

Local Development Framework:

Major Allocations Search Sequence and Detailed Assessment Approach

September 2006

Sedgefield Borough Council is currently undertaking the evidence gathering stage in the production of its Major Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), which is to be included within the Borough's Local Development Framework. It is programmed that a consultation Issues and Alternative Options Paper will be published May/June 2007. The Major Allocations DPD will set out the location for major housing and employment development for the plan period in accordance with national and regional planning policy.

The Council is therefore seeking your views on this proposed search sequence and detailed assessment, against which all housing sites put forward for consideration will be assessed together with a range of material currently being gathered as part of the Council's evidence base.

Please make your comments in writing by the date to:

Chris Myers Forward Planning Team Sedgefield Borough Council Offices Green Lane Spennymoor County Durham DL16 6JQ

cmyers@sedgefield.gov.uk

Background

This draft Search Sequence and Detailed Assessment aims to set out the key sustainability tests against which potential housing sites will be assessed. It is fundamental that the Council has a credible and robust evidence base to ensure the most sustainable locations for housing development are identified. This is crucial in meeting the Council's Corporate aim of creating a healthy, attractive and prosperous Borough with strong communities.

The purpose of this assessment is therefore to identify all major constraints and opportunities that may apply to each of the potential housing sites. This identification of constraints and opportunities will form only a small proportion of the necessary evidence base. If significant adverse impacts cannot be satisfactorily overcome or alleviated then the particular site will be deemed unsuitable for residential development.

It is not envisaged that potential housing sites will be ranked in any priority order, other than apportioning each one to the appropriate sequential category.

Policy 3 of the Submission Draft North East Regional Spatial Strategy states that Local Planning Authorities should adopt a sequential approach to the identification of land to give priority to previously developed land and buildings in the most sustainable locations. Locations should be selected in the following priority order:

- a) suitable PDL sites and buildings within urban areas, particularly around public transport nodes;
- b) other suitable locations within urban areas not identified as land to be protected for nature or heritage conservation or recreational purposes;
- c) suitable sites in locations adjoining urban areas, particularly those that involve the use of PDL sites and buildings;
- d) suitable sites in settlements outside urban areas, particularly those that involve the use of PDL sites and buildings.

All sites should be in locations that are, or will be, at lowest risk from flooding, and well related to homes, jobs and services by all modes of transport, particularly public transport, walking and cycling.

Proposed Sedgefield Borough Search Sequence

In accordance with the sequential approach identified within the RSS, the categories of the Search Sequence for new housing development should be split between the four main towns, the larger villages, and the smaller villages in the Borough, and in the following initial priority list.

Main Towns - Ferryhill, Newton Aycliffe, Shildon and Spennymoor

- i. PDL sites and buildings (including housing market renewal areas) within the four main towns
- ii. Greenfield sites within the four main towns
- iii. PDL extensions that adjoin the four main towns

Greenfield extensions that adjoin the four main towns iv.

Larger villages – Aycliffe, Kirk Merrington, Bishop Middleham, Byers Green, Chilton, Chilton Lane, Eldon, Fishburn, Sedgefield, Trimdon Colliery, Trimdon Grange, Trimdon Village, West Cornforth

- PDL sites and buildings (including housing market renewal areas) within v. the larger villages
- Greenfield sites within the larger villages vi.
- PDL extensions that adjoin the larger villages vii.
- Greenfield extensions that adjoin the larger villages viii.

Smaller villages – Bradbury, Mainsforth, Middridge, Mordon, North Close, Rushyford

- PDL sites and buildings within the smaller villages ix.
- Development in the countryside Х.

Proposed Sedgefield Borough Detailed Assessment

A more detailed selection process should follow the aims of the Core Strategy in order to determine whether the sites are available, suitable and viable.

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Location of site in relation to town or district centre (as defined in Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres)	++ + 0 X XX	Within 400m of Town or District Centre 400m - 800m 800m - 1.6km 1.6km - 3km 3km or over	GIS
Location of site in relation to local centre*, community based facilities, shopping parades, clusters (*as defined in Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres)	++ + 0 X XX	Within 400m of a local neighbourhood centre 400m - 800m 800m - 1.6km 1.6km - 3km 3km or over	GIS
Location of site in relation to leisure facilities (e.g. sports centres)	++ + 0 X XX	Within 400m of leisure facility 400m - 800m 800m - 1.6km 1.6km - 3km 3km or over	GIS

