

# Corringham Neighbourhood Plan

Site Options and Assessment

Corringham Parish Council

March 2020

## Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
Jessica Cooke Graduate Planner	Tim Fearn Senior Planner	Una McGaughrin Associate Director	Una McGaughrin Associate Director

Tim Fearn  
Senior Planner

## Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
V1	23.01.2020	Draft Review	UM	Una McGaughrin	Associate Director
V2	11.03.2020	Group Review	DS	Diane Semley	Corringham Neighbourhood Plan Committee
V3	12.03.2020	Final Draft	TF	Tim Fearn	Senior Planner
V4	18.03.2020	Final	AO	Annabel Osborne	Neighbourhood Planning Officer, Locality

### Prepared for:

Corringham Parish Council

### Prepared by:

AECOM Limited  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Leman Street  
London E1 8FA  
United Kingdom  
aecom.com

© 2020 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited (“AECOM”) for sole use of our client (the “Client”) in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

### Disclaimer

This document is intended to aid the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and can be used to guide decision making and as evidence to support Plan policies, if the Qualifying Body (QB) so chooses. It is not a Neighbourhood Plan policy document. It is a ‘snapshot’ in time and may become superseded by more recent information. Corringham Neighbourhood Plan is not bound to accept its conclusions. If landowners or any other party can demonstrate that any of the evidence presented herein is inaccurate or out of date, such evidence can be presented to Corringham Neighbourhood Plan at the consultation stage. Where evidence from elsewhere conflicts with this report, the QB should decide what policy position to take in the Neighbourhood Plan and that judgement should be documented so that it can be defended at the Examination stage.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	5
1. Introduction.....	6
Background .....	6
2. Planning Policy and Evidence Base.....	8
National Planning Policy Framework (2019).....	8
Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017).....	8
Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review (early consultation held in 2019) .....	9
3. Methodology .....	11
Task 1: Identify Sites to be included in the Assessment.....	11
Task 2: Gathering Information for Site Assessments.....	11
Task 3: Site Assessment.....	12
Task 4: Consolidation of Results .....	12
Task 5: Indicative Housing Capacity.....	12
4. Site Assessment.....	13
5. Site Assessment Summary .....	15
6. Conclusions .....	18
Next Steps.....	18
Viability.....	19
Appendix A - Site Appraisal Pro Formas .....	20

## Figures

Figure 1-1 Neighbourhood Plan Area Boundary .....	6
Figure 4-1: Sites identified for assessment.....	14
Figure 5-1 Corringham Sites with RAG rating.....	16

## Tables

Table 3-1 Indicative Percentage of Site Developable Area (extract from HELAA, 2019) .....	12
Table 4-1 Sites identified in the Call for Sites consultation for allocation consideration.....	13
Table 5-1 Site Assessment Summary.....	17

## Abbreviations used in the report

### Abbreviation

CLJSPC	Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee
CNP	Corringham Neighbourhood Plan
CPC	Corringham Parish Council
DPD	Development Plan Document
Ha	Hectare
HELAA	Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NPA	Neighbourhood Plan Area
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PDL	Previously Developed Land
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
WLDC	West Lindsey District Council

## Executive Summary

Corringham Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared in the context of the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the emerging revision of this plan. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is a joint plan prepared by the City of Lincoln Council and West Lindsey and North Kesteven District Councils. Corringham falls in the administrative area of West Lindsey District Council. Corringham Parish Council seeks to identify sites which are potentially suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan in order to guide development in the parish towards locations which will preserve and enhance the setting of the village of Corringham. The assessment of sites is informed by a Character Assessment prepared for the Neighbourhood Plan, which identifies key views and landscape considerations.

Corringham is defined as a Small Village in the adopted Local Plan. Small Villages are expected to accommodate small scale development of a limited nature in appropriate locations, while larger villages are expected to deliver higher levels of development. Corringham is permitted to grow by 15%, equating to 33 dwellings.

There is an emerging Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The Central Lincolnshire councils have recently ended their Call for Sites consultation in June 2019. One site was identified for Corringham, ref WL/GAIN/001, with a capacity for 2,706 dwellings. It is allocated as an urban extension in the Local Plan and has not been assessed in this report. West Lindsey District Council have stated that this allocation does not contribute to the housing requirement for Corringham.

This site assessment considers seven potential development sites, taking into account policies in the Local Plan as well as national planning criteria to establish which, if any, of the sites are suitable for development. All of the sites included in the assessment were promoted through the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites, carried out in August 2019.


The conclusions of the site assessment are that three sites are suitable for allocation and that a further three are potentially suitable for allocation either in their entirety or in part, subject to constraints being addressed and to due consideration of Local Plan policy. One site is considered unsuitable for allocation due to major constraints that are unmitigable.

This assessment is the first step in the consideration of site allocations. From the shortlist of potentially suitable sites identified in this report, the Parish Council should engage with West Lindsey District Council and the community to select sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan which best meet the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan and the housing need for the plan area.

# 1. Introduction

## Background

- 1.1 AECOM has been commissioned to undertake an independent site assessment for the Corringham Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) on behalf of Corringham Parish Council (CPC) as part of the Locality and MHCLG Neighbourhood Planning programme.
- 1.2 Site selection and allocation is one of the most contentious aspects of planning, raising strong feelings amongst local people, landowners, developers and businesses. It is important that any selection process carried out is transparent, fair, robust and defensible and that the same criteria and thorough process is applied to each potential site. Equally important is the way in which the work is recorded and communicated to interested parties, to ensure that the approach is transparent and defensible.
- 1.3 The Neighbourhood Plan Area (NPA) was designated in May 2016 and the boundary was revised in March 2020 following public consultation to make the Neighbourhood Plan boundary synonymous with the parish boundary. **Figure 1-1** shows the Corringham Neighbourhood Plan Area.



**Figure 1-1 Neighbourhood Plan Area Boundary**

- 1.4 Preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan is being led by CPC, who are currently in the stages of drafting the plan. Common themes highlighted through the community consultation on objectives for the plan include:
  - Housing for the elderly and first-time buyers;
  - Green space; and
  - Children's play space.
- 1.5 Corringham NPA has some services and facilities, including a pub, church and primary school. A wider range can be found in the neighbouring town of Gainsborough.
- 1.6 The A631 connects Corringham with Gainsborough to the west. The nearest train station is located in Gainsborough with frequent services to Sheffield. There are bus routes linking Corringham to Gainsborough and Lincoln.
- 1.7 There are some environmental issues that need to be considered. The south west of the NP area falls within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone. In addition, a number of planning applications have been refused due to drainage issues in the village.

