**SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY**

**College Farm, Shortstown**

**August 2020**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

This review has been completed by Barton Willmore to appraise the site in relation to the key selection criteria and objectives set out by Bedford Borough Council, as part of the Call for Sites process. Where appropriate, references have been made to technical reports which accompany the Call for Sites representation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ++ | Major positive effect |
| + | Positive effect |
| 0 | Neutral effect |
| ? | Uncertain effect or insufficient information |
| x | Negative effect |
| xx | Major negative effect |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment questions – is the site:** | **Assessment criteria** | |
| **Air quality** – 1. Improve air quality. | | |
| 1a. Within or adjoining the urban area, a defined settlement policy area or the built form of a small settlement? | + | The site is adjoining the urban area. |
| 1b. Accessible on foot to a food store?  *The accessibility by foot to the nearest food store is calculated for each site using TRACC computer software.* | ++ | **Guidance: A site accessibility score of 8 is recorded where 8 is 0 – 10 minutes’ walk.**  The site is within 10 minutes walk of McColls, Shortstown |
| 1c. Accessible on foot to a primary school? | ++ | **Guidance: A site accessibility score of 8 is recorded where 8 is 0 – 10 minutes’ walk.**  The site is within 10 minute walk of both Shortstown Primary School and a proposed new primary school located on-site. Access to Shortstown Primary School is facilitated by existing footpaths and the proposed Site be accessible to pedestrians. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment questions – is the site:** | **Assessment criteria** | |
| *The accessibility by foot to the nearest primary school is calculated for each site using TRACC computer software.* | + | **Guidance: A site accessibility score of 6 is recorded where 6 is 11 – 20 minutes’ walk.**  Both Shortstown Primary School and the proposed new primary school will be within a walkable catchment of 10 minutes.  **See Figure 4-9 - Access to Local Facilities, p.20 of accompanying College Farm ‘Transport Technical Note’ by WSP, June 2020.** |
| 1d. Accessible on foot or by bus to a major employer?  *The accessibility by foot to the nearest major employer is calculated for each site using TRACC computer software.* | + | **Guidance: The site is within 10 minutes’ walk of a bus stop with a regular bus service (at least hourly) which enables travel 8am-6pm Monday to Friday to a major employer or it is possible to walk to a major employer within 10 minutes.**  Bus routes 9A/9B operates along A600, directly passing the Site with services every 30 minutes in each direction between Bedford and Shefford/Hitchin. The nearest bus stop served by service 9A/9B is ‘Cardington Hangers’, which is located on the Site frontage approximately 150m south of Greycote roundabout in both directions. Journey time to Bedford Bus Station from the ‘Cardington Hangers’ bus stop is around 22 minutes.  Further connections are available within Shortstown with a high frequency circular route 9 operating every 15minutes Monday to Saturday from the ‘De Haviland Avenue’ bus stops 260m north of the Site’s frontage on A600. |
| 1e. Outside, adjoining or within the air quality management area? | + | The site is not within or adjoining the air quality management area. |
| **Biodiversity and green infrastructure** – 2. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and habitats. | | |
| 2a. Within or adjoining a site of nature conservation importance / within the impact risk zone of an SSSI / Natura 2000 site? | + | The site is not within or adjoining a site of nature conservation  importance (eg county wildlife site, local nature reserve), or within the impact risk zone of an SSSI / Natura 2000 site.  The Site is not located within 2km of any statutory designated sites or ancient woodland. |
| **Assessment questions – is the site:** | **Assessment criteria** | |
| 2b. In an area where protected species are known or likely to exist? | 0 | A Phase 1 Habitat Survey has been completed and shows potential habitat for amphibians, badgers, bats, birds, otters, reptiles, water voles, dormice and hedgehogs. Ecological impacts can be successfully managed through a number of measures such as the creation of wildlife corridors, enhancement of hedgerows and field boundaries and provision of green and brown roofs.  **See accompanying Preliminary Ecology Appraisal Report by Waterman, June 2020**  In support of any future planning applications for future developments a full Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) would be required. |
| 2c. Potentially able to achieve a net gain in biodiversity? | + | Development of the site will achieve a net gain in biodiversity |
| 2d. Able to link into the green infrastructure opportunity network? | + | The site is within or adjoining the green infrastructure opportunity network and able to enhance the network.  Green infrastructure connections can be successfully managed through a number of measures such as the creation of wildlife corridors and enhancement of hedgerows and field boundaries |