Aim 1. – To enhance social inclusion and well-being

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Location of site in relation to primary and secondary schools	++ + 0 X XX	Within 400m 400m - 800m 800m - 1.6km 1.6km - 3km 3km or over	GIS
Capacity of nearby primary and secondary schools	+ 0 X	High surplus school places – development may help to sustain the school There is sufficient capacity within neighbouring schools Nearby schools are running at full capacity and any development will be required to contribute to any necessary provision	Consultation with Local Education Authority and department for Education and Skills
Location of site in relation to health and social care services	++ + 0 X XX	Within 400m of health and social care services 400m-800m 800m-1.6km 1.6m-3km 3km or over	GIS
Capacity of existing health and social care services to absorb further development	++ 0 X XX	Sufficient capacity Some capacity Unknown Existing constraints Significant existing constraints	Consultation with Primary Care Trust and Strategic Health Authority
Location of site in relation to local Greenspace and parks (including designated parks and gardens, natural greenspace, amenity open space, outdoor sports facilities. common/green, children's play and recreational areas, allotments and civic space)	++ + 0 X XX	Within 400m of Greenspace 400m-800m 800m-1.6km 1.6km-3km 3km or over	GIS Open Space Needs Assessment
Impact on local Greenspace ⁽¹⁾ (including designated parks and gardens, natural Greenspace, amenity open space, outdoor sports facilities, common/green, children's play and recreational areas, allotments and civic space) 1 – Criteria determining impact can in-	++ + 0 X XX clude accessibility, i	Significant opportunity to improve existing or create Greenspace Opportunity to improve or enhance No impact Some adverse impact even with mitigation Significant adverse impact (difficult to mitigate) ncluding disabled access, design, security issues management	GIS Open Space Needs Assessment

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Impact on Public Rights of Way	++ 0	Site within 1km of an existing PROW therefore increasing access to countryside No impact	Durham County Council
	XX	Need to divert an existing PROW (PROW within the site)	

Aim 2. – Improve the quality of where people live

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Impact on historic environment and setting (inc. listed buildings, conservation areas, Registered Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Ancient Monumentsetc.)	++ + 0 X XX	Significant opportunity to improve or enhance Opportunity to improve or enhance No known constraints Some adverse impact even with mitigation Significant adverse impact (difficult to mitigate)	GIS, Sites and Monuments Records, Buildings at Risk Register, Conservation Area Appraisals Consultation with external bodies
Impact on townscape	++ + 0 X XX	Development would have a positive impact on the townscape No impact on townscape Insignificant adverse impact (can be mitigated) Some adverse impact even with mitigation Significant adverse impact (difficult to mitigate)	Photographs Site Visits
Avoid Green Wedge	++ 0 XX	Green Wedge creation/enhancement Not in the Green Wedge Green Wedge	GIS
Capacity of existing infrastructure e.g. waste water disposal and treatment and predicted incidences of flooding from sewer	++ + 0	The site requires significant infrastructure works and this has already been made available The site can easily be connected to existing physical infrastructure Unknown	Consultation with Northumbrian Water, Transco and the National

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
	X	The site requires some new physical infrastructure before development can take place but provision of necessary infrastructure is already planned	Grid
	XX	The site requires significant new physical infrastructure and there are no current plans for such infrastructure to be provided	
Avoid conflict with un- neighbourly uses e.g.	0	No conflict	GIS
sewerage treatment works, overhead	Х	Minimal conflict can be mitigated	
power lines, quarries, electricity substations	XX	Conflict can not be mitigated	

Aim 3. – Reduce the impact of development on climate change

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score User Guide	Data Source
Accessibility of the site to the local public	++	8 or more buses per hour within 400m walking distance of bus stop	GIS Durham
transport network	+	4 or more buses per hour within 400m walking distance of bus stop	County Council –
	0	Less than 4 buses per hour within 400m walking distance of bus stop	Public Transport
	Х	Areas with little or no evening/weekends service	Team
	XX	Areas outside 400m walking distance of bus stop	
Accessibility of the site to cycle network	++	Within 400m of dedicated cycle route	GIS Durham
,	+	400m - 800m	County
	0	800m - 1.6km	Council
	Х	1.6km - 3km	
	XX	3km or over	
Suitability of site for renewable energy generation	++	Opportunity for micro renewable energy generation e.g. local wind resource, aspect for solar/PV, small scale hydro	North East Renewable Energy Strategy,
	0	Unknown	PPS22 and
	XX	Significant opportunity for large scale renewable energy generation i.e. site should be safeguarded	companion guide

