Template for site assessment

Sustainability criteria	Site 1	Site 2	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6
Site Location					
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Potential nos of dwellings	This site could accommodate 60-71 units at approx. 25-30dph. An application (DC/15/1886) for 77 dwellings was refused in April 2016 (and then on appeal) but not due to the number of dwellings. So up to 77 dwellings could be suitable.	N/a - site put forward for non-residential uses	Only part of the site (2.7ha) is proposed for development. Yield proposed by site promoter is approximately 80 units. The site could accommodate 170-204 units at approx. 25-30dph if developed solely for residential use.	The landowner has indicated that they would only be seeking to develop part of the site. The site could accommodate 249-300 units at approx. 25-30dph if developed solely for residential use.	Only part of the site (5.3ha) is proposed for development. Yield proposed by site promoter is up to 80 units. The site could accommodate 132-159 units at approx. 25-30dph if developed solely for residential use.
Deliverability - landowner willing to release the site	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.
Context					
Proposed development	Residential	Proposed holiday homes, tourism, business units	Residential	Only small number of dwellings next to Church Close.	Proposed development includes residential development with land adjacent to the existing school playing fields provided for a Multi Use Games Area. In addition, nursing home and land for GP surgery. On adjacent land, provision would be made for allotments and, across the remainder of the total site, a country park.
Current and previous uses (mixed use or previously developed land)	A mix of uses with part of the site being a horticultural nursery currently not in use and part being used for the storage of caravans. An application (DC/15/1886) for 77 dwellings was refused in April 2016 (and then on appeal) but largely due to being outside BUAB. This would not impact ability to allocate in NP.	A large proportion of the site is greenfield comprising of fields and is agricultural land.	Greenfield. The site is a field in agricultural use, with some farm buildings.	Greenfield. The site consists of two areas separated by a stream (Spring Copse) running east-west.	Greenfield. The site is made up of fields in agricultural use and an area with mature trees
Surrounding land uses	East of the site is residential. North and south of the site is open countryside with Chanctonbury House to the west of the site. It is surrounded with very mature trees. Proposed development would generally be compatible with these surrounding uses.	There are four farms all around the site, to the north east, west and south. To the east of the site are four large warehouses and beyond this the A24. Development would need to reflect the rural aspect of the farmland.	Lots of listed buildings along main road. Residential uses to the east and south with very good access to the A24. Open fields to the west of the site, with a caravan park to the north. Development would be compatible with surrounding uses.	The land is very close to Ashington Parish Church and primary school. There is a residential area to the north and east so development of the northern part of the site would be broadly compatible. There are open fields to the south east and west. Development on the southern part of the site would not sit well with the surrounding land uses.	Residential areas and school, with playing fields, to the east of the area proposed for development. Area of trees to the west of the site would provide reasonable screening. Site would also be well screened by dense tree belt to the south.
Site boundary	Well screened by very mature trees.	Well screened at all borders by trees.	The site is well screened by a boundary of trees, with dense forest at the north and south. Billinghurst Road borders the east.	Well screened at all borders by trees.	Well screened at all borders by trees.
General character - open countryside/rural/suburban	The character to the east of the site is suburban. The site is in a built-up location within the settlement. The site is developed land with small open field in the north.	The site is open countryside and farmland giving a very rural feel. Very large plot of land, almost as large as the built up area in Ashington itself, with a mixture of pasture and more intensive arable farmland. The A24 forms the eastern boundary of the site, with agricultural uses on this side too. It is in a relatively isolated area from the centre of the village and built up areas.	The site is open countryside and farmland giving a very rural feel. A pathway runs directly through the centre of the site.	This site contains the listed building Church Farm House. PROW runs along the eastern boundary and then through the centre of the site where it has a more rural feel. There is heavy vegetation around this central area.	The area proposed for development is set in a much larger plot of land. However, its location adjacent to residential uses and a school means it has a relatively suburban feel.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Adjacent to BUAB	The majority of the site is adjacent to the built up area boundary. A small part of the site (approximately 20%) at the northern end is within the built up area boundary.	This site is outside the built up area boundary	The site is adjacent to the built up area boundary, although only on its south-eastern boundary.	The site is adjacent to the built up area boundary.	The site is adjacent to the built up area boundary.
Housing					
Able to accommodate affordable housing	The site would be able to provide a number of affordable homes (circa 25 units max)	This site would be able to provide a significant amount of affordable homes (circa 428 units max)	The site would be able to provide a number of affordable homes (circa 28 units based on developer proposals)	The site would be able to provide a reasonable number of affordable homes (based on landowner's indication that they would only be seeking to develop part of the site)	The site would be able to provide a number of affordable homes (circa 28 units based on developer proposals)
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Community Facilities and Access to Services					
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Distance to village centre/shop(s)	572m approx. to Co-op	1025m approx. from Co-op	649m approx. to Co-op. [illegible]	391m approx. to Co-op	385m approx. to Co-op
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Loss of community/recreation facilities/cultural	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.
Opportunity to provide open space/ recreation/ community facility	The site could provide any form of open space, recreation or community facility. The site is in a good location, however, it may be too small to do so.	There is a lot of opportunity to provide open space/recreation/ community facilities. However, the site is poorly located for the majority of residents.	There is a lot of opportunity to provide open space/recreation/ community facilities. However, the site is not particularly well located for the majority of residents. The promoter is proposing the provision of a car park which would help with accessibility but, given its location on the edge of the village, could encourage car use for short journeys.	There is a lot of opportunity to provide open space/recreation/ community facilities. However, if any residential development were to be provided on the northern part of the site (where it would be more in keeping with the adjacent uses), the southern part of the site is not particularly well located for the majority of residents. The site does provide the opportunity to upgrade the existing PROW in order to provide a cyclepath from the Church to Malthouse Lane (and then potentially on using existing PROWs towards Storrington).	There is a lot of opportunity to provide open space/recreation/ community facilities and the promoter has offered to provide a MUGA, allotments and a country park, as well as land for a new GP surgery.