- 1.8 The built environment constraints consist of a number of Listed Buildings. Mill at Mill House Farm, Lychgate at Church of St Lawrence and Old Hall are all Grade II Listed Buildings and Grade I Church of St Lawrence are located in the village of Corringham.
- 1.9 The Corringham Character Assessment describes the landscape in Corringham as generally large flat agricultural fields with long ranging views and rural character.
- 1.10 Central Lincolnshire covers the combined areas of the City of Lincoln, North Kesteven and West Lindsey. Corringham is located within West Lindsey District Council. The adopted statutory development plan includes the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017)<sup>1</sup>. This is currently being reviewed and was subject to early consultation in June/July 2019<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.11 Neighbourhood plans are required to be in conformity with the adopted Local Plan as well as with the strategic policies of an emerging Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plans can add value to the development plan by developing policies and proposals to address local place-based issues. The intention, therefore, is for the Local Plan to provide a clear overall strategic direction for development in Corringham, whilst enabling finer detail to be determined through the neighbourhood planning process where appropriate.
- 1.12 Corringham had a population of 523 in the 2011 census. CPC have communicated that retaining young people is a problem and subject to detailed assessment there may be a need for housing to meet requirements of young and older people.
- 1.13 The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) states that Corringham is permitted to grow by 15% in housing numbers within the Plan period, this equates to 33 dwellings.
- 1.14 It is the intention of the NP to include allocations for housing, to direct development to sustainable sites and meet identified local housing need over the current Local Plan period.
- 1.15 This assessment in itself does not allocate sites. It is the responsibility of the Neighbourhood Group to decide, guided by this report and other relevant information, which sites to select for allocation, to best meet the housing requirement and Neighbourhood Plan objectives.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/>

<sup>2</sup> Available at <https://central-lincs.inconsult.uk/consult/ti/CLLP.Issues.Options/consultationHome>

## 2. Planning Policy and Evidence Base

- 1.1 All Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) policies and site allocations must be in accordance with national planning guidance of the most recent NPPF and PPG, the strategic policies of the adopted Development Plan, and have regard to the emerging Local Plan.
- 2.1 The key documents for West Lindsey's planning framework which are relevant to the Corringham neighbourhood area include the:
  - Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017);
  - Emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review policies (2019); Reg 18 Issues and Options.
- 2.2 The key evidence base documents include:
  - Corringham Character Assessment.
- 2.3 A draft Landscape Character Assessment has been prepared for the Parish Council to inform the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. This identifies significant views and areas of special landscape character which form an important part of the setting of Corringham. The assessment of sites includes consideration of whether development would have an adverse impact on views and the surrounding landscape.

### National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- 1.2 NPPF<sup>3</sup> (2019) paragraph 69 states that neighbourhood planning groups should consider the opportunities for allocating small and medium sized sites (of a size consistent with paragraph 68a) suitable for housing in their area.
- 1.3 Paragraph 78 states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.
- 1.4 Paragraph 79 states that planning policies should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:
  - there is an essential need for a rural worker;
  - the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would enable development to secure the future of heritage assets;
  - the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
  - the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; or
  - the design is of exceptional quality.

### Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017)

- 2.4 The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan was adopted by the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (CLJSPC), which West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) is a part of, in April 2017. It provides land use planning policies, allocates sites for development and identifies other areas designated for protection that will shape the growth and regeneration of the Central

---

<sup>3</sup>Available at [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/810197/NPPF\\_Feb\\_2019\\_revised.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf)



Lincolnshire area over the next 20 years and beyond. The Local Plan sets out the long-term vision and objectives for Central Lincolnshire, and identifies the settlements of Lincoln, Sleaford and Gainsborough to which new development will be directed and the amount of new housing and employment land that will be provided in these areas up to 2036, with appropriate and sensitive development being permitted in villages to ensure they remain sustainable, thriving local communities.

- 2.5 Between 2012 and 2036, the Local Plan states that Central Lincolnshire will grow by 36,960 new homes, meeting the housing needs of all communities. The level of growth for each settlement is established through a settlement hierarchy spatial strategy, whereby Corringham is identified as a ‘Small Village’ in the settlement hierarchy. Corringham has been given an indicative growth level of 15%, however no specific sites have been allocated. Policy LP4 allows for Neighbourhood Plans to exceed the level of growth proposed by the Local Plan.
- 2.6 The 2017 Local Plan sets out a range of policies governing development in Central Lincolnshire. Those of relevance to development to Corringham include:
- 2.7 **Policy LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy** identifies Corringham as a ‘Small Village’. Unless otherwise promoted, via a neighbourhood plan or through the demonstration of clear local community support<sup>4</sup>, Small Villages are expected to accommodate small scale development of a limited nature in appropriate locations. Proposals will be considered on their own merits but would be limited to around 4 dwellings.
- 2.8 **Policy LP4: Growth in Villages** identifies the level of growth in villages. Corringham is permitted to grow 15% in the number of dwellings over the plan period.

The policy also states that a sequential test for development sites will be applied with priority given as follows:

1. *Brownfield land or infill sites, in appropriate locations, within the developed footprint of the settlement*
2. *Brownfield sites at the edge of a settlement, in appropriate locations*
3. *Greenfield sites at the edge of a settlement, in appropriate locations*

Proposals for development of a site lower in the above list should include clear explanation of why sites are not available or suitable for categories higher up the list.

- 2.9 **Policy LP54: Remaining Capacity on SUEs and Broad Locations for Future Growth** identifies broad locations for development should net housing delivery, on average, been near to, or exceeded 1,540pa. One of the locations identified is within Corringham NP area, although would act as an extension to Gainsborough. Indicative dwelling capacity of 2,500 has been provided.
- 2.10 **Policy LP55: Development in the Countryside** states that applications for new dwellings will only be acceptable where they are essential to the effective operation of rural operations listed in policy LP2. Proposals on the best and most versatile agricultural land will only be permitted if there is insufficient lower grade land available at that settlement and impacts are minimal on ongoing agricultural operations. The re-use and conversion of non-residential buildings for residential use and replacement of dwellings in the countryside will be supported provided restrictive criteria are met.

## Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review (early consultation held in 2019)

- 2.11 Despite the recent adoption of the Local Plan, it is currently being reviewed in response to significant changes to national policy. The Issues and Options consultation which took place in June and July 2019 proposed some key areas for review, including:

---

<sup>4</sup> Where ‘demonstration of clear local community support’ means that at the point of submitting a planning application to the local planning authority, there should be clear evidence of local community support for the scheme, with such support generated via a thorough, but proportionate, pre-application community consultation exercise. If, despite a thorough, but proportionate, pre-application consultation exercise, demonstrable evidence of support or objection cannot be determined, then there will be a requirement for support from the applicable Parish or Town Council.

- The overall housing requirement of a range of 1,083 -1,300 dwellings per year, as opposed to the target of 1,540 dwellings per year in the current Local Plan (proposal 6);
- Changes to the settlement hierarchy based on address point data. Corringham remains as a Small Village in the proposed changes (proposal 5);
- The threshold for housing site allocations is proposed to be reduced from sites for 25 dwellings or more to sites that can deliver 10 dwellings or more (proposal 9);
- Retaining housing allocations that are still considered to be suitable development and deallocating sites that are built-out or are no longer suitable or available. Allocated sites without permission and with no clear and demonstrable evidence that progress is likely within the next five years will also be deallocated (proposal 10);
- The approach to resetting growth in small and medium villages (proposal 11);
- A change of approach for identifying and protecting Important Open Spaces. Designated Local Green Spaces are proposed to be retained (proposals 18 and 19).

2.12 The draft plan is scheduled to be consulted upon in early 2020. No timetable was available for this at the time of writing.