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score User Guide	Data Source
Opportunity for carbon	++	Significant opportunity	Site visits,
off-setting	0	Unknown	Sustainable
	Х	No opportunity	Communities Team
Avoid land liable to	0	Areas at little or no risk	GIS
flood	Х	Areas at low to medium risk	SFRA
	XX	Areas at high risk	Environment
	XXX	Functional floodplain	Agency
Opportunities for	++	Significant opportunity	Site visits,
climate change	+	Minimal Opportunity	Sustainable
adaptation	0	Unknown	Communities
-	Х	No opportunity	Team

Aim 4. – Protect and enhance natural resources

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Brownfield (previously developed land) or	++	Brownfield	NLUD, GIS – aerial
Greenfield (see Annex	+	More than 50% Brownfield	photographs
C Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 for	Х	More than 50% Greenfield	
Brownfield definition) Note: PDL may have high biodiversity value and will be dealt with by an individual factor	XX	Greenfield	
Avoid coalescence or	++	Site wholly within settlement	GIS
sprawl	+	Settlement extension site contained on three sides by existing development	
	0	Development site within existing settlement on two sides	
	Х	Settlement site would extend settlement in an uncontained way	
	XX	Site in open countryside or unattached to settlement or an extension site which would significantly reduce distances between settlements	
Sensitivity of	++	Urban / Developed	Durham
Landscape to	0	Need to Enhance	County
Change (also see	Х	Need to Conserve	Landscape
landscape capacity factor below)	XX	Need to Conserve and Restore	Character Strategy

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Landscape Capacity (including vistas in and	++	Opportunity to enhance landscape	GIS - aerial photographs
out of the site, site	+	No impact on landscape	Landscape
prominence, vegetation,	0	Insignificant adverse impact (can be mitigated)	Officer site visit
topography, water)	Х	Some adverse impact even with mitigation	
	XX	Significant adverse impact (difficult to mitigate)	
Location of site in	++	3km or over	GIS
relation to areas of	+	1.6km - 3km	
designated	0	800m - 1.6km	
biodiversity value	Х	400m - 800m	
(SAC/SPA,	XX	Within 400m	
SSSIs/NNR, LNRs, SNCIs)	XXX	Within designated site	
Impact on biodiversity	++	Very poor conditions for biodiversity and geo-diversity. Enhancement would significantly improve habitats (see determining criteria 2)	GIS – aerial photographs Magic website Durham
	+	Relatively poor conditions for biodiversity and geodiversity ^{(see} determining criteria 3)	Geodiversity Audit Consultation
	0	Neutral	with Natural
	X	Negative impact on biodiversity and geo-diversity ^(see determining criteria 4)	England, Durham
	XX	Severe negative impact on biodiversity and geo-diversity ^{(see} determining criteria 5)	Wildlife Trust, Badger and Bat Group

2 - Site has no statutory designations (SSSI, SAC, SPA, NNR);

-Site is not an LNR or SNCI (SNCIs include Durham County Geological Sites as well as County Wildlife Sites)

-No records of great crested newt within 500m of site

-No record of reptiles (slow worm, adder, grass snake) within 500m of site

-No record of badger sett within 30m of site

-Site has no know seasonal or permanent wetlands or streams or ditches within 20m

-Site has few mature trees or hedgerows

-Site is in arable cultivation / site is currently brownfield / site is improved grassland

-Site has no buildings older than 1939 within 200m of woodland or water (indicator of bats)

-Site does not contain an ancient semi - natural woodland

-Site is not a GCR site or RIG site

- No evidence that site contains habitat or would affect the favourable conservation status of species listed under Section 74 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

3 - Site has no statutory designations (SSSI, SAC, SAC, SPA, NNR);

-Site is not an LNR or SNCI

-Site does not contain ancient woodland

-Site has no more than one of the following:

- Record of Great Crested Newt within 500m but not on site

- Known badger sett within 30m of site but not on site

- Record of reptiles on or within 500m of site

- Site contains seasonal or permanent wetland

- Stream or ditch with record of water vole runs within 20 m of site
- Site contains some mature trees or hedgerows

- Site has a few buildings older than 1939 within 200m of woodlands or water

4 - Site has one or more of the following:

- Record of Great Crested Newts on site
- Known badger sett on site Record of reptiles -
- _
- Site contains seasonal or permanent wetland -
- Stream or ditch with record of water vole within 130m of site runs thorough site -
- Significant amount of mature trees or hedgerows -
- Several buildings older than 1939 -
- -
- RIG site or is a Durham County Geological site Evidence that Section 74 of CROW Act habitat would be damaged or that favourable conservation status of a species listed under Section 74 would be affected -