Biodiversity					
European designation - SAC/SPA/Ramsar	Bat sustenance zone runs through nearby SAC (2.4ha of the site)	Bat sustenance zone runs through nearby SAC (28.2ha of the site)	Bat sustenance zone runs through nearby SAC (6.8ha of the site)	Bat sustenance zone runs through nearby SAC (31.3ha of the site)	Bat sustenance zone runs through nearby SAC (8.5ha of the site)
National designation - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	No	No	No	No	No
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Ancient woodland	No	No	No	0.3ha of ancient woodland	0.04ha of ancient woodland although this would not be affected by the development proposed
Tree Preservation Order (within site/ boundary)	No	A tiny fraction of land contains TPOs	No	No	A tiny fraction of wider land contains TPOs although these would not be affected by the development proposed
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Opportunity to enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure	The site has potential to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure, particularly given the surrounding woodland	As the site is very large, there is potential to enhance green infrastructure and biodiversity	As the site is very large, there is potential to enhance green infrastructure to retain and enhance biodiversity around the two bordering forests	Potential to enhance green infrastructure to retain and enhance biodiversity around ancient woodland and springs. The site is large enough to keep development away from the central area that is woodland rich.	As the site is very large, there is potential to enhance green infrastructure to retain and enhance biodiversity around ancient woodland and springs.
Hedgerows	No hedgerows running through the site	Some hedgerows run through the site but the scale of the site is such that these could largely be retained.	There is a hedgerow running north-south through the site, adjacent to the PROW. Development is proposed to the east of the PROW so the hedgerow could be retained.	No hedgerows running through the site	Some hedgerows run through the site but the scale of the site is such that these could largely be retained.
Landscape					
Views into site (wide/framed/screened/long/short)	Well screened with mature trees. Views into site extremely limited.	Well screened with mature trees and next to established commercial use. Views into site extremely limited.	Site generally well screened and no medium distance view from west on Rectory Lane.	Well screened with mature trees. Views into site extremely limited.	Scale of site is such that there might be some medium distance views affected. But if growth is restricted to 80-100 dwellings on eastern part of the site, then these impacts would be limited
Views out of the site (wide/framed/screened/long/short)	Well screened with mature trees. Views out of site extremely limited.	Well screened with mature trees and next to established commercial use. Views out of site extremely limited.	Minor impact on long distance views to the south towards South Downs (including from caravan park) and Warminghurst Church.	Well screened with mature trees. Views out of site extremely limited.	Scale of site is such that there might be some medium distance views affected. But if growth is restricted to 80-100 dwellings on eastern part of the site, then these impacts would be limited
Inter village gap	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site could narrow the gap between Ashington and Storrington so [illegible]	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to materially contribute to settlement coalescence
Opportunity to enhance landscape	Site is relatively unkempt so would provide opportunity to enhance landscape, albeit that site is well screened.	Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.	Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.	Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.	Existing landscape is attractive but development of the country park offers the opportunity to open up the land to public access, thereby allowing better public appreciation of the landscape.
Heritage					
Distance to Listed Building	Site is not near any listed buildings.	The site is within 100m of 3 different Grade 2 listed buildings. [illegible]	This site is within 100m of 5 different Grade 2 buildings but most are [illegible]	This site contains a Grade 2 building. Development would need to ensure [illegible]	Proposed development area of site is not near any listed buildings.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Distance to Scheduled Monument	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	A scheduled monument (a Roman Villa) extends into the south-western boundary of the site. In addition, a geophysical survey in 2017 identified that on land directly west of the site and outside the scheduled monument, additional areas of archaeological remains that appear to be related to the scheduled site were present. In respect of the northern part of the site that is more distant from the scheduled monument, the opinion of Historic England is that there are likely to be archaeological remains which form a part of the wider complex of remains in the location. It does not consider there to be sufficient evidence that the loss of the remains in this area as a part of the site as a whole would be more acceptable than loss of the more obvious structures of the "bathhouse" and "villa". There is therefore potential for built development on any part of the site to have a significant detrimental impact on heritage due to the loss of Roman remains. Only the use of [illegible]	Large scheduled monument (a Roman building) adjacent to south-eastern corner of the site must be avoided. Development could have an impact on archaeological remains and may need to be moved away from boundary.
Archaeological Areas	0.02ha is archaeological land. During the planning application DC/15/1886 an archaeological assessment of the site confirmed that that there is unlikely to be [illegible]	No	No	4.76ha is archaeological land	11.5ha is archaeological land. However, the proposed development area is outside of this.
Transport					
Distance to public transport (minimum hourly service)	530m approx. to the nearest bus stop.	104m approx. to the nearest bus stop	285m approx. to the nearest bus stop	311m approx. to the nearest bus stop	312m approx. to the nearest bus stop
Access to highway	Access onto Rectory Lane has no problems.	Access would be off A24 slip road, which would mean access would only be via northbound A24 carriageway.	Access from site would be on to B2133 (Billingshurst Road) which is very busy with fast moving traffic. Scale of growth likely to create significant issues with safety of vehicles turning onto B2133 unless a traffic calming scheme was provided along that road to reduce speeds. Pre-application discussions by the promoter with WSCC Highways indicates that such traffic calming would be possible.	Access would have to use the current entranceway off Church Close in cooperation with site 6. The site also has full-width access onto Malthouse Lane although this road is very narrow and would be unsuitable as a main or secondary access road.	Access would be off Church Close and would require cooperation with Site 5. Access is also possible from Rectory Lane.