## 3. Methodology

- 3.1 The approach to the site assessment is based on the Government's Planning Practice Guidance. The relevant sections are Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (updated July 2019)<sup>5</sup>, Neighbourhood Planning (updated May 2019)<sup>6</sup> and Locality's Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment Toolkit<sup>7</sup>. These all encompass an approach to assessing whether a site is appropriate for allocation in a Neighbourhood Plan based on whether it is suitable, available and achievable. In this context, the methodology for identifying sites and carrying out the site appraisal is presented below.

### Task 1: Identify Sites to be included in the Assessment

- 3.2 The first task is to identify which sites should be considered as part of the assessment.
- 3.3 For the CNP, this included sites identified in the Corringham Parish Council Call for Sites 2019.
- 3.4 The most recent update of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for Central Lincolnshire was reviewed to identify sites within the neighbourhood area.
- 3.5 Sites identified through the Call for Sites consultation which had not already been assessed through the HELAA were appraised using AECOM's site assessment pro-forma.

### Task 2: Gathering Information for Site Assessments

- 3.6 A site appraisal pro-forma has been developed by AECOM to assess potential sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. It has been developed based on the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance, the Site Assessment for Neighbourhood Plans: A Toolkit for Neighbourhood Planners (Locality, 2015)<sup>8</sup> and the knowledge and experience gained through previous Neighbourhood Planning site assessments. The purpose of the pro-forma is to enable a consistent evaluation of each site against an objective set of criteria.
- 3.7 The pro-forma utilised for the assessment enabled a range of information to be recorded, including the following:
- General information:
    - Site location and use; and
    - Site context and planning history.
  - Context:
    - Type of site (greenfield, brownfield etc.).
  - Suitability:
    - Site characteristics;
    - Environmental considerations;
    - Heritage considerations;
    - Community facilities and services; and
    - Other key considerations (e.g. flood risk, agricultural land, tree preservation orders).
  - Availability

---

<sup>5</sup> Available at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment>

<sup>6</sup> Available at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

<sup>7</sup> Available at <https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/assess-allocate-sites-development/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/assess-allocate-sites-development/>

## Task 3: Site Assessment

- 3.8 The next task was to complete the site pro-formas. This was done through a combination of desk top assessment and site visits. The desk top assessment involved a review of the conclusions of the existing evidence and the use of other sources including Google Maps/Streetview and MAGIC maps in order to judge whether a site is suitable for the use proposed. The site visits allowed the team to consider aspects of the site assessment that could only be done visually. It was also an opportunity to gain a better understanding of the context and nature of the neighbourhood area.

## Task 4: Consolidation of Results

- 3.9 Following a site visit, the desktop assessments were revisited to finalise the assessments and compare the sites to judge which were the most suitable to meet the housing requirement.
- 3.10 A 'traffic light' rating of all sites has been given based on whether the site is an appropriate candidate to be considered for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The traffic light rating indicates 'green' for sites that show no constraints and are appropriate as site allocations, 'amber' for sites which are potentially suitable if issues can be resolved and 'red' for sites which are not currently suitable. The judgement on each site is based on the three 'tests' of whether a site is appropriate for allocation – i.e. the site is suitable, available and achievable.

## Task 5: Indicative Housing Capacity

- 3.11 If landowners/developers have put forward a housing figure, this has been used if appropriate. If a site has been granted planning permission but the site has not yet been started or completed, then this capacity figure has been used.
- 3.12 Where there are no estimated figures provided, the density assumption of 30 dph is used in accordance with the HELAA.
- 3.13 In addition to the assumed density of 30dph, paragraph 4.11 of the HELAA Report considers how much of each site can reasonably be expected to be developed for housing and proposes a simple formula be used to consider the percentage of a site that could reasonably be assumed to come forward as outlined in Table 3-1.

**Table 3-1 Indicative Percentage of Site Developable Area (extract from HELAA, 2019)**

Site size	Percentage of the site developable
Less than 0.4 hectares	100%
0.4 - 2 hectares	85%
2 - 10 hectares	75%
10 hectares or larger	60%

## 4. Site Assessment

- 4.1 The sites to be considered through this site appraisal have all been identified through the Corringham Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites (2019). No additional sites have been identified.
- 4.2 Although a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) was prepared in 2019 to provide evidence to inform the preparation of the emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, no sites within Corringham Parish were assessed through the HELAA.
- 4.3 The list of the Parish Council's sites was checked against the WLDC's planning database to identify whether any of the submitted sites were subject to current planning permission.
- 4.4 Table 4-1 presents those sites identified in the Call for Sites consultation (May 2019).

**Table 4-1 Sites identified in the Call for Sites consultation for allocation consideration**

Site Ref.	Site Name / Address	Site Size (ha)	Promoter Capacity (homes or other)	Planning History	Proposed Uses
CNP1	North of Church Lane	6.35	142 (estimated)	No recent or relevant planning history	Residential
CNP2	Land South of Corringham High Street	1	5	No recent or relevant planning history	Residential
CNP3	Land North of Corringham High Street	0.59	5	Ref: 136432 - Outline application for 2 dwellings. Withdrawn August 2017.	Residential
CNP4	Land to the north of East Lane	0.65	9	None on site, but land to the south has outline permission for 9 dwellings (Ref: 132781 / approved May 2017) with reserved matters application approved July 2019 (Ref: 139386).	Residential
CNP5	Land East of Poplar Lane	0.23	2 (plus 1 existing)	No recent or relevant planning history	Residential
CNP6	The Old Hall, East Lane	0.33	3	No recent or relevant planning history	Residential
CNP7	Corner Farm	0.3	7	No recent or relevant planning history	Residential

- 4.5 The sites identified through the Call for Sites are shown in the map at Figure 4-1.



Figure 4-1: Sites identified for assessment

## 5. Site Assessment Summary

- 5.1 7 sites were assessed by AECOM to consider whether they would be appropriate for allocation in the Corringham Neighbourhood Plan.
- 5.2 Table 5-1 sets out a summary of the site assessments, which should be read alongside the full assessments available in the pro formas in **Appendix A**.
- 5.3 The final column within the table is a traffic light' rating for each site, indicating whether the site is appropriate for allocation. **Red** indicates the site is not appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan and **Green** indicates the site is appropriate for allocation. **Amber** indicates the site is less sustainable or may be appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan if certain issues can be resolved or constraints mitigated.
- 5.4 Figure 5-1 shows the sites considered for assessment and their traffic light rating.
- 5.5 The conclusions of the site assessment are that three sites are suitable for allocation and that a further three are potentially suitable for allocation either in their entirety or in part, subject to constraints being addressed and to due consideration of Local Plan policy. These constraints consist of access issues, environmental considerations and the rural character of the village. One site is considered unsuitable for allocation due to major constraints that are unmitigable.