| **Climate change and energy** – 3. Reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and improve energy efficiency. | | |
| 3a. Proposing a renewable energy scheme or extra energy efficiency standards? | + | **Guidance: Development of the site includes a renewable energy generation scheme or efficiency standards that go beyond normal requirements.**  The scheme offers opportunity for renewable energy through roof-mounted solar panels and construction of high standards of insulation and energy efficiency to buildings to reduce carbon emissions |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment questions – is the site:** | **Assessment criteria** | |
| 3b. Within or adjoining the urban area, a  defined settlement policy area or the built form of a small settlement? | Assessment as for 1a. | |
| 3c. Accessible on foot to a food store? | Assessment as for 1b. | |
| 3d. Accessible on foot to a primary school? | Assessment as for 1c. | |
| 3e. Accessible on foot or by bus to a major employer? | Assessment as for 1d. | |
| **Cultural heritage and historic environment** – 4. Conserve, sustain and enhance the historic environment. | | |
| 4a. Likely to impact on designated or non- designated heritage assets or their settings? | 0 | Proposal is unlikely to have a direct impact on any heritage assets.  **See accompanying Heritage Appraisal by Barton Willmore, July 2020**. |
| **Employment, business, retail and tourism** – 5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation  across a range of sectors. | | |
| 5a. Likely to increase future economic and employment opportunities? | + | **Guidance: Proposal includes permanent economic and employment opportunities.**  The submitted Vision Document and Masterplan for the Site includes 0.82ha of land set aside for a Local Centre with employment, retail and community opportunities. |
| **Employment, business, retail and tourism** – 6. Promote vital and viable town centres. | | |
| 6a. Proposing a main town centre use in, on the edge or outside of a town centre? | 0 | The proposed Masterplan includes a Local Centre aimed at serving the needs of the site and local area rather than a wider town centre use. Therefore, no detrimental impact on existing town centre uses |
| **Health and wellbeing** – 7. Encourage and support physical activity. | | |
| 7a. Within 400m of an existing open space or proposing open space within it? | + | **Guidance: The proposal includes or is within 400m walking distance of a publicly accessible open space that includes an equipped children’s play area**  **of at least 200 sqm.**  The proposal includes on-site public open space in accordance with Bedford Borough Council policy. **Please refer to Vision Document** |
| 7b. Within 800m of a sports facility or proposing a sports facility within it? | + | **Guidance: The proposal includes or is within 800m of a publicly accessible sports facility.**  The proposal includes on-site sports space in accordance with Bedford Borough Council policy. **Please refer to Vision Document** |
| **Landscape and townscape** – 8. Protect and enhance landscape and townscape character and the sense of place in settlements. | | |
| 8a. Likely to have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding landscape? | 0 | The proposal is likely to have a neutral effect on the landscape. Long ranging views of the Site from the north, east and west are obscured due to intervening vegetation, topographic variation and built form within Shortstown. Views of the Site from further south within the broadly level clay vale are largely filtered by intervening vegetation and lack of topographic variation. There are relatively open views across the landscape from the John Bunyan Trail on rising land to the south along the Greensand Ridge, which demonstrates the settlement pattern of Shortstown occupying a localised ridge of elevated land with the Site largely visible from this location, albeit at a distance of 3km. However, it is viewed in the context of built form within Shortstown and Bedford to the north, which demonstrate a strong pattern of settlement within the vale concentrated near to major transport corridors e.g. A421 and the River Great Ouse.  For further assessment, **please see Baseline Landscape and Visual Appraisal by Barton Willmore, June 2020.** |
| 8b. Within the existing settlement form? | + | **Guidance: The site adjoins a defined settlement policy area or the built form of a small settlement.**  The Site adjoins the defined settlement policy area of Shortstown and its built form |
| **Land, soil and water** – 9. Maximise development on previously developed land and avoid the loss of high quality agricultural land. | | |
| 9a. On previously developed land? | x | The site is not previously developed land as defined in the NPPF. |
| 9b. On best and most versatile agricultural land ie grades, 1, 2 or 3a? | ? | The classification of the site is not known or it is not clear whether is classified as grade 3a or 3b. |
| **Land, soil and water** – 10. Protect the quantity and quality of water resources. | | |
| 10a. Within a groundwater source protection zone? | + | The site is not located in a source protection zone. |