Site potential to generate significant additional traffic/congestion	No significant additional traffic	No significant additional traffic based on uses proposed.	Access would be on to B2133 (Billingshurst Road) which is a main road, so congestion issues unlikely to be created.	Provided that only part of the site was developed (thereby reducing the number of houses), it is unlikely that there would be significant additional traffic. If however both sites 5 and 6 were developed though, the cumulative impact could be significant.	80 dwellings not likely to create any significant access issues. If however both sites 5 and 6 were developed though, the cumulative impact could be significant.
Pedestrian access	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable. There is good pedestrian access to the site off Rectory Lane. Development of the site provides an opportunity for access to the school and recreation facilities via improvements to the existing PROW.	The site has limited pedestrian access as it is far from the village centre.	There is footpath access into village along the busy B2133 which would not encourage use. However, if traffic calming was provided and included narrowing of the B2133 highway, along with associated widening of the footway, then this would likely mitigate such problems. There is also an existing PROW running through the site which provides access into the village. By its nature, this is less attractive outside of [illegible]	Access may be wide enough to provide footpath access but this would need to be confirmed. Access via the PROW to Malthouse Lane provides wider access to the south of the site.	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable. There is good access off Foster Lane, past the school which would need to be secured through a fence to separate it from the school playing fields. Multiple access points are proposed by promoter off Rectory Lane and to Church Close, as well as to footpaths to the south.
Public rights of way (PROW) present	PROW is present, but on the eastern border of the site so will not affect development. Development of the site provides an opportunity for access to the school and recreation facilities via improvements to the existing PROW.	There is a PROW through the site that may have to be diverted. Development may lead to a loss of view from the PROW.	There is a PROW through the site. Development is proposed to the east of the PROW so there would be no loss of views from the PROW.	There is a PROW running along the eastern boundary of the site and then through the centre of the site. If development was restricted to the northern half of the site then the PROW would be unaffected and there would be no loss of views.	No PROW runs through the site. There is one adjacent to the site and development may have a limited effect on the view from this PROW. The delivery of a country park would open up significant new PROW routes which the promoter has confirmed would be provided.
Access by bike	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is poorly located for access by bike	The site is poorly located for access by bike	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes. The site does provide the opportunity to upgrade the existing PROW in order to provide a cyclepath from the Church to Malthouse Lane (and [illegible]	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes. The site promoter has identified multiple cycle access points to Rectory Lane. Access could also be provided to Church Close.
Economic Development					
Distance to employment sites	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]
Loss of employment site	The site has a commercial use for the storage of boats and caravans but [illegible]	No	No	No	No
Opportunity for employment	The site has not been promoted for employment uses	The site has been promoted for a mix of uses that include business units.	The site has not been promoted for employment uses	The site has not been promoted for employment uses	The site has not been promoted for employment uses
Flooding					
Within Flood zone 1, 2 or 3 (low risk)	No	No	No	No	No
Surface water flooding issues	Low risk as only 8% has a risk of flooding every 1000 years in the south of the site.	Low risk as only 1% of the site in the northwest has a risk of flooding every 100-1000 years	Medium risk as 2% to the south of the site has a risk of flooding every 30 years. 34% of the south has a risk of flooding every 100-1000 years.	Low risk as only 1% in the centre/north of the site has a risk of flooding every 30 years. 10% has a risk of flooding in the centre every 100-1000 years.	Some risk as a small part of the site proposed for development on its north-eastern boundary has a risk of flooding every 30 years, with a slightly larger area at risk every 100-1000 years. This may limit development on this part of the area proposed for development.
Local flooding issues	No	The land is very large and so there are opportunities to avoid the small proportion of areas with surface flooding	Most flooding issues are to the south of the site and so problem can be resolved by uniquely positioned development	Wider flood problem could possibly be resolved by this uniquely positioned site, being at the confluence of streams. Further work would be needed by the flood authority before this could be confirmed.	The streams run mainly through the north and south of the site separately. The development area proposed avoids these areas.
Environmental Quality					
Water quality issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Air quality issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Any local noise issues	No issues	No issues	No issues	No issues	No issues
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Potential contaminated land	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Other Issues					
Other issues	Power line along edge of a site but not a constraint to developing the site.				
SUMMARY	The site has good potential to accommodate development with no significant issues to resolve. Provides a good opportunity to improve footpath access to the key services in the village.	Whilst the site has been put forward for low density uses, the location well away from the village on high value agricultural land limits the sustainability of development. Employment uses adjacent to the existing employment buildings may generally be suitable but other leisure uses are likely to be less so.	The site is not well located to the village with respect to pedestrian access. The B2133 (Billingshurst Road) is a very busy road with the speed of traffic making pedestrian access unsafe although any proposals which included traffic calming along the B2133 and particularly the widening of the footway would address this.	Retention of the site for public open space (as part of a joint site allocation with Site 6, agreed by the respective landowners) should mean that most issues are mitigated. This site has the potential to deliver improved cyclepath linkages onwards towards Storrington and possibly wider solutions to flooding problems.	The scale of development proposed would not create any issues and would also provide significant community benefits, not least a MUGA, allotments and a country park that would open up a quality landscape for use by the community.

Sustainability criteria	Site 8	Site 9	Site 10	Site 11	Site 12
Site Location					
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Potential nos of dwellings	N/a - only proposed for single dwelling	This site could accommodate 23-28 units at approx. 25-30dph	This site could accommodate 180-216 units at approx. 25-30dph	This site could accommodate 2-3 units at approx. 25-30dph	This site could accommodate 9-11 units at approx. 25-30dph
Deliverability - landowner willing to release the site	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.