Figure 5-1 Corringham Sites with RAG rating





Table 5-1 Site Assessment Summary

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Source	Proposed land use	Approx. Developable Area (AECOM estimate)	Capacity (homes and other)	Site Type	Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment summary	Traffic Light Rating
CNP1	North of Church Lane	NP Call for Sites	Residential	4.76 ha	142 (estimated)	Greenfield	The site is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the existing built footprint of the village. Development on the whole site would exceed the upper threshold of housing growth. Therefore, partial allocation is subject to the mitigation of the impact on the character of the village and important views as well as a number of physical constraints such as access and drainage ditches.	Yellow
CNP2	Land South of Corringham High Street	NP Call for Sites	Residential	0.85 ha	5	Greenfield	The site is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the existing built footprint of the village, subject to mitigation of impact upon the views into and out of the village and consultation with the Highways Authority. If partial allocation is chosen, it is recommended that the western side of the site is allocated so as to be in keeping with the current built up form of the village.	Yellow
CNP3	Land North of Corringham High Street	NP Call for Sites	Residential	0.5 ha	5	Greenfield	The site is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the existing built footprint of the village, subject to mitigation of impact upon the views into and out of the village and consultation with the Highways Authority.	Yellow
CNP4	Land to the north of East Lane	NP Call for Sites	Residential	0.55 ha	9	Greenfield	This site is suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Green
CNP5	Land East of Poplar Lane	NP Call for Sites	Residential	0.23 ha	3 (including existing dwelling)	Previously developed land	This site is suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Green
CNP6	The Old Hall, East Lane	NP Call for Sites	Residential	0.12 ha	3	Greenfield	The site is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan due to considerable constraints including, the impact on heritage assets, the priority habitat status and the disconnection from the village.	Red
CNP7	Corner Farm	NP Call for Sites	Residential	0.3 ha	7	Previously developed land	The site is suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Green

## 6. Conclusions

- 6.1 The Corringham Neighbourhood Plan intends to include allocations for housing, to direct development to sustainable sites and meet identified local housing need outlined in the Local Plan as 33 dwellings over the Plan period.
- 6.2 The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan sets out a sequential test in the support for sites. Brownfield sites within villages are most favourable, then brownfield sites adjacent to villages and the least favourable type of sites are greenfield adjacent to the village.
- 6.3 The site assessment has found that of the seven sites considered three sites are immediately suitable and available for housing and, if found to be viable for the proposed development, would be a recommended shortlist from which the Parish Council could select sites to allocate for housing in the Neighbourhood Plan. These sites are free from constraints or have constraints that can be resolved. These are:
- **Site CNP4:** This greenfield site located towards the north of the village is adjacent to a current construction site and would act as a natural extension to this. Access has been planned for through this adjacent site. The site has no environmental constraints.
  - **Site CNP5:** This site is a mixture of greenfield and previously developed land in the centre of the village. Access could pose a minor constraint although there are no environmental constraints.
  - **Site CNP7:** This site is a mixture of greenfield and previously developed land to the south of the village, mitigation would need to be provided for the large Beech tree on the site. Other than this there are no constraints to the site.
- 6.4 Of these three sites, CNP5 and CNP7 perform best against the sequential test set out in Policy LP4 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan since they are within the existing built-up area of the village.
- 6.5 A further three sites are potentially suitable and available (i.e. have not been ruled out entirely) but have constraints – some very significant – which mean they are less likely to be suitable for development. If these constraints could not be resolved or mitigated, they would not be appropriate for allocation. These are:
- **Site CNP1:** The site is a large greenfield located to the north of the village and has significant environmental and physical constraints. Development on the whole site would have a significant impact on locally-important views and is likely to exceed the levels of growth expected in the village. Therefore, if the site is to be allocated, only a small section adjacent to the existing footprint of the village would be appropriate for development.
  - **Site CNP2:** The site is a greenfield located to the south of the village and has some environmental and physical constraints as well as some impact on locally-important views. Therefore, development on part of the site adjacent to the existing footprint of the village is appropriate.
  - **Site CNP3:** The site is a greenfield located to the south of the village and has some environmental and physical constraints. Therefore, part of the site adjacent to the existing footprint of the village is appropriate.
- 6.6 The remaining site (**CNP6**) is not suitable for residential development due to environmental and physical constraints. The site performs poorly against the sequential test set out in Local Plan policy LP4. It is therefore not appropriate for allocation in the plan.

## Next Steps

- 6.7 From the shortlist of suitable sites, the Parish Council should engage with WLDC and the community to select sites for allocation in the NP which best meets the housing need and objectives of the NP.



- 6.8 Should Corringham Parish Council decide to allocate a site or sites, the next steps will be for the Parish Council to select the sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, based on:
- The findings of this site assessment;
  - An assessment of viability;
  - Community consultation;
  - Discussions with West Lindsey District Council;
  - Local criteria that can be applied to differentiate between the suitable sites, in particular the extent to which the sites support the vision and objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan;
  - Any other evidence that becomes available, such as assessments of constraints, such as local transport or infrastructure capacity; and
  - Other considerations such as the appropriate density of the proposed sites to reflect local character.

## Viability

- 6.9 As part of the site selection process, it is recommended that the Neighbourhood Group discusses site viability with WLDC and with landowners and site developers. The Local Plan evidence bases may contain evidence of the viability of certain types of sites or locations which can be used to support the Neighbourhood Plan site allocations.

# Appendix A - Site Appraisal Pro Formas

## CNP1 Site Details

Topic	Details
<i>Site Reference / Name</i>	CNP1
	
Site Address / Location	North of Church Lane
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	6.3
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural land
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	142 (estimated)
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	NP Call for Sites
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	No recent or relevant planning history
Neighbouring uses	Residential, agricultural land, churchyard

## CNP1 Assessment of Suitability

## Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <p>Ancient Woodland            Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)            Biosphere Reserve            Local Nature Reserve (LNR)            National Nature Reserve (NNR)            National Park            Ramsar Site            Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*            Special Area of Conservation (SAC)            Special Protection Area (SPA)</p> <p>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following non statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <p>Green Infrastructure Corridor            Local Wildlife Site (LWS)            Public Open Space            Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)            Nature Improvement Area            Regionally Important Geological Site            Other</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b>            Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i>            Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i>            Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i>            Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></p>	<p>Low Risk. Entirely in Flood Zone 1</p>
<p>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>- &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium risk. High risk of surface water flooding in middle of site and alongside field drains. Low risk of flooding on approx. 35% of site.</p>
<p>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Entire site is Grade 3 - unknown if 3a or 3b</p>

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Potential habitat for lapwing, curlew, grey partridge, tree sparrow.</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP1 Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site:</i></p> <p>Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping</p>	Flat or relatively flat
<p><i>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Yes. Field gate at north end of Church Lane
<p><i>Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p><i>Pedestrian?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Cycle?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Site can be accessed from Church Lane</p> <p>Yes. Site can be accessed from existing road network. No dedicated cycle route.</p>
<p><i>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Yes. Public footpath runs northeast across the site from top of Church Lane
<p><i>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?</i></p> <p><i>Significant trees?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Potentially veteran or ancient trees present?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Owned by third parties?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Yes. Power lines running southeast to northwest across southern part of site with pylon north of site entrance.
<p><i>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No



### CNP1 Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
<p>Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps: <a href="https://www.google.com/maps">https://www.google.com/maps</a></p>	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	>1200m
Bus / Tram Stop	<400m
Train station	>1200m
Primary School	<400m
Secondary School	>3900m
Open Space / recreation facilities	400-800m
Cycle Route	>800m. No cycle routes nearby

## CNP1 Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</p>	<p>High - Identified as important in Landscape Character Assessment for providing visual connection with rural area when viewed from Church Lane, long-range views north to Aisby, and for providing setting for Old Hall when viewed from churchyard.</p>

## CNP1 Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact - Grade II listed Old Hall immediately adjacent to east but screened from site by existing vegetation. Grade I listed Church of St Lawrence with Grade II listed lychgate immediately south of site.</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No impact</p>