| **Land, soil and water** – 11. Minimise flood risk. | | |
| 11a. At risk of flooding? | 0 | **Guidance: Part of a site is within flood zone 2 or 3 but the area proposed for development is in flood zone 1.**  The majority of the Site is located within an area of low flood risk. The EA Flood Map shows that parts of the Site are located in Flood Zones 2 and 3 resulting from fluvial flooding; however, site-specific hydraulic model shows a much reduced extent of fluvial flooding. Removal of on-site culverts together with improvements to the floodplain through ground raising to the north of the Cople Brook and ground lowering to the south of the Brook are proposed to be carried out to compensate for any loss of floodplain storage, and to mitigate any increase in flood risk downstream as a result of the removal of culverts.  Please see accompanying **Preliminary Drainage Strategy, p.68 of Flood Risk and Drainage Briefing Note, Waterman, June 2020.** |
| **Population, housing and community** – 12. Promote good quality housing, ensuring an appropriate mix of house types and sizes. | | |
| 12a. Likely to provide a mix of housing, including affordable housing? | + | **Guidance: The site is likely to provide a mix of housing and include affordable housing.**  The Site is of sufficient size to provide a range of housing tenures and sizes, including policy compliant levels of affordable housing. |
| 12b. Able to address a particular housing need? | + | The proposal will meet identified housing need including self-contained older persons housing and/or supported living accommodation in accordance with Policy 59S of the Local Plan. It will provide specialist housing including the needs of those with a learning disability or mental health need in accordance with the Council’s most up to date statement of need. |
| **Population, housing and community** – 13. Provide for residents’ needs and improve access to community services and facilities. | | |
| 13a. Within 800m of a facility where cultural | + | **Guidance: The site is within 800m of a facility where cultural or social activities can be accessed.**  **See Figure 4-9 - Access to Local Facilities, p.20 of accompanying College Farm ‘Transport Technical Note’ by WSP, June 2020.** |
| or social activities can be accessed? |
| **Population, housing and community** – 14. Promote social cohesion, the prevention of crime and reduce the fear of crime. | | |
| 14a. Likely to encourage social cohesion? | + | **Guidance: The proposal is for or includes a community use or is likely to promote community collaboration and social interaction**  Yes, the proposal includes a central area for a Local Centre along with health facility and primary school. |
| 14b. Likely to help make the area safer? | + | The development is likely to increase public surveillance or increase activity. |
| **Transport** – 15. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport. | | |
| 15a. Within or adjoining the urban area, a defined settlement policy area or the built  form of a small settlement? | Assessment as for 1a. | |
| 15b. Accessible on foot to a food store? | Assessment as for 1b. | |
| 15c. Accessible on foot to a primary school? | Assessment as for 1c. | |
| 15d. Accessible on foot or by bus to a major employer? | Assessment as for 1d. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment questions – is the site:** | **Assessment criteria** | |
| 15e. Able to connect with the highway without constraint? | + | The proposed development would be served by a new junction on A600, located south of the access that currently serves the listed airship Sheds at Cardington and south of the existing northern field access. The proposed access would most likely take the form of an ‘at grade’ roundabout with a controlled combined crossing to cater for pedestrians and cyclists.  An additional emergency access, combined as ‘green’ corridor to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists, would also be located along the A600 at a point south of the existing southern field access. The ‘green’ corridor would connect the development areas with the proposed community public open space and formal playing fields.  **See pp.21-22 of accompanying College Farm ‘Transport Technical Note’ by WSP, June 2020.** |
| 15f. Able to be developed without causing highway or junction capacity issues? | 0 | **Guidance: Potential highway or junction capacity problem requiring mitigation.**  Based on the 2030 analysis contained within the Systra TA in support of the BBC Local Plan, there would be sufficient capacity in the local road network to accommodate the potential trip demand generated by the proposed development of the Site. Should there be a need to implement any highway improvements off Site to the junction of A600/A421 to accommodate future demand then further provision could be made to either enhance roundabout entry flares or introduce peak hour traffic signals.  A comprehensive TA would be completed in support of any subsequent planning application in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. This would comprise modelling of both the local and strategic highway networks at specific junctions to identify any appropriate mitigation in consultation with BBC and Highways England |