Context					
Proposed development	4 commercial units and 1 dwelling	Residential and commercial	Residential.	Residential.	Residential.
Current and previous uses (mixed use or previously developed land)	Previously developed land - an existing workshop.	Previously developed land. The site contains farm buildings.	Greenfield. The land is open countryside.	Previously developed land. Land used for car valeting. It has a 'temporary' tin building surrounded by car parking.	Previously developed land. The site contains a hall for Ashington Scouts.
Surrounding land uses	Off road to A24 in between Hole Street. Access to the site is from the south side of this street. The site is in a residential area, but is the other side of the A24 and so outside the built up area. Open fields surround the west and south of the site but on the pother side of the road. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses.	Small lane off A24 past the listed building properties. Very narrow. Open fields surround the site in all directions. Isolated from the main built up area of the village. There is also a commercial timber site nearby. Development may not sit well with the surrounding land uses.	Rectory Lane forms the southern boundary, with residential uses then on the other side of Rectory Lane. Open countryside to the north, west and east of the site. Development would be in keeping with surrounding land uses to the south, but the open countryside that surrounds it on the other three sides would sit poorly in the wider landscape.	In a central location of the built up area, with many other commercial buildings on the same road. Aside from this, surrounding land use is primarily residential. Development would generally be compatible with these uses.	The site is located in an area with the village community centre and primary school to the west. There is a large recreation ground to the north that is associated with the site. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses, but would perhaps take away from the community aspect of the village.
Site boundary	Well screened, particular on the border of the A24	Well screened at all borders by trees.	Well screened at all borders by mature trees.	The site is screened by trees to the east and south of the site, but is bordered by roads to the north and west of the site.	The site is not screened at all, with an open field to the north of the site and road to the south. However, this is in a wider residnetial area so development would generally be compatible with these uses.
General character - open countryside/rural/suburban	The site contains 1 large dwelling and a few smaller ones in the centre, surrounded by a small area of greenland. The site is relatively small and has a rural feel.	The developed land is surrounded by a border of trees. To the south of the site is a relatively small area of open fields. The site is around farmland and so has a very rural feel.	The land is primarily arable agricultural land. It has two rows of trees in the centre and a stream to the north. The site is away from the main built up area of the village and so has a rural feel.	The site is principally a car park. The site has a more urbanised feel as it is in the centre of the built up area. The character of the area is residential and suburban.	The site is relatively small and consists of three community buildings. The site feels generally open as it is not screened at all. There is no significant green space around the site so it has more of a suburbanised character.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Adjacent to BUAB	The site is outside the built up area boundary	The site is outside the built up area boundary	The site is adjacent to the built up area boundary, although only on its south-eastern boundary with Rectory Lane. There is a significant gap of open countryside between the site and the BUAB directly to the east.	The site is within the built-up area boundary.	The site is within the built-up area boundary.
Housing					
Able to accommodate affordable housing	This site could only provide a limited number of affordable housing. (circa 3 units max)	This site is of a scale that could provide a number of affordable housing (circa 10 units max)	This site is of a scale that could provide a significant amount of affordable housing (circa 76 units max)	The site is not of a scale that could provide affordable housing.	This site is of a scale that could provide a limited number of affordable housing (circa 2-3 units max)
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Community Facilities and Access to Services					
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Distance to village centre/shop(s)	572m approx. to Co-op	969m approx. to Co-op	655m approx. to Co-op	286m approx. to Co-op	255m approx. to Co-op
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Loss of community/recreation facilities/cultural	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	Loss of community amenity
Opportunity to provide open space/ recreation/ community facility	The site is too small and far from the central area of the village to provide any form of open space, recreation or community facility.	The site is too small and far from the central area of the village to provide any form of open space, recreation or community facility.	There is potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facilities and the site promoter is willing to do so. However, being located adjacent to the edge of the existing built-up area means it is not centrally located for the majority of the population to easily access by foot or bicycle. This location restricts the type of open space/recreation/community uses that are appropriate.	The site is too small to provide any form of open space, recreation or community facility.	The site provides an existing recreation/community facility, therefore its loss could only be justified by re-provision elsewhere (which is proposed). It is unlikely that any re-provision would result in a significant net increase in the amount of provision of recreation/community space or facilities.
Biodiversity					
European designation - SAC/SPA/Ramsar	None	No	Bat sustenance zone runs through nearby SAC (7.2ha of the site)	No	No
National designation - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	No	No	No	No	No
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Ancient woodland	Ancient Woodland to south of the site	No	No	No	No
Tree Preservation Order (within site/ boundary)	No	No	No	No	No
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Opportunity to enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure	Site is too small to be able to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.	Given the size of the site, it is likely to be too small to be able to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.	Potential to enhance green infrastructure to retain and enhance biodiversity around ancient woodland and springs, towards the north of the site	Site is too small to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.	Site is too small to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.
Hedgerows	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site
Landscape					
Views into site (wide/framed/screened/long/short)	Views limited and restricted by the fact that the site is surrounded by busy access roads.	Well screened with mature trees. Views into site extremely limited.	Well screened with mature trees. Views into site are limited.	Site well surrounded by development. No views into site	Site well surrounded by development. No views into site.
Views out of the site (wide/framed/screened/long/short)	Views limited and restricted by the fact that the site is surrounded by busy access roads.	Well screened with mature trees. Views out of site extremely limited.	Well screened with mature trees. Views out of site are limited.	Site well surrounded by development. No views out of site	Site well surrounded by development. No views out of site.