5 - -Site has statutory designations (SSSI, SAC, SAC, SPA, NNR); -Site is a Local Nature Reserve or SNCI

-Directly affects a habitat or species listed under Section 74 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 -Directly affects a statutorily designated geological site (Geological Conservation Review Site (GCR)

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Impact on water body (including river,	++	Significant opportunity to improve water body	GIS Consultation
stream, pond, aquifer)	+	Limited opportunity to enhance water body	with Environment
	0	No impact	Agency
	X	Adverse impact on water body	
	XX	Significant adverse impact on water body	
Opportunity for	++	Significant opportunity for SuDS	Site visits and
Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)	+	Limited opportunity for SuDS	consultation
Systems (SuDS)	0 X	Unknown No opportunity for SuDS and	with the
	X	development will slightly increase runoff	Environment Agency
	XX	No opportunity for SuDS and	
		development will significantly increase runoff	
Impact on ancient	0	No impact	GIS
woodland	XX	Adverse impact on ancient woodland	
Impact on trees and	++	Significant opportunity to enhance	GIS – aerial
woodland		trees/woodland	photographs
	+	Limited opportunity to enhance trees/woodland	
	0	No impact	
	X	Adverse impact on trees/woodland	
	XX	Significant adverse impact on trees/woodland	
Impact on hedgerows	++	Significant opportunity to enhance hedgerows	GIS – aerial photographs
	+	Limited opportunity to enhance hedgerows	Prioro Brobino
	0	No impact	

	x xx	Adverse impact or possible loss of hedgerows Significant adverse impact and known loss of hedgerows	
Avoid sterilisation of	0	No mineral designation	GIS
mineral resources	Х	Site is within a mineral consultation	Durham
		area	County
	XX	Site is within a preferred area or	Council
		area of search for mineral extraction	

Aim 5. – Encourage and support a competitive and diverse economy

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Location of site in	++	Within 400m of employment site	GIS
relation to industrial	+	400m - 800m	
estate / business	0	800m -1.6km	
park	Х	1.6km – 3km	
	XX	3km or over	
Where a site lies within an existing employment land allocation	++	The site meets sustainable location criteria and is unlikely to be viable for employment development without public funding	Employment Land Review
	+	The site has seen no development activity for at least 5 years and meets sustainable location criteria	
	Х	The site is being actively marketed as an employment site and is the only acceptable form of built development for this site	
	XX	The proposed site is currently active for employment purposes	
Avoid high quality	0	Not applicable	www.magic.gov.uk
agricultural land	Х	Grade 3a	
	XX	Grade 2	
	XXX	Grade 1	

Availability and Viability

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
Owner / developer interest	++ + 0	Established developer interest Owner keen to sell / develop Owner / developer intentions	General consultation
	0	Owner / developer intentions	

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
	X	Developers have expressed doubts about viability	
	XX	Owner / landowner unwilling to sell	
Highway Access	++	Development on the site can be achieved via the existing access	Consultation with Durham
	+	Some highway improvements required	County Council
	х	Major highway improvements required	
	XX	Access is not achievable	
Planning History	+	Site with a valid planning permission for housing	Planning application
	0 X	No known planning history Site was refused planning	records
		permission for housing and the	
		principle of development on this site was dismissed at appeal	
Avoid other overriding physical constraints that would rule out development (heavily contaminated land, steep slopes, land stability, poor access, conflict with groundwater protection etc)	0	No known constraints	GIS General
	Х	Some constraints	consultation
	XX	Significant constraints	
Site availability:	++	Site immediately available	GIS,
factors which would affect market attractiveness e.g. evidence of contamination, steep slopes, unstable land, access traffic impact	+	Likely to be available within Phase 1 of the plan period	General consultation,
	0	Likely to be available within plan period without major infrastructure /	other plans and
	Х	remediation investment Unlikely to be available within plan period without major infrastructure/remediation	programmes
	XX	investment Unlikely to be available in the plan period	
Emergency Planning - avoid sites within proximity of hazardous industry or installation	0	No Zone	Consultation with HSE
	X	Inner Zone	wiui 113E

Indicator	Predicted Impact	Score user guide	Data Source
(as defined by the Health and Safety Executive)	XX	Middle or outer zone	

This page is intentionally left blank