## CNP1 Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Central Lincolnshire Plan (2017) LP4: Growth in Villages
<p>Is the site: <b>Greenfield</b> A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land?</p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area? Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?</p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built-up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)? Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p>	N/A – Corringham has no defined settlement boundary in the Local Plan
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes</p>

### CNP1 Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site available for development?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><i>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Is there a known time frame for availability?</i>                      Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.</p>	<p>Available now</p>

### CNP1 Viability

Indicators of Viability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p> <p><i>What evidence is available to support this judgement?</i></p>	<p>Potential viability issues - powerlines running across the site</p>

## CNP1 Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
<i>What is the expected development capacity of the site (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)?</i>	142
<i>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</i>	Unknown
<i>Other key information</i>	N/A
<p><i>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</i></p> <p><i>The site is suitable and available</i></p> <p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</i></p> <p><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</i></p>	Amber
<p><i>Summary of justification for rating</i></p>	<p>The site is a large greenfield site located towards the north of the village. Access could be created, however, the lane that access would be created from is very narrow and would require upgrading with any substantial development. In addition, a public footpath runs across the site.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to the Grade I Listed Church of St Lawrence and Grade II Listed Old Hall which could provide adverse impacts on these heritage assets. There are two significant drainage ditches to the north and to the west of the site.</p> <p>The landscape in Corringham is generally large flat agricultural fields with long ranging views and rural character. The site juts out into the countryside, does not have any screening and has long ranging views. The Corringham Character Assessment identified it as providing key views to the north of the village out to Aisby and providing the setting for Old Hall when viewed from the adjacent churchyard. It is likely that the site will have medium landscape sensitivity and high visual sensitivity. The size of the site would detract from the village character and would constitute ribbon development extending the village into open countryside. This extension to the north of the village also counteracts the location of the majority of services (pub, hall and garage) which are at the southern end of the village.</p> <p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) Policy LP4 sets out a prioritisation criterion for the selection of development locations and as this site is a greenfield adjacent to the current development footprint it falls into the least favourable category.</p> <p>The site is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the existing built footprint of the village. Development on the whole site would exceed the upper threshold of housing growth. Therefore partial allocation is subject to mitigation of impact on the character of the village and important views as well as a number of physical constraints such as access and drainage ditches.</p>

### CNP2 Site Details

Topic	Details
Site Reference / Name	CNP2
	
Site Address / Location	Land South of Corringham High Street
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural land
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	5
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	NP Call for Sites
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	No recent or relevant planning history
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural land, farm machinery business

## CNP2 Assessment of Suitability

## Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <p>Ancient Woodland  Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)  Biosphere Reserve  Local Nature Reserve (LNR)  National Nature Reserve (NNR)  National Park  Ramsar Site  Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*  Special Area of Conservation (SAC)  Special Protection Area (SPA)</p> <p>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following non statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <p>Green Infrastructure Corridor  Local Wildlife Site (LWS)  Public Open Space  Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)  Nature Improvement Area  Regionally Important Geological Site  Other</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b>  Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i>  Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i>  Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i>  Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></p>	<p>Low Risk. Entirely in Flood Zone 1</p>
<p>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>- &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium risk. Medium-high risk of surface water flooding in centre of site. Most of site has low risk of flooding.</p>
<p>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Entire site is Grade 3 - unknown if 3a or 3b</p>

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Potential habitat for lapwing, curlew, grey partridge, tree sparrow, yellow wagtail.</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>



## CNP2 Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site:</i></p> <p>Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping</p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><i>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes -Site is adjacent to A631 and there is potential for vehicle access to be established. The speed limit on the A631 changes from 30mph to 40mph halfway along the site and access should be discussed with the relevant highways authority.</p>
<p><i>Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p><i>Pedestrian?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Cycle?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - Pavement runs along A631 adjacent to site. Potential for access to be established.</p> <p>Yes- Potential for access to be established from A631, but no dedicated cycle route.</p>
<p><i>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?</i></p> <p><i>Significant trees?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Potentially veteran or ancient trees present?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Owned by third parties?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown. None visible</p>
<p><i>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

### CNP2 Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
<p>Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps: <a href="https://www.google.com/maps">https://www.google.com/maps</a></p>	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	>1200m
Bus / Tram Stop	<400m
Train station	>1200m
Primary School	400-1200m
Secondary School	>3900m
Open Space / recreation facilities	<400m
Cycle Route	>800m. No cycle routes nearby

## CNP2 Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</p>	<p>Medium</p>

## CNP2 Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP2 Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Central Lincolnshire Plan (2017) LP4: Growth in Villages
<p>Is the site: <b>Greenfield</b> A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land?</p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area? Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?</p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built-up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)? Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p>	N/A – Corringham has no defined settlement boundary in the Local Plan.
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### CNP2 Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site available for development?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	No
<p><i>Is there a known time frame for availability?</i>                      Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.</p>	Available now


### CNP2 Viability

Indicators of Viability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p> <p><i>What evidence is available to support this judgement?</i></p>	Unknown

## CNP2 Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
<i>What is the expected development capacity of the site (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)?</i>	5
<i>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</i>	0-5 years
<i>Other key information</i>	N/A
<i>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</i>  <i>The site is suitable and available</i> <i>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</i> <i>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</i>	Amber
<i>Summary of justification for rating</i>	<p>The site is greenfield located to the south of the village.</p> <p>Access could be created, however, this would be directly off the A631. Although the speed limit on the stretch of road where access would be created is 30 mph, it has been communicated by the neighbourhood planning group that cars often travel at much faster speeds and therefore the Highways Authority would need to be consulted regarding safety.</p> <p>The landscape in Corringham is generally large flat agricultural fields with long ranging views and rural character. The site slightly juts out into the countryside, does not have any screening and has fairly long ranging views. It is likely that the site would have low landscape sensitivity and medium visual sensitivity, although the Corringham Character Assessment does not directly refer to this site.</p> <p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) Policy LP4 sets out a prioritisation criterion for the selection of development locations and as this site is a greenfield adjacent to the current development footprint it falls into the least favourable category.</p> <p>The site is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the existing built footprint of the village, subject to mitigation of impact upon the views into and out of the village and consultation with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>If partial allocation is chosen, it is recommended that the western side of the site is allocated so as to be in keeping with the current built up form of the village.</p>

## CNP3 Site Details

Topic	Details
Site Reference / Name	CNP3
	
Site Address / Location	Land North of Corringham High Street
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.5
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural land
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	5
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	NP Call for Sites
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	Ref: 136432 - Outline application for 2 dwellings. Withdrawn August 2017.
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural land, agricultural outbuildings

## CNP3 Assessment of Suitability

## Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <p>Ancient Woodland  Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)  Biosphere Reserve  Local Nature Reserve (LNR)  National Nature Reserve (NNR)  National Park  Ramsar Site  Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*  Special Area of Conservation (SAC)  Special Protection Area (SPA)</p> <p>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following non statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <p>Green Infrastructure Corridor  Local Wildlife Site (LWS)  Public Open Space  Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)  Nature Improvement Area  Regionally Important Geological Site  Other</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b>  Flood Zone 1: <i>Low Risk</i>  Flood Zone 2: <i>Medium Risk</i>  Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <i>Medium Risk</i>  Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <i>High Risk</i></p>	<p>Low Risk. Entirely in Flood Zone 1</p>
<p>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Low Risk</i></li> <li>- &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <i>Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium risk. Area at medium-high risk of surface water flooding in the east of the site alongside field drain. Majority of rest of site at low risk of flooding.</p>
<p>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)  <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Entire site is Grade 3 - unknown if 3a or 3b</p>



Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Potential habitat for lapwing, curlew, grey partridge, tree sparrow.</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP3 Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site:</i></p> <p>Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping</p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><i>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes, it is considered possible that access can be created. Site is adjacent to A631 and there is potential for vehicle access to be established directly from the highway. The speed limit on the A631 changes from 30mph to 40mph halfway along the site and access should be discussed with the relevant highways authority.</p>
<p><i>Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p><i>Pedestrian?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Cycle?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - Pavement runs along A631 to northwest corner of site. Potential to extend footway and establish access to site.</p> <p>Yes - Potential for access to be established from A631, but no dedicated cycle route.</p>
<p><i>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?</i></p> <p><i>Significant trees?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Potentially veteran or ancient trees present?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Owned by third parties?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown. None visible</p>
<p><i>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

### CNP3 Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
<p>Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps: <a href="https://www.google.com/maps">https://www.google.com/maps</a></p>	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	>1200m
Bus / Tram Stop	<400m
Train station	>1200m
Primary School	400-1200m
Secondary School	>3900m
Open Space / recreation facilities	<400m
Cycle Route	>800m. No cycle routes nearby

### CNP3 Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</p>	<p>Medium - view north from A631 across site identified in Landscape Character Assessment as providing connection between High Street and East Lane. Also forms part of key view from village hall towards the west.</p>
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</p>	<p>Medium</p>

### CNP3 Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i>  <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i>  <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP3 Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site in the Green Belt?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</i></p>	Central Lincolnshire Plan (2017) LP4: Growth in Villages
<p><i>Is the site:</i> <b>Greenfield</b> <i>A mix of greenfield and previously developed land</i> <i>Previously developed land?</i></p>	Greenfield
<p><i>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</i>  <i>Within the existing built up area (infill)?</i> <i>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area?</i> <i>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built-up area
<p><i>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</i>  <i>Within the existing settlement boundary?</i> <i>Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary?</i> <i>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</i></p>	N/A - - Corringham has no defined settlement boundary in the Local Plan.
<p><i>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### CNP3 Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site available for development?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	No
<p><i>Is there a known time frame for availability?</i>                      Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.</p>	Available now



### CNP3 Viability

Indicators of Viability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p> <p><i>What evidence is available to support this judgement?</i></p>	Potential viability issues - powerlines running across the site

## CNP3 Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
<i>What is the expected development capacity of the site (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)?</i>	5
<i>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</i>	0-5 years
<i>Other key information</i>	N/A
<p><i>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</i></p> <p><i>The site is suitable and available</i></p> <p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</i></p> <p><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</i></p> <p><i>Are there any known viability issues? Yes / No</i></p>	Amber
<i>Summary of justification for rating</i>	<p>The site is greenfield located to the south of the village.</p> <p>Access could be created however, this would be directly off the A631. Although the speed limit on the stretch of road where access would be created is 30 mph, it has been communicated by the neighbourhood planning group that cars often travel at much faster speeds and therefore the Highways Authority would need to be consulted regarding safety.</p> <p>The landscape in Corringham is generally large flat agricultural fields with long ranging views and rural character. The site slightly juts out into the countryside, does not have any screening and has fairly long ranging views. It is likely that the site would have medium landscape sensitivity and medium visual sensitivity, as the Corringham Character Assessment identifies a view north across the site as providing a connection between the A631 and East Lane as well as a key view from the village hall towards the west.</p> <p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) Policy LP4 sets out a prioritisation criterion for the selection of development locations and as this site is a greenfield adjacent to the current development footprint it falls into the least favourable category.</p> <p>The site is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the existing built footprint of the village, subject to mitigation of impact upon the views into and out of the village and consultation with the Highways Authority.</p>

### CNP4 Site Details

Topic	Details
<i>Site Reference / Name</i>	CNP4
	
Site Address / Location	Land to the north of East Lane
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.6
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural land
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	9
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	NP Call for Sites
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	None on site, but land to the south has outline permission for 9 dwellings (Ref: 132781 / approved May 2017) with reserved matters application approved July 2019 (Ref: 139386).
Neighbouring uses	Residential, agricultural land.



## CNP4 Assessment of Suitability

## Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <p><i>Ancient Woodland</i>  <i>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</i>  <i>Biosphere Reserve</i>  <i>Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</i>  <i>National Nature Reserve (NNR)</i>  <i>National Park</i>  <i>Ramsar Site</i>  <i>Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</i>  <i>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</i>  <i>Special Protection Area (SPA)</i></p> <p><i>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following non statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <p><i>Green Infrastructure Corridor</i>  <i>Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</i>  <i>Public Open Space</i>  <i>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</i>  <i>Nature Improvement Area</i>  <i>Regionally Important Geological Site</i>  <i>Other</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</i></p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b>  <i>Flood Zone 1: Low Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk</i></p>	<p>Low Risk. Entirely in Flood Zone 1</p>
<p><i>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</i></p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>- <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low risk. Most of site has low risk of surface water flooding, with a small area of medium risk in the north of the site.</p>
<p><i>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)</i></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Entire site is Grade 3 - unknown if 3a or 3b</p>

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Potential habitat for lapwing, curlew, grey partridge, tree sparrow.</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP4 Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site:</i></p> <p>Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping</p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p><i>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. There is existing access from the lane to the east, although this is a narrow lane and the crossing over Corringham Beck may need to be upgraded. It may be possible for access to be established from East Lane through the development immediately to the south.</p>
<p><i>Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p><i>Pedestrian?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Cycle?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. There is existing access from the lane to the east, although this is a narrow lane and there are no footpaths. It may be possible for access to be established from East Lane through the development immediately to the south.</p> <p>Yes. There is existing access from the lane to the east, although this is a narrow lane. It may be possible for access to be established from East Lane through the development immediately to the south. There is no dedicated cycle route.</p>
<p><i>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?</i></p> <p><i>Significant trees?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Potentially veteran or ancient trees present?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Owned by third parties?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown. None visible</p>
<p><i>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

### CNP4 Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
<p>Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps: <a href="https://www.google.com/maps">https://www.google.com/maps</a></p>	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	>1200m
Bus / Tram Stop	400-800m
Train station	>1200m
Primary School	<400m
Secondary School	>3900m
Open Space / recreation facilities	>800m
Cycle Route	>800m. No cycle routes nearby

### CNP4 Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</p>	<p>Low</p>

### CNP4 Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP4 Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Central Lincolnshire Plan (2017) LP4: Growth in Villages
<p>Is the site: <b>Greenfield</b> A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land?</p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?  Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?</p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built-up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?  Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p>	N/A - - Corringham has no defined settlement boundary in the Local Plan.
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

#### CNP4 Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site available for development?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	No
<p><i>Is there a known time frame for availability?</i>                      Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.</p>	Available now

#### CNP4 Viability


Indicators of Viability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p> <p><i>What evidence is available to support this judgement?</i></p>	Potential viability issues - powerlines running across the site