Inter village gap	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence
Opportunity to enhance landscape	Site is relatively unkempt so would provide opportunity to enhance landscape, albeit that site is well screened.	Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.	Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it and the open nature of the site on its western, northern and eastern sides mean that it would be very difficult to avoid detrimental impacts on the landscape.	Site is relatively unkempt so would provide opportunity to enhance quality of site but is so small that this would not enhance landscape in any material way.	Site adjacent to existing green space and unlikely to improve this.
Heritage					
Distance to Listed Building	Site is not near any listed buildings.	The site is close to two Grade 2 listed buildings. Development would need [illegible]	Site is not near any listed buildings.	Site is not near any listed buildings.	The site is 50m from a Grade 2* listed building. Development would [illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Distance to Scheduled Monument	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.
Archaeological Areas	No	No	No	The site is just on the border of archaeological land	0.24ha is archaeological land
Transport					
Distance to public transport (minimum hourly service)	123m approx. to the nearest bus stop	304m approx. to the nearest bus stop	467m approx. to the nearest bus stop	6m approx. to the nearest bus stop	214m approx. to the nearest bus stop
Access to highway	Access onto Hole Street has no problems.	Malthouse Lane is very narrow and unsuitable for this scale of development.	Access onto Rectory Lane has no problems.	Access onto London Road has no problems.	Access onto Church Lane has no problems.
Site potential to generate significant additional traffic/congestion	No significant additional traffic	Malthouse Lane is very narrow and therefore any level of development would be likely to create congestion problems.	The maximum scale of development could create possible traffic issues on Rectory Lane which, at this point, is a relatively narrow country lane. The levels of development suitable to access onto Rectory Lane would likely have to be much lower.	No significant additional traffic	No significant additional traffic
Pedestrian access	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable. There is good access to the site off Hole Street	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable.	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable. There is good access from Rectory Lane.	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable.	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable.
Public rights of way (PROW) present	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site.	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site.	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site.	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site.	No PROW runs through the site. There is a PROW adjacent to the site, but will not be affected by development.
Access by bike	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is poorly located for access by bike	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes
Economic Development					
Distance to employment sites	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]
Loss of employment site	No	No	No	The site has an existing employment use that would be lost.	No
Opportunity for employment	The site is too small to accommodate employment uses as well as residential uses	The site is too small to accommodate employment uses as well as residential uses. The promoter has offered the site for some additional commercial use. Given the existing uses, this may be acceptable but would be limited by the access. Already the access road sees 50-60 vehicle movements per day.	The site has not been promoted for employment uses	The site is too small to accommodate employment uses as well as residential uses	The site is too small to accommodate employment uses as well as residential uses
Flooding					
Within Flood zone 1, 2 or 3 (low risk)	No	No	No	No	No
Surface water flooding issues	Low risk. 7% to the south of the site has a risk of flooding every 100-1000 years.	No identified flood risk	Medium risk as 3% of the site has surface water flooding issues towards the north. 38% of the site has a risk of flooding every 100-1000 years	No identified flood risk	No identified flood risk
Local flooding issues	No	No	Development could avoid the north of the site where the streams run through	No	No
Environmental Quality					
Water quality issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Air quality issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Any local noise issues	Site is adjacent to busy access roads and A24 but proposals are only for a [illegible]	No issues	No issues	No issues	No issues
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Potential contaminated land	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Other Issues					
Other issues			Power line across site but very large site so unlikely to be a constraint.		The site would result in the loss of an existing community asset. Whilst the promoters have confirmed their wish to retain the provision of community space, it will be important that this is of sufficient space and quality to address the needs of the community.
SUMMARY	The proposals by the promoter to only deliver a single dwelling provides no benefit to the wider community as part of a Neighbourhood Plan. Any larger scale of development would, given its location, be unlikely to be sustainable.	The site is poorly located with respect to the village and highway access would be unacceptable for all but the smallest development. The site has been offered for some additional commercial activity which may be acceptable, but would have to be limited in scale due to the poor access.	The site has some sustainability benefits and the promoter is willing to provide community infrastructure. One major issue would be the scale of development which could access onto Rectory Lane which, at this point, is a relatively narrow country lane. The levels of development suitable would likely have to be much lower than the theoretical levels stated. Another fundamental issue would be the exposed nature of the site on the landscape, being adjacent to open countryside on its eastern, southern and western boundaries.	The site is too small to provide any benefit to the wider community as part of a Neighbourhood Plan. It is an otherwise sustainable site.	This is a sustainable site in a highly sustainable location. However, the loss of valued community facilities would only be acceptable if these were provided to a higher standard in an equally accessible location.

Sustainability criteria	Site 13	Site 14	Site 15	Site 16	Sites 22 and 23 (joint)
Site Location					
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Potential nos of dwellings	This site could accommodate 9-11 dwellings at approx. 25-30dph.	This site could accommodate 15-18 dwellings at approx. 25-30dph.	This site could accommodate 1-2 dwellings at approx. 25-30dph.	This site could accommodate 10-12 dwellings at approx. 25-30dph.	This site could accommodate 108-130 dwellings at approx. 25-30dph.
Deliverability - landowner willing to release the site	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter. Sites now in single ownership.
Context					
Proposed development	Residential.	Residential.	Residential.	Residential.	Residential.
Current and previous uses (mixed use or previously developed land)	Greenfield/previously developed land. The site is in use as a playground with open green space.	Previously developed land. The site is in employment use as a manufacturing location for G&M Tools.	Previously developed land. The site consists of a school and adjacent car park.	Previously developed land. The site is a residential dwelling and large garden area.	Greenfield. The site is made up of fields in agricultural use.
