settlements
 - b) Brownfield sites on the edge of settlements
 - c) Greenfield sites within settlements
 - d) Greenfield sites on the edge of settlements
- 4.7 The sequential approach prioritises the allocation of brownfield sites and sites within the existing planned limits of development. This approach to the site selection process prioritises the use of previously developed land in line with the NPPF requirement. It also prioritises sites that are within the existing built up area of settlements, limiting the impact on the edge of settlements. If further sites are required to meet the number of new dwellings required, the remaining greenfield sites on the edge of settlements found suitable for allocation will be assessed against one another to establish which are the most suitable options on a comparative basis. These may be identified in the draft Local Plan as reserve sites.
- 4.8 The scale of the sites and the capacity will be compared with the existing number of dwellings within a settlement in order to assess the overall growth of the settlement as a result of sites. This will also guide the allocation assessment process, prioritising sites which are more in keeping with the size of the existing settlement. In determining site allocations, the Council will also have regard to the scale of development already permitted in a settlement and where there are known significant infrastructure capacity issues which cannot be readily resolved.

- 4.9 Consideration will also be given to the provision of a variety of sized sites for allocation, to ensure that a wide range of sites in different locations are allocated in order to provide choice and flexibility which aids the deliverability of new homes. Paragraph 68a of the NPPF states that, ‘through development plans and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved.’ Therefore, it is important that there is a range of different sized sites, including a number of sites which are less than 1 hectare in size allocated in the Local Plan.

Availability, Deliverability and Achievability

- 4.10 Throughout the SHLAA process, information on the availability, deliverability and achievability of sites has been collected from site promoters on all individual sites through the site promotion forms and additional forms sent out on the deliverability of sites.
- 4.11 As the local plan develops, all promoters of sites identified as the most appropriate for allocation will be contacted to provide an update on the status of the site to ensure that sites are still available and that there are no new barriers to delivery that have not been raised previously. Intended timescales for delivery will be established along with confirmation that there is an agreement (where necessary) that the land will be sold to a developer. Where any issues with availability, deliverability or achievability are identified, sites will be re-assessed to avoid allocating sites where these particular factors become a constraint to the delivery of a site.
- 4.12 The achievability of sites, which is essentially a test of viability, is an important part of the site allocation process, ensuring that the sites selected are achievable on an economic basis. The whole plan, including site allocations is subject to viability testing to ensure that the plan is a realistic and viable option. The initial site allocations assessment with regards to achievability has been based on the latest viability assessment report. Where future viability assessments are provided, the sites will be re-assessed against this updated information to ensure that the preferred options remain achievable. If issues arise about specific sites, further consideration will be given to the impact of viability and the site assessment process will be revisited if a site becomes identified as unviable.

Conclusions

- 4.13 An overall site conclusion is set out for each site, based on professional judgement, as to the most suitable sites to be allocated for development in the Local Plan having regards to the factors identified in the site assessments, the need for the particular development and any other factors that may be relevant. See Appendices B and C
- 4.14 The conclusions will set out:
- the sites recommended as being suitable for inclusion as allocations in the Local Plan and the main reasons for selection of each site;
 - sites that are not recommended as being suitable for allocating in the Local Plan setting out the main reasons for the exclusion of each site.
- 4.15 The Site Allocations Assessment document will subsequently be updated to take account of the response to consultation of the Local Plan.

5. Sustainability appraisal process

- 5.1 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process involves assessing the potential sites in terms of their likely impact on the sustainability objectives that have been identified in a Technical Annex to the SA report. The SA considers all the likely impacts, cumulative impacts and the scope for mitigating any possible negative impacts on the environmental, economic and social factors of sustainable development. Links between the plan making, SA and Site Assessment processes are illustrated in Appendix D.

Appendix A: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site details

Site ID Code	New SHLAA site code	Previous SHLAA reference	Site Name	Parish	Proposed Use	Area (hectares)
55	BAE01	BAE/003, BAE/001	The Lookout (land W of Main Rd, Barleythorpe/Oakham)	Barleythorpe	Housing	45.92
63	BAE02	BAE/01	The King Centre and Oakham Football Club	BARLEYTHORPE	Housing	4.12
2	BAR02	BAR/02	7 Wakerley Rd	Barrowden	Housing	0.53
2418	BAR04	N/A	Land S of Back Lane, Barrowden	Barrowden	Housing	4.19
2438	BRA01	BRA/01	Land N of Brooke Rd, Braunston	Braunston-in-Rutland	Housing	1.36
4495	BRA04	BRA/02; BRA/03	Land to rear of 10 Church Street/land off Oakham Road, Braunston	Braunston-in-Rutland	Housing	4.24
3	COT12	COT/12a; COT/12b; COT/12c; COT/12d; COT/12e; COT/12f; COT/12g	Land off Harrier Close, Cottesmore.	Cottesmore	Housing	0.98
38	COT14	N/A	Easson Garage, Cottesmore	Cottesmore	Housing	0.17
65	COT13	COT/13	Land at Mill La, Cottesmore	Cottesmore	Housing	6.34

