Overview of the process

The SHLAA panel is convened annually if possible in order to offer some market insight into the deliverability and achievability of those sites received through the call for sites process. SHLAA 2016 Panel looked at 5 sites from last year in addition to 20 sites received in the call for sites in 2015-16. It was decided that the few sites from previous years may be looked at for their development potential in light of new evidence available, time permitting (we couldn’t look at these sites – these will be reassessed in the background alongside and information will be made available to whoever asks for any particular site). These will be added to feed into the SHLAA Trajectory at a later point.

Site introductions and assessments

**MBC/001/16 – Asfordby (Land north of bypass)**

There is a high demand in Asfordby but the extent of the site, the landscape impact (because of hill), connection into centre, and the barrier that the road represents with the current village make the site unsuitable. There’ll be impact on viability due to being adjacent to landfill. Apart from that, okay from EA. In any case, the build rate of 50 dwellings per year is high, if at all, it must be 30 per year. From developers’ point of view, delivery not considerable.

**MBC/002/16 – Eaton (Land to rear of Eaton Court)**

The site has unique characteristics – being on a good location and on slope gives views which can be a selling feature and there is market for one dwelling of about 400sq.ft area, however harder to deliver in terms of construction due to size and being on a steep slope which may make it unviable. Site considered suitable for 1-2 dwellings (max less than 5 dwellings). Deliverable within 5 years.

**MBC/003/16 – Eaton (Devacore Lodge, Vicarage Lane)**

There is contaminated land that will increase the costs – site on PDL and on aquifer. Also, sheds need to be relocated. Site considered suitable for a couple or maximum 3-4 dwellings that can be achieved in 0-5 years. It is not in Flood Zone 2*

* The Flood Zone 2 details in MBC/003/16 and MBC/004/16 were swapped. The details are now amended.

**MBC/004/16 – Frisby on the Wreake (Water Lane)**

It is in Flood Zone 2*. There is a pumping station at the Northeast corner of the site. The access can be an issue due to level crossing and the junction in a small road. The noise of the trains would affect as constraint and as a factor dropping the number of hectares due the anti-noise barriers required (10-15 meters buffer from the train line). The drainage might be an issue too. All these issues and a lower development density would decrease the number of dwellings. Site not considered deliverable due to flood risk, drainage, noise, highways, aquifer, sewage constraints. However site considered suitable for social housing with good design, all above constraints could be overcome.
* The Flood Zone 2 details in MBC/003/16 and MBC/004/16 were swapped. The details are now amended.

**MBC/005/16 – Kirby Bellars (Field South A607)**

Not sustainable due to the scale of the site (compared with the size of the settlement itself). The area closer to Main Road might be ok but it is a quite fast-busy road to create a safe access. About 10-15 dwellings near Main Road may be suitable. However, it must be noted that there is no market in that sort of village. This will have viability impact. There is no infrastructure (services, facilities, public transport).

**MBC/006/16 – Melton Mowbray (Land north of Kirby Lane)**

The density should be lower. It is not a proper urban area despite it is located in Melton Mowbray. There are contamination issues related with an aquifer. It is a sort of door opening site for surrounding area. Site considered suitable subject to environmental issues resolved. Deliverable in 0-5 years.

**MBC/007/16 – Frisby on the Wreake (Land due south of village up to 607)**

Scale of the site is too large for it to be delivered in 0-5 years, may commence during this time, but will be completed in 6-10 years. There may be phasing issues. 30 dwellings per year build rate more appropriate. Views across whole valley affected from Leicester Road. The fact that the proposed use includes Educational, Leisure, etc… makes it a good site for that scale. Just part of the site can fit into the 0-5 years category, the rest of the site 6-10. Viable place to live.

**MBC/008/16 – Hose (Land off Canal Lane)**

There is a tree belt that separates and split the site. It could be ok for 10-15 dwellings but a road is needed. Looks like a good site, if highways constraints can be overcome. Deliverable but some ownership issues have come to MBC recently.

**MBC/009/16 and MBC/018/16 – Old Dalby (North Lodge Farm, Longcliffe Lane and Longcliffe Hill House)**

Old Dalby as a sustainable location because of facilities, services, employment, etc. This can be a good location where new housing can come forward, also for sales. However, scale of the site is too large. Sites of this scale take longer to start. Once they start, they are faster to deliver. Again the number of units should be lower (50 or even 25). It might have highways issues. 50% of the site can be developed in 0-5 years and the other 50% in 6-10 years with a build rate of 30 dwellings per year.

**MBC/010/16 – Thorpe Arnold (Land to the northwest of Thorpe Road A607)**

It is not sustainable due to the size of site and that of the village. It is difficult to allocate Affordable Housing on small villages as this one. Therefore this site may be suitable for affordable housing provision (part of site) for half the number of dwellings proposed. Visual impacts, drainage,
Highways and slope issues would impact viability. Part of the site could be ok but the access issues make it undeliverable.

**MBC/011/16 – Thorpe Arnold (Land to the southeast of A607 – Thorpe Road)**

Heritage issues. There is a graveyard adjacent to the site. It is difficult to get an access due to the slope. Would create significant negative visual impact from the Main Road. Part of site considered suitable for upto 10 dwellings. However, access issue would impact viability.