Surrounding land uses	Residential uses surround the site to the west, north and east. Ashington Community Centre lies to the south across Foster Road. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses.	An open field lies beyond the western border and residential uses surround the rest of the site with the A24 passing nearby to the east. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses.	Residential uses immediately border the site to the west and east, as well as to the south past Rectory Lane. Further to the west and to the north are sites 22/23 comprising open fields with potential for the site to be included in proposed developments. Given the scale of the site, development is likely to be compatible with the existing uses.	A small number of residential dwellings border the site to the north. Chanctonbury Nursery is situated to the east of the site and an open field sits to the west. To the south is copseland beyond which are open fields. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses.	The north and west of the site are rural. Residential uses border the site to the south and east. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses.
Site boundary	The site is bordered by residential uses on three sides, with the recreation ground to the south. Development would be compatible with these uses.	The site is well screened to the west and north by a significant amount of mature trees.	The site has some screening by a few mature trees. The north of the site is well screened by mature trees.	The site is well screened at the western and southern borders by mature trees and at the eastern and northern borders by hedgerows.	The west, east and south of the site comprises a border comprising a mix of small and mature trees. The north of the site is well screened by a dense copse.
General character - open countryside/rural/suburban	The character of the west, north and east of the site is residential. The south of the site is green open space adjacent to the Ashington Community Centre. The majority of the site is open field with a play area in the southeast corner.	The character of the west of the site is open countryside. The character of the north, east and south of the site is residential. The factory building comprises most of the east of the site, sitting flush with Mill Lane. The west of the site comprises some space for car parking.	The character of the site to the north and west is open countryside. The character of the south and east of the site is residential. The site comprises an existing play school.	The character to the east and immediately to the north of the site is residential. The character of the west and south of the site is open countryside. The site comprises an extant dwelling with a garden to the south.	The character of the site is open countryside to the west and north. The character to the south and east of the site is residential. The site is a collection of open fields each bordered by a mixture of hedgerows and trees of varying maturity. There is a small pond in the south west. Some buildings sit at the south corner, near the centre and in the north west.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Adjacent to BUAB	The site is within the built-up area boundary.	The western border of site is adjacent to the built-up area boundary.	The site is within the built-up area boundary.	The site is outside the BUAB but adjacent at the northern border.	The site is adjacent to the BUAB
Housing					
Able to accommodate affordable housing	The site is of a scale that could provide a limited amount of affordable housing (circa 1-2 units max).	The site could support 1-2 affordable dwellings. However given proposed development, this development will not provide this.	The site is not of a scale that could provide affordable housing.	The site is of a scale that could provide a limited amount of affordable housing (circa 2-3 units max).	The site is of a scale that could provide a significant amount of affordable housing (circa 38-46 units max).
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Community Facilities and Access to Services					
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Distance to village centre/shop(s)	324m approx. to Co-op.	459m approx. to Co-op.	494m approx. to Co-op.	696m approx. to Co-op.	502m approx. to Co-op.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Loss of community/recreation facilities/cultural	Loss of play area and open space. However, community facilities exist [illegible]	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	Loss of community pre school.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/ recreation facilities.
Opportunity to provide open space/ recreation/ community facility	The site provides an existing recreation/community facility, therefore its loss could only be justified by re-provision elsewhere (which is proposed). It is unlikely that any re-provision would result in a significant net increase in the amount of provision of recreation/community space or facilities.	The site is too small to provide any form of open space, recreation or community facility.	The site is too small to provide any form of open space, recreation or community facility.	The site is too small to provide any form of open space, recreation or community facility.	There is potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facilities and the site promoter is willing to do so. However, being located adjacent to the edge of the existing built-up area means it is not centrally located for the majority of the population to easily access by foot or bicycle. This location restricts the type of open space/recreation/community uses that are appropriate.
Biodiversity					
European designation - SAC/SPA/Ramsar	No	No	Bat sustenance zone runs through nearby SAC (5.7ha of the site)	Bat sustenance zone runs through nearby SAC (1ha of the site)	No
National designation - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	No	No	No	No	No
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Ancient woodland	No	No	No	No	No
Tree Preservation Order (within site/ boundary)	Almost all of the site is covered by a blanket TPO	No	No	No	A tiny fraction of land contains TPOs
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Opportunity to enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure	Site is too small to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.	Site is too small to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.	Site is too small to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.	Site is too small to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.	As the site is large with woodlands to the north and areas of mature trees within the site and around the borders, there is potential to retain and enhance biodiversity and to link green infrastructure to the existing built-up area.
Hedgerows	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site
Landscape					
Views into site (wide/framed/screened/long/short)	Site well surrounded by development. No views into site	Well screened with mature trees. No views into site.	Site well surrounded by development. No views into site	Site well surrounded by development and well screened. No views into site	Well screened with mature trees. Views into site quite limited.
Views out of the site (wide/framed/screened/long/short)	Site well surrounded by development. No views out of site	Well screened with mature trees. No views out of site.	Site well surrounded by development. No views out of site	Site well surrounded by development and well screened. No views out of site	Well screened with mature trees. Views out of site quite limited.
Inter village gap	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence
Opportunity to enhance landscape	Site is an existing green space so would not enhance landscape.	Site is unkempt so would provide opportunity to enhance landscape, albeit that site is well screened.	Site is too small to materially enhance the landscape.	Existing landscape and adjacent properties are reasonably attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.	Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.
Heritage					
Distance to Listed Building	Site is not near any listed buildings.	Site is close to three Grade II listed buildings. Development would need [illegible]	Site is approx. 30m from a Grade II listed building. Development would [illegible]	Site is not near any listed buildings.	Site not near any listed buildings.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Distance to Scheduled Monument	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.