146	COT05	COT/05	Manor Farmyard, Main St, Cottesmore	Cottesmore	Housing	3.02
151	COT07	COT/07	Land at Railway Sidings, Burley Road, Cottesmore	Cottesmore	Employment, Minerals/Waste	4
152	COT13	COT/13	Land N of Mill La, Cottesmore	Cottesmore	Housing	4.53
2433	COT01	COT/01	Land at Main Str, Cottesmore	Cottesmore	Housing	1.26
2588	COT04	COT/03; COT/04	Land off Rogues La, Cottesmore (Site 2)	Cottesmore	Housing	4.28
2643	COT03	COT/03	Land off Rogues La, Cottesmore (Site 2)	Cottesmore	Housing	1.75
5	EDI05	N/A	Ash Tree stables Manton Rd Edith Weston	Edith Weston	Housing, Employment	0.45
81	EDI06	N/A	Land N of Pennine Drive	Edith Weston	Housing	4.71
209	EDI07	N/A	Land N of Pennine Drive	Edith Weston	Housing	4.73
1348	EDI08	N/A	Rutland Water Campsite	Edith Weston	Housing	1.58
2490	EDI09	N/A	Normanton Rd, Edith Weston	Edith Weston	Housing	3.9
2851	EDI03	EDI/03	St Georges Officer's Mess	Edith Weston	Housing	3.89
1354	EDI10	N/A	Paddock off Weston and Gibbet La, Edith Weston	Edith Weston	Housing	4.62
10	EMP06	N/A	Land at Highfields Farm	Empingham	Housing	1.85
40	EMP04	EMP/04	Land at Exton Rd, Empingham	Empingham	Housing	0.62
44	EMP02	EMP/02	Main St, Empingham	Empingham	Housing	0.28
77	EMP01	EMP/01	Whitwell Rd North Empingham	Empingham	Housing	0.18
82	EMP03	EMP/03	Whitwell Rd South Empingham	Empingham	Housing	1.18
46	ESS04	N/A	Land at Manor Farm La, Essendine	Essendine	Housing	3.66
46	ESS02	ESS/02	Land at Manor Farm La, Essendine	Essendine	Housing	4.75
47	ESS01	ESS/01	Land to rear of Essendine Rd	Essendine	Housing	5.39
148	EXT03	EXT/03	Land E of Stamford Rd, Exton	Exton	Housing	0.32

149	EXT04	EXT/04	Land at The Workshops, Exton	Exton	Housing	0.33
150	EXT05	EXT/05	Land at Home Farm, Exton	Exton	Housing, Employment	0.51
170	EXT08	None	Barnsdale Car Park	Exton	Other (Campsite)	6.57
12	GRT05	N/A	Casterton College, Rutland	Great Casterton	Housing	2.61
23	GRT04	GRT/04	Land to the N of College Cl, Great Casterton	Great Casterton	Housing	2.6
25	GRT03	GRT/03	Land off Pickworth Rd	Great Casterton	Housing	4.25
29	GRT06	N/A	Roman View	Great Casterton	Housing	2.08
141	GRT01	GRT/01	Land off Old Great North Rd	Great Casterton	Housing	1.67
35	GRT07	N/A	Workshop site, Stretton Rd, Greetham	Greetham	Housing	0.88
147	GRE02	GRE/02	Land S of Oakham Rd, Greetham	Greetham	Housing	1.22
157	GRE10	GRE/01	Land N of Bridge Lane	Greetham	Housing	1.29
158	GRE01	GRE/01	Former Phase 1 of Greetham Quarry	Greetham	Housing	2.54
159	GRE11	GRE/01	Former Phase 1 of Greetham Quarry	Greetham	Housing, Employment	
4480	GRE12	N/A	Paddock to the rear of 8 Bridge Lane Greetham	Greetham	Housing	0.18
4500	GRE13	N/A	Land south east of Stretton Lane	Greetham	Housing	4.74
15	KET05	KET/05	Ketton Disused Quarry Barrowden Rd	Ketton	Housing	3.02
26	KET21	KET/09	Ketton Cement Works Area of Search	Ketton	Minerals/Waste	783.12
53	KET10	N/A	Northern Extension to Ketton Quarry	Ketton	Minerals/Waste	110.1
64	KET22	N/A	Ketton Library	Ketton	Housing	0.08