**MBC/012/16 – Stathern (Land off Main Street)**

Access issues but it is a good site. It can be ok for 35-40 units if the access issues are solved – Highways works to be undertaken (visibility is good both ways, but need more land to create access). Good site, with positive engagement with the landowner, housing developers would be interested in this site.

**MBC/013/16 – Bottesford (Land rear of Daybell Barns, Grantham Road)**

It would be good to clarify if the access road is public or not. The Climate Change Allowance announced in February 2016 impacts could be difficult to be resolved in 5 years. However it would help to speak to landowner if they are happy to get further work done on that. Site considered suitable subject to issues resolved for about 10 units. The allotment at the West might not be property of the landowner who is proposing the site.

**MBC/014/16 – Pickwell (Land off Pickwell Road)**

It is a sensible site for small villages as it is linear (continues previous development). The whole site it is over an aquifer. Nonetheless considered deliverable by the Panel for the number of units proposed.

**MBC/015/16 – Welby (Land off St Bartholomew’s Way)**

*This site was skipped as it is proposed as an employment site.*

**MBC/016/16 and MBC/017/16 – Harby (Land at Colstone Lane 0.69Ha and 1.94Ha)**

There is an aquifer on part of the area (where the farm buildings are). The undulating terrain is an issue. 50% of the site is feasible. There are contamination issues. It might be suitable for Affordable housing but may be costly due because of ground works. Both sites’ market interest depends upon activity at employment site (Dairy) and what it is going to happen with it as they are in a reasonable location with good access. Front 35% of the site considered do-able incorporating good design for about half to one-third of the proposed numbers (between 25-35 dwellings for MBC/017/16). Reasonable market.

**MBC/019/16 – Waltham on the Wolds (Land to the north of Goadby Road)**

Site on auifer. Eastern area of site would be okay. There is an application apposite (Grantham Road) of 8 bungalows that can give an idea of the kind of units. Market would be very good there – sales
very good. It is a good site subject to a question of design for about 1/3 of the proposed number of units. Good services in the village.

**MBC/020/16 – Waltham on the Wolds (Land to the west of Mere Road)**

Site is on aquifer. However this shouldn’t be an issue. This is a good, logical site for housing development of about 1/3 of the proposed units. Site considered achievable within 0-5 years.

**MBC/191/15 – Frisby on the Wreake (Land off Great Lane)**

Good site. Site considered suitable.

**MBC/192/15 – Waltham on the Wolds (Land at Manor Farm, rear of High Street)**

On aquifer. Mill Lane is constrained, hence access issues on site. It would help to engage with owners and discuss the achievability subject to sorting of access issue.

**MBC/193/15 – Gaddesby (Land at rear of Gaddesby Primary School)**

Most of the site is in Flood Zone but it is also a Main river, it means that the EA has some rights. It can be used as a protection area. The top left doesn’t have flood issues, up to 5 units can be delivered here. General feeling that the site is too big for this kind of settlement. Positive engagement with landowner and further engagement with Flood Risk Consultant would be helpful.

**MBC/194/15 – Eaton (Land off Waltham Lane)**

Northwest part over an aquifer. The scale is too big for the village. The access is a big issue as it is a single track. Isolated from the settlement. It can be ok for a single large unit.

**MBC/195/15 – Stather (Land between Harby Lane, Penn Lane and Long Lane)**

There are pileons in the middle of the site which is a constraint. No feasible development potential on site. Site is too big. Really isolated. Highways constraints.

**General view for all sites**

- The density of dwellings per hectare that MBC is using is too high. The tendency now is dropping the numbers to 20-25 dwellings per hectare which is market driven, instead of the 30dph that MBC is currently using in villages and 40dph in Melton Mowbray.
- It would be useful to add information about the number of dwellings and/or population of the settlement to the SHLAA assessments in order to give a rough idea of the sustainability of the settlement.
- There is a risk of approving unsustainable sites due to no 5 years supply.
- It is important to bear in mind the time involved for getting a full planning application, especially on big sites. Developers can spend up to 3 years to get the planning permission.
That directly impacts the time frame of the site to come forward especially in the first five years (deliverability).

- It would be beneficial for MBC to have a greater mix of sites and lower expectations on number of dwellings per site. More submission should be invited! Identification of smaller sites would help quicker delivery. It would also help to identify more land than the need.
- If the ownership contact details are available to developers, they would be able to contact the landowners in order to solve issues that directly affect the suitability of the site (i.e. access matters, other environmental issues like flood risk etc). If issues can be solved at initial stages, it will build a two-way process and increase the chances of the site coming forward earlier and also considered suitable at an envisaged point in time. The Council should also build positive engagement with the landowners for any issues identified for otherwise suitable sites but hindering the overall suitability / delivery of the sites.
- MBC needs to start thinking about how the new Climate Change approach affects to the sites. This approach was adopted on February 2016. SFRA done in June last year (2015) will need to be updated to reflect this new climate change allowance.
- It would be beneficial to show the contours in the maps.
- It would be good to link pictures of the site to the proforma. It can be done in a digital way via URLs.
- If a site it is over an aquifer it affects the development costs depending if the previous use has contaminated the underground water or not (i.e. farms) and the new use when building up the foundations.