Archaeological Areas	0.36 is archaeological land	0.41ha is archaeological land	No	No	No
Transport					
Distance to public transport (minimum hourly service)	290m approx. to bus stop.	153m approx. to bus stop.	292m approx. to bus stop.	624m approx. to bus stop.	195m approx. to bus stop.
Access to highway	Access onto Foster Lane has no problems.	Mill Lane is very narrow and unsuitable for this scale of development.	Access onto Rectory Lane has no problems.	Access onto Rectory Lane has no problems.	Access onto Rectory Lane has no problems.
Site potential to generate significant additional traffic/congestion	The scale of the proposed site would not generate significant increases in traffic.	Mill Lane is very narrow and therefore any level of development would be likely to create congestion problems.	The scale of the proposed site would not generate significant increases in traffic.	The scale of the proposed site would not generate significant increases in traffic.	The scale of the proposed site would not generate significant increases in traffic.
Pedestrian access	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable.	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable. Site access the same as Site 26.	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable.	Site accessed by a private road, footway connections not an issue.	Site would not need new footway connections to make development acceptable with existing access off Rectory Lane.
Public rights of way (PROW) present	A PROW runs adjacent to the eastern border of the site. Development would likely not affect the view within the context of the surrounding residential area.	A PROW runs adjacent to the eastern border of the site. Development would likely not affect the view as the buildings and trees currently on the site already restrict views past the site.	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site.	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site.	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site.
Access by bike	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes
Economic Development					
Distance to employment sites	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]
Loss of employment site	No	No	No	No	No
Opportunity for employment	The site is too small to accommodate employment uses as well as residential uses	The site is too small to accommodate employment uses as well as residential uses	The site is too small to accommodate employment uses as well as residential uses	The site is too small to accommodate employment uses as well as residential uses	The site has not been promoted for employment uses
Flooding					
Within Flood zone 1, 2 or 3 (low risk)	No	Within flood zone 3	No	No	No
Surface water flooding issues	Low Risk. 2.8% of the north east of the site has a risk of flooding every 1000 years.	Medium Risk. 7% of the western and northern borders of the site has a risk of flooding every 30 years. 10% of the site has the risk of flooding every 100-1000 years at the northern and western borders as well as a portion of the south east border.	No identified flood risk	No identified flood risk	Medium Risk. 8.8% of the site has a risk of flooding every 30 years and 30% every 100-1000 years at the north and west of the site.
Local flooding issues	No	Significant localised flooding in the recent past has left nearby properties flooded and the road impassable.	No	No	Only a small proportion to the west of the site has surface flooding issues and so development can avoid this area.
Environmental Quality					
Water quality issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Air quality issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Any local noise issues	No issues	No issues	No issues	No issues	No issues
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Potential contaminated land	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
Other Issues					
Other issues	The site would result in the loss of a community open space. It would be important to understand how reprovision would be made elsewhere of at least the same area and quality.		The site would result in the loss of the pre-school facility. It would be important to understand if an improved facility could be provided elsewhere.		
SUMMARY	This is a sustainable site in a highly sustainable location. However, the loss of valued community facilities would only be acceptable if these were provided to a higher standard in an equally accessible location.	The site is poorly located with respect to the village and localised flooding adjacent to the site, coupled with poor highway access, would mean that all but the smallest development would be unacceptable.	The site is too small to provide any benefit to the wider community as part of a Neighbourhood Plan. It would also result in the loss of the community pre-school.	The site is relatively sustainable and this would increase if Site 1 was brought forward for development. However, the site has existing residential uses on it and therefore it is questionable as to whether the scale of any development would provide any material wider benefit to the community as part of a Neighbourhood Plan.	The site is sustainable although could result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Class 3a).

Red — **Significant impact likely**, e.g. directly affects Listed Building, within [illegible]

Potential impact, e.g. adjacent to Listed Building, adjacent to [illegible]

Minimal impact likely. Where using distance criteria 0 - 500m

No issue/ Neutral impact

Not relevant

Site 25	Site 26	Site 27
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
This site could accommodate 26-31 dwellings at approx. 25-30dph.	This site could accommodate 22-27 dwellings at approx. 25-30dph. However, 1/3 of site is in flood zone 3 which would reduce yield to approx. 15-20 units. Promoter has proposed 12-16 units.	This site could accommodate 28-34 dwellings at approx. 25-30dph.
Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.	Yes. Call for Sites Promoter.
Residential.	Residential.	Residential.
Greenfield. The site is a field in agricultural use.	Greenfield/previously developed. The site is in the curtilage of an existing residential dwelling.	Greenfield. The site is a field in agricultural use.
Residential uses border the site to the southeast. Site 15 shares border with the southern site where it meets Rectory Lane at the south. The rest of the site is bordered by open fields in agricultural use comprising Site 22. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses.	The A24 is near to the southeast. Open agricultural fields sit to the west with residential uses to the south and east. Mill House Hotel is near to the north. G&M Tools is nearby to the north along with residential uses. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses.	Residential uses border the site to the south and east. Site 22/23 shares its border with the western border site. The promoter of site 22/23 has stated that negotiations are ongoing with the promoter of this site, potentially with a view to purchasing the land and putting it forward as a single site. The rest of the site is bordered by open fields in agricultural use comprising Site 22. Development would generally be in keeping with surrounding land uses.
The site is surrounded at all sides by a border of mature trees. The north of the site is covered by trees.	The west is bordered by some small trees and the north is well screened by a significant amount of mature trees.	The site is surrounded at all sides by a border of mature trees. The north of the site is covered by trees.