## CNP4 Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
<i>What is the expected development capacity of the site (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)?</i>	9
<i>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</i>	0-5 years
<i>Other key information</i>	N/A
<p><i>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</i></p> <p><i>The site is suitable and available</i></p> <p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</i></p> <p><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</i></p>	Green
<i>Summary of justification for rating</i>	<p>This is a greenfield site located towards the north of the village and it is adjacent to a site that has recently started construction.</p> <p>Access to the site could be provided from East Lane through the new development site adjacent which the proposal plans have incorporated into the design. In addition, the site has existing access to the lane to the east, although this is narrow and potentially unsuitable for a significant increase in vehicle movements.</p> <p>The landscape in Corringham is generally large flat agricultural fields with long ranging views and rural character. There are fairly long ranging views out to the east of the site however there is good screening of hedgerows along this boundary of the site. It is likely that the site would have low landscape visual sensitivity, although the Corringham Character Assessment does not directly refer to this site.</p> <p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) Policy LP4 sets out a prioritisation criterion for the selection of development locations and as this site is a greenfield adjacent to the current development footprint it falls into the least favourable category.</p> <p>This site is suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>



### CNP5 Site Details

Topic	Details
<i>Site Reference / Name</i>	CNP5
	
Site Address / Location	Land East of Poplar Lane
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.2
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Residential, former butcher's shop
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	2 additional (existing dwelling to be retained)
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	NP Call for Sites
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	No recent or relevant planning history
Neighbouring uses	Residential

## CNP5 Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <p><i>Ancient Woodland</i>  <i>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</i>  <i>Biosphere Reserve</i>  <i>Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</i>  <i>National Nature Reserve (NNR)</i>  <i>National Park</i>  <i>Ramsar Site</i>  <i>Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</i>  <i>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</i>  <i>Special Protection Area (SPA)</i></p> <p><i>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following non statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <p><i>Green Infrastructure Corridor</i>  <i>Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</i>  <i>Public Open Space</i>  <i>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</i>  <i>Nature Improvement Area</i>  <i>Regionally Important Geological Site</i>  <i>Other</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</i></p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b>  <i>Flood Zone 1: Low Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk</i></p>	<p>Low Risk. Entirely in Flood Zone 1</p>
<p><i>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</i></p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>- <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Low risk. Small area at western edge of site is at low risk, remainder of site is very low risk.</p>
<p><i>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)</i></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Entire site is Grade 3 - unknown if 3a or 3b</p>

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Potential habitat for lapwing, curlew, grey partridge, tree sparrow.</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP5 Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site:</i></p> <p>Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping</p>	Flat or relatively flat
<p><i>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Yes. Existing access from Poplar Lane
<p><i>Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p><i>Pedestrian?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Cycle?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Site can be accessed from existing road network.</p> <p>Yes. Site can be accessed from existing road network. No dedicated cycle route.</p>
<p><i>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?</i></p> <p><i>Significant trees?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Potentially veteran or ancient trees present?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Owned by third parties?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Potential
<p><i>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Yes. Power/telegraph lines running along eastern boundary of site.
<p><i>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### CNP5 Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
<p>Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps: <a href="https://www.google.com/maps">https://www.google.com/maps</a></p>	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	>1200m
Bus / Tram Stop	<400m
Train station	>1200m
Primary School	400-1200m
Secondary School	>3900m
Open Space / recreation facilities	<400m
Cycle Route	>800m. No cycle routes nearby

## CNP5 Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</i></p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</i></p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</i></p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</i></p> <p><i>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</i></p>	<p>Low - Opposite Important Open Space designated through Policy LP23 of adopted Local Plan.</p>

## CNP5 Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP5 Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Central Lincolnshire Plan (2017) LP4: Growth in Villages
<p>Is the site: <b>Greenfield</b> A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land?</p>	Previously developed land
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?  Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?</p>	Within the existing built-up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?  Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p>	N/A - - Corringham has no defined settlement boundary in the Local Plan.
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### CNP5 Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site available for development?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	No
<p><i>Is there a known time frame for availability?</i>                      Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.</p>	Available now

### CNP5 Viability



Indicators of Viability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p> <p><i>What evidence is available to support this judgement?</i></p>	Potential viability issues - powerlines running across the site



## CNP5 Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
<i>What is the expected development capacity of the site (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)?</i>	2 (net)
<i>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</i>	0-5 years
<i>Other key information</i>	N/A
<p><i>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</i></p> <p><i>The site is suitable and available</i></p> <p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</i></p> <p><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</i></p>	Green
<i>Summary of justification for rating</i>	<p>This site is a mixture of previously developed land and greenfield located in the centre of the village.</p> <p>There is current access serving the existing dwelling. However the access road is very narrow and there are local concerns, communicated by the neighbourhood planning group, over increasing traffic on this road. The scale of development proposed however should not drastically impact this.</p> <p>The landscape in Corringham is generally large flat agricultural fields with long ranging views and rural character. Given the site is surrounded by buildings it is likely that the site will have low landscape and visual sensitivity.</p> <p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) Policy LP4 sets out a prioritisation criterion for the selection of development locations and as this site is partially previously developed and within the current development footprint it falls into the most favourable category.</p> <p>This site is suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

### CNP6 Site Details

Topic	Details
<i>Site Reference / Name</i>	CNP6
 	
Site Address / Location	The Old Hall, East Lane
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.3
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Residential garden
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	3
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	NP Call for Sites
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	No recent or relevant planning history
Neighbouring uses	Residential gardens, agricultural land

## CNP6 Assessment of Suitability

## Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <p><i>Ancient Woodland</i>  <i>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</i>  <i>Biosphere Reserve</i>  <i>Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</i>  <i>National Nature Reserve (NNR)</i>  <i>National Park</i>  <i>Ramsar Site</i>  <i>Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</i>  <i>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</i>  <i>Special Protection Area (SPA)</i></p> <p><i>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> the following non statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <p><i>Green Infrastructure Corridor</i>  <i>Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</i>  <i>Public Open Space</i>  <i>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</i>  <i>Nature Improvement Area</i>  <i>Regionally Important Geological Site</i>  <i>Other</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><i>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</i></p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b>  <i>Flood Zone 1: Low Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk</i></p>	<p>Low Risk. Entirely in Flood Zone 1</p>
<p><i>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</i></p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>- <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	<p>Medium risk. Entire site is at low risk of flooding, with area of medium risk (approx.</p>
<p><i>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)</i></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Unknown. Entire site is Grade 3 - unknown if 3a or 3b</p>

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. BAP Priority habitat (Deciduous Woodland). Potential habitat for lapwing, curlew, grey partridge, tree sparrow.</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to</b> an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP6 Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site:</i></p> <p>Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping</p>	Flat or relatively flat
<p><i>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Yes. Existing access from the lane to the east.
<p><i>Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</i></p> <p><i>Pedestrian?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Cycle?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Site can be accessed from existing road network but no footway leading to site.</p> <p>Yes. Site can be accessed from existing road network. No dedicated cycle route.</p>
<p><i>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?</i></p> <p><i>Significant trees?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Potentially veteran or ancient trees present?</i> Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p><i>Owned by third parties?</i> Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Unknown</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p><i>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Unknown. None visible
<p><i>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</i></p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### CNP6 Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
<p>Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps: <a href="https://www.google.com/maps">https://www.google.com/maps</a></p>	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	>1200m
Bus / Tram Stop	400-800m
Train station	>1200m
Primary School	400-1200m
Secondary School	>3900m
Open Space / recreation facilities	>800m
Cycle Route	>800m. No cycle routes nearby