68	KET03	KET/03	Land at Bartles Hollow, Ketton (SHELAA/KET/03)	Ketton	Housing	5.51
72	KET13	N/A	Luffenham Rd, Ketton	Ketton	Housing	7.02
136	KET14	N/A	Land NE of Pit La, N of Forest Park Industrial Estate	Ketton	Employment	3.68
137	KET15	N/A	Land NE of Pit Lane- E of Chater Business Estate	Ketton	Employment	4.27
2646	KET16	N/A	Land W of Steadfold La, Ketton, Stamford	Ketton	Employment	3.54
2525	KET25	KET/05	Former Quarry, Barrowden Rd, Ketton	Ketton	Housing	3.34
2543	KET24	KET/05	Former Quarry, Barrowden Rd, Ketton	Ketton	Employment	3.39
1692	KET10	KET/10	Land at Manor Green	Ketton	Housing	5.86
1693	KET09	KET/09	Land S of Empingham Rd	Ketton	Housing	5.74
3419	KET17	N/A	Paddock Adj off Steadfold La Ketton, adjacent to Stamford Rd	Ketton	Housing, Employment	0.33
4481	KET18	N/A	Field east of Long Barn Mews	Ketton	Employment	1.45
4493	KET19	KET/01	Land to the rear of Park Farm House, 5 Luffenham Road	Ketton	Housing	1.52
4492	KET01	KET/01	Land South of Luffenham Road	Ketton	Housing	0.18
4502	KET20	N/A	Geeston Road Development	Ketton	Housing	1.51
14	LAN07	LAN/07	Land at Burley Road, Langham	Langham	Housing	1.6
74	LAN13	N/A	Land on N side of Cold Overton Rd, Langham	Langham	Housing	6.04
2471	LAN14	N/A	Land E of Melton Rd and N of Manor Lane	Langham	Housing	4.46
3613	LAN15	N/A	Land on Melton Rd, Langham	Langham	Housing	8.44

3630	LAN16	N/A	Land at Westmoor Farm,	Langham	Housing, Employment, Minerals/Waste	1.92
4494	LAN12	LAN/12	Land on the east side of Ashwell Road, Langham	Langham	Housing	3.77
4499	LAN17	N/A	Land off (south side of) Manor Lane, Langham	Langham	Housing	0.5
49	LIT01	LIT/01, LIT/01a, LIT/01c	Quarry Farm	LITTLE CASTERTON	Housing	67.36
7	MAN03	MAN/03	Manton, St Mary's Rd, Paddock	Manton	Housing	0.34
16	MAN04	N/A	Land Adj to Cemetery Cemetery Lane Manton Rutland	Manton	Housing	2.29
33	MAN05	N/A	Lyndon Rd, Manton	Manton	Housing	3.89
54	MAN06	N/A	The Stables - Land E of Cemetery La, Manton	Manton	Housing	0.32
9	MAR05	N/A	Former Play Area, Market Overton	Market Overton	Housing	0.39
88	MAR06	N/A	Land S of Main Street	Market Overton	Housing	1.43
207	MAR07	N/A	Land N of Pinfold Lane	Market Overton	Housing	5.31
208	MAR08	N/A	Land South of Pinfold La, Market Overton	Market Overton	Housing	25.84
315	MAR01	MAR01	Land off Thistleton Rd Market Overton	Market Overton	Housing	0.53
2419	MAR09	N/A	Land at Main St, Market Overton	Market Overton	Housing	0.48
2427	MAR04	MAR/04a; MAR/04b	Land at Main Stt, Market Overton	Market Overton	Housing	1.91
13	NOR06	none	Settings Farm	North Luffenham	Housing	0.58