The character of the site to the west and north is open countryside. The character to the south and east of the site is residential. The site is primarily open field with a dense growth of small and mature trees at the north.	The character to the west and south of the site is open countryside. The character to the north and east is residential. There is a brook running through part of the site.	The character of the site to the west and north is open countryside. The character to the south and east of the site is residential. The site is primarily open field with a dense growth of small and mature trees at the north.
Site slopes [illegible] gently down to the north	Site slopes slightly down to the west	Site slopes [illegible] gently down to the north
The site is outside the BUAB but adjacent at the south and east borders.	The site is outside the BUAB to the west past the brook and inside the BUAB to the east where there is an existing building.	The site is adjacent to the BUAB
The site is of a scale that could provide some affordable housing (circa 9-11 units max).	The site is of a scale that could provide a limited amount of affordable housing (circa 5-6 units max).	The site is of a scale that could provide some affordable housing (circa 10-12 units max).
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
480m approx. to Co-op.	600m approx. to Co-op.	480m approx. to Co-op.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
No loss of community amenity/recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/recreation facilities.	No loss of community amenity/recreation facilities.
There is potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facility, but being located at the northern edge of the settlement, is not well located for the population located in the southern edge of the settlement to access by foot or bicycle.	The site is too small to provide any form of open space, recreation or community facility.	There is limited potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facility, but being located at the northern edge of the settlement, is not well located for the population located in the southern edge of the settlement to access by foot or bicycle.
No	No	No
No	No	No
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
No	No	No
No	No	No
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
The site is large enough to retain and enhance biodiversity with mature trees within and bordering the site. There is potential to enhance green infrastructure to link future developments to the existing built-up area.	Given the size of the site, it is likely to be too small to be able to enhance biodiversity or green infrastructure.	The site is large enough to retain and enhance biodiversity with mature trees within and bordering the site. There is potential to enhance green infrastructure to link future developments to the existing built-up area.
No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site	No hedgerows running through the site
Well screened with mature trees. Views into site quite limited.	Some short distance views in from the west, but quite limited.	Well screened with mature trees. Views into site quite limited.
Well screened with mature trees. Views out of site quite limited.	Limited view of the White House - a distinctive but unlisted property - from the PROW to the west is reasonable and would be lost	Well screened with mature trees. Views out of site quite limited.
This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence	This site is not likely to contribute to settlement coalescence
Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.	Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.	Existing landscape is attractive so development would be unlikely to enhance it.
Site not near any listed buildings.	Site not near any listed buildings.	Site not near any listed buildings.
Site is not within [illegible] Conservation Areas	Site is not within [illegible] Conservation Areas	Site is not within [illegible] Conservation Areas
Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.	Site is not near any scheduled monuments.
No	0.65ha is archaeological	No
252m approx. to bus stop.	140m approx. to bus stop.	252m approx. to bus stop.
Provision of access road to Rectory Lane would result in loss of existing play area for the pre-school.	Access directly from and onto A24 northbound is very dangerous and not suitable. Mill Lane is very narrow and unsuitable for this scale of development. Access through white house annex which would need to be demolished.	Provision of access road to Rectory Lane would need to be via Rectory Close which is a very narrow road unsuitable for additional traffic. If the site was brought forward along with sites 22/23 then access could easily be provided.
The scale of the proposed site would not generate significant increases in traffic.	Mill Lane is very narrow and therefore any level of development would be likely to create congestion problems.	The scale of the proposed site would not generate significant increases in traffic.
Site access would be a new connection through part of play area from play school. No footpath potential	Site would likely require some new footway connections which could be linked up to existing PROW.	Site access could be provided via Rectory Close or through sites 22/23 if brought forward as a comprehensive development
A PROW runs adjacent to the eastern border of the site along a line of mature trees. Development would have a detrimental impact on the open views to the west.	A PROW runs adjacent to the eastern border of the site. Development would have some limited impact on the views past the current residential properties to the open field at the back of the site.	A PROW runs adjacent to the eastern border of the site along a line of mature trees. Development would have a detrimental impact on the open views to the west.
The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes	The site is well located for access by bike, albeit using local roads rather than dedicated bike paths or routes
All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]	All sites in Ashington are a broadly similar distance to larger employment [illegible]
No	No	No
The site has not been promoted for employment uses	The site has not been promoted for employment uses	The site has not been promoted for employment uses
No	Approx. 1/3 of site, on western edge, within flood zone 3. Development [illegible]	No
Low Risk. 10% of the west of the site has a risk of flooding every 1000 years.	Medium Risk. 1% of the north western border of the site has a risk of flooding every 30 years and 56% of the open field at the west of the site every 100-1000 years.	Low Risk. 10% of the west of the site has a risk of flooding every 1000 years.
No	Flooding is an issue to the north due to flat land and development could exacerbate this issue. WSCC flood report recommends reducing flow of water and this should not be jeopardised. In addition, there have been a number of recent incidents of flooding to properties along Mill Lane, at the entrance to the road leading up to the site, leaving it impassable.	No
No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
No issues	No issues	No issues
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
No known issues	No known issues	No known issues
The site would result in the loss of part of the play area which is an important part of the pre-school facility and offer. It would be important to understand the impact on the pre-school and whether an improved facility could be provided elsewhere.		
Development would result in the loss of the pre-school play area and would have a detrimental impact on views from the adjacent PROW. These issues restrict the sustainability of the site.	Localised flooding adjacent to the site, coupled with poor highway access, would mean that all but the smallest development would be unacceptable. The site provides no other wider benefits to the community.	Development would have fundamental access issues unless brought forward along with sites 22/23 as part of a comprehensive development. Development would have a detrimental impact on views from the adjacent PROW.