## CNP6 Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</p>	<p>Low - Identified in Landscape Character Assessment as providing wooded setting to Old Hall.</p>
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</p>	<p>Low</p>

## CNP6 Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible. Grade II listed Old Hall immediately adjacent to west. Site forms part of gardens of the house.</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP6 Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Central Lincolnshire Plan (2017) LP4: Growth in Villages
<p>Is the site: <b>Greenfield</b> A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land?</p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area? Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?</p>	Outside and not connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)? Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p>	N/A - - Corringham has no defined settlement boundary in the Local Plan.
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No



Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### CNP6 Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site available for development?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	No
<p><i>Is there a known time frame for availability?</i>                      Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.</p>	Available now



### CNP6 Viability

Indicators of Viability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p> <p><i>What evidence is available to support this judgement?</i></p>	Unknown

## CNP6 Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
<i>What is the expected development capacity of the site (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)?</i>	N/A
<i>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</i>	0-5 years
<i>Other key information</i>	N/A
<p><i>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</i></p> <p><i>The site is suitable and available</i></p> <p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</i></p> <p><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</i></p>	Red
<i>Summary of justification for rating</i>	<p>This is a greenfield site located to the north of the village.</p> <p>There is access serving the building set further back from the road. However the access road is narrow and would potentially need upgrading.</p> <p>The site is within the grounds of the Grade II Listed Old Hall therefore there is potential to harm this heritage asset. There are a number of large, old trees on the site, a large drainage ditch alongside the southern boundary of the site and the wooded area supports BAP priority habitats.</p> <p>The landscape in Corringham is generally large flat agricultural fields with long ranging views and rural character. The site is well screened on all sides and the Corringham Character Assessment described it as providing wooded setting to The Old Hall. It is likely that the site would have low landscape and visual sensitivity.</p> <p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) Policy LP4 sets out a prioritisation criterion for the selection of development locations and as this site is a greenfield away from the existing settlement (although adjacent to existing isolated development) it falls into the least favourable category.</p> <p>The site is not suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan due to considerable constraints including, the impact on heritage assets, the priority habitat status and the disconnection from the village.</p>

### CNP7 Site Details

Topic	Details
Site Reference / Name	CNP7
	
Site Address / Location	Corner Farm
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.2
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Farm and outbuildings
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	7
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	NP Call for Sites
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	No recent or relevant planning history
Neighbouring uses	Residential, agricultural land.

## CNP7 Assessment of Suitability

## Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent</b> to the following statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</i></p> <p><i>Ancient Woodland</i>  <i>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</i>  <i>Biosphere Reserve</i>  <i>Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</i>  <i>National Nature Reserve (NNR)</i>  <i>National Park</i>  <i>Ramsar Site</i>  <i>Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*</i>  <i>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</i>  <i>Special Protection Area (SPA)</i></p> <p><i>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	No
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent</b> to the following non statutory environmental designations:  <i>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</i></p> <p><i>Green Infrastructure Corridor</i>  <i>Local Wildlife Site (LWS)</i>  <i>Public Open Space</i>  <i>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</i>  <i>Nature Improvement Area</i>  <i>Regionally Important Geological Site</i>  <i>Other</i></p>	No
<p><i>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</i></p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b>  <i>Flood Zone 1: Low Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk</i></p>	Low Risk. Entirely in Flood Zone 1
<p><i>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</i></p> <p><b>See guidance notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk</i></li> <li>- <i>&gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</i></li> </ul>	Low risk
<p><i>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)</i></p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Unknown. Entire site is Grade 3 - unknown if 3a or 3b

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK BAP Priority Habitat;</li> <li>• a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);</li> <li>• wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Potential habitat for lapwing, curlew, grey partridge, tree sparrow.</p>
<p>Site is <b>predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an</b> Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

## CNP7 Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site:</p> <p>Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping</p>	Flat or relatively flat
<p>Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Yes. Existing access from the A631 and potential for second access to be established from Middle Street, subject to addressing the change in level between the site and the roadway.
<p>Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?</p> <p>Pedestrian? Yes / No / Unknown</p> <p>Cycle? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes. Site can be accessed from existing road network.</p> <p>Yes. Site can be accessed from existing road network. No dedicated cycle route.</p>
<p>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No
<p>Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?</p> <p>Significant trees? Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p>Potentially veteran or ancient trees present? Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p>Owned by third parties? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Unknown</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Potential
<p>Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	Unknown. None visible
<p>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

### CNP7 Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
<p>Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps: <a href="https://www.google.com/maps">https://www.google.com/maps</a></p>	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	>1200m
Bus / Tram Stop	<400m
Train station	>1200m
Primary School	400-1200m
Secondary School	>3900m
Open Space / recreation facilities	<400m
Cycle Route	>800m. No cycle routes nearby

### CNP7 Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Is the site <i>low, medium or high</i> sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p><i>Low sensitivity:</i> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>Medium sensitivity:</i> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><i>High sensitivity:</i> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</p>	<p>Medium</p>

### CNP7 Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</i></p> <p><i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</i></p> <p><i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>No</p>



CNP7 Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>Central Lincolnshire Plan (2017) LP4: Growth in Villages</p>
<p>Is the site:  Greenfield A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land?</p>	<p>Previously developed land</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?  Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?</p>	<p>Within the existing built-up area</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?  Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p>	<p>N/A - - Corringham has no defined settlement boundary in the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown</p>	No

**CNP7 Assessment of Availability**

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site available for development?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p>	No
<p><i>Is there a known time frame for availability?</i>                      Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.</p>	Available now

**CNP7 Viability**

Indicators of Viability	Assessment
<p><i>Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?</i>                      Yes / No / Unknown.</p> <p><i>What evidence is available to support this judgement?</i></p>	Unknown

## CNP7 Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
<i>What is the expected development capacity of the site (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)?</i>	7
<i>What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)</i>	0-5 years
<i>Other key information</i>	N/A
<p><i>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</i></p> <p><i>The site is suitable and available</i></p> <p><i>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</i></p> <p><i>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</i></p>	Green
<i>Summary of justification for rating</i>	<p>The site is a mixture of previously developed and greenfield land located in the southern end of the village.</p> <p>There are two potential access points to the site. The first access point could be created off Middle Street to the west however, mitigation would be required for the large Beech tree which stands at this end of the site. The other option is to create access directly off the A631. Although the speed limit on the stretch of road where access would be created is 30 mph, it has been communicated by the neighbourhood planning group that cars often travel at much faster speeds, therefore the Highways Authority would need to be consulted regarding safety. Access to this site and CNP3 could be designed collectively should both sites come forward for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The landscape in Corringham is generally large flat agricultural fields with long ranging views and rural character. There are fairly long ranging views out to the east of the site and although the Corringham Character Assessment does not specifically mention this site its is likely that it will have low landscape sensitivity and medium visual sensitivity.</p> <p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) Policy LP4 sets out a prioritisation criterion for the selection of development locations and as this site is partially greenfield within the current development footprint, and previously developed where the site is adjacent to the current development footprint it falls into the most favourable category.</p> <p>The site is suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