42	NOR03	NOR/03. NOR/04	Land S of Glebe Rd, N Luffenham	North Luffenham	Housing	0.32
21	OAK19	None	Burley Appliances Ltd	Oakham	Housing, Employment	3.01
28	OAK21	None	Land adjacent Kimball Close	Oakham	Housing	3.91
39	OAK17	OAK/17	Tim Norton Motors, Oakham	Oakham	Housing	0.74
56	OAK04	OAK/04	Land off Brooke Rd, Oakham	Oakham	Housing	7.54
57	OAK06	OAK/06a, OAK/06d	Land SW of Oakham	Oakham	Housing	44.98
58	OAK05	OAK/05, OAK/06b	Land off Uppingham Rd	Oakham	Housing	4.17
60	OAK14	OAK/14	Catmose House, Catmose St, Oakham	Oakham	Housing, Employment	1.89
67	OAK07	OAK/04, OAK/07	Land S of Brooke Road (wider site)	Oakham	Housing	21.68
69	OAK02	OAK/02, OAK/08b	Land E of Uppingham Rd, Oakham	Oakham	Housing	7.29
70	OAK01	OAK/01	Land N of Braunston Rd, Oakham	Oakham	Housing	7.91
75	OAK15	OAK/15	Land W of Ashwell Rd, Oakham	Oakham	Housing	14.7
84	OAK03	OAK/03	SHELAA/OAK/03	Oakham	Housing	1.23
130	OAK20	None	Car Park 3 Rutland Showground	Oakham	Retail/Employment	2.95
145	OAK13	OAK/13c	Land off Burley Rd, Oakham	Oakham	Housing	13.92
155	OAK22	OAK/08a, OAK/08b	Land at Uppingham Rd	Oakham	Housing	12.2
156	OAK08	OAK/08a, OAK/08b	Land at Stamford Rd	Oakham	Housing	3.91
86	OAK23	OAK/13b	The Burley Estate	Oakham & Burley	Other	433.52

34	RYH09	RHY/04, RYH/09	Land SW of Belmesthorpe La, Ryhall	Ryhall	Housing	0.42
76	RYH10	None	Land to the rear of Hilltop Cottage, Essendine Rd, Ryhall	Ryhall	Housing	1.32
2639	RYH11	None	Field rear of St Johns Cl, Ryhall	Ryhall	Housing	1.59
4491	RYH06	RYH/06a	Land between Meadow Lane and Belmesthorpe Road, Ryhall	Ryhall	Housing	3.1
4501	RYH12	None	Land to the west of A6121 Ryall Road	Ryhall	Housing	6.34
43	SOU03	SOU/03	Back Lane, South Luffenham	south Luffenham	Housing	0.34
50	SOU02	SOU/02	Land off A6121, South Luffenham	south Luffenham	Housing	2.41
17	UPP13	None	Uppingham old sewage works	Uppingham	Housing, Employment, Gypsy and Travellers or Travelling Show people Accommodation	0.33
19	UPP14	None	Stockerston Rd	Uppingham	Housing	2.48
30	UPP11	UPP/11	Woodcocks, land off Goldcrest.	Uppingham	Housing	2.67
31	UPP08	UPP/08	Land N of Leicester Rd	Uppingham	Housing	5.52
36	UPP05	UPP/05	Land at Ayston Rd	Uppingham	Housing	4.15
41	UPP07	UPP/07	Land at Gypsy Hollow La, Uppingham	Uppingham	Housing	0.33
51	UPP04	UPP/04	Land at Leicester Rd, Uppingham	Uppingham	Housing	8.37
59	UPP17	UPP/01, UPP/12	Land off The Beeches, Uppingham	Uppingham	Housing	4.12
73	UPP15	None	Launde Farm Uppingham	Uppingham	Housing	20.38

138	UPP02	UPP/02	Land E and rear of Uppingham Surgery	Uppingham	Other (Care home)	0.67
168	UPP03	UPP/03	Land rear of 7 Stockerston Rd, Uppingham	Uppingham	Housing	1.08
191	UPP02	UPP/02	Uppingham Gate	Uppingham	Housing, Employment	5.9
277	UPP16	None	Land at Junction of A4 and Glaston Rd, Uppingham, LE15	Uppingham	Other	1.68
8	WHI10	WHI10	Stapleford Rd	Whissendine	Housing	1.34
22	WHI09	WHI/09a, WHI/09b	Land west of Stapleford Rd	Whissendine	Housing	7.26
134	WHI13	WHI/02	Land W of Ashwell Rd	Whissendine	Housing	4.44
135	WHI03	WHI/03	Land E of Ashwell Rd	Whissendine	Housing	0.77
85	WHI12	WHI/12	Land off Pickwell La, Whissendine	Whissendine	Housing	3.59
4510	WHI07	WHI/07	Land off Melton Rd, Whissendine	Whissendine	Housing	3.59
1225	WHI11	WHI/11	Land bordering the caravan pk, Pickwell La, Whissendine,	Whissendine	Other	2.7
2536	WHI02	WHI02	Land off Ashwell Rd, Whissendine	Whissendine	Housing	4.09
3631	WHI15	None	Land north of Stapleford Rd, Whissendine	Whissendine	Housing	6.12

Appendix B: Site Assessment Proformas – Towns

See separate pdf

Appendix C: Site Assessment Proformas – Larger Villages

See separate pdf

Appendix D: Links between plan making process, sustainability appraisal process and site assessment process

