Template for site assessment

Sustainability criteria	Site ref: 1 Brewhurst Field 1	Site ref: 2 Brewhurst Field 2	Site ref: 3 Land off Brewhurst Lane	Site ref: 4 The Wharf	Site ref: 5 Land at Hoadfoldswood Farm	Site ref: 6 Lowwood House	Site ref: 7 Hawthorn Cottage	Site ref: 8 Land at Little Farm	Site ref: 9 Pawlies Farm	Site ref: 10a Land north east of Mellow	Site ref: 10b Land north east of Mellow - extended	Site ref: 11 Land south of Lowwood Road - north	Site ref: 12 Land south of Lowwood Road - south	Site ref: 13 Plot opposite Lowwood Hall
HELAA ref				HLX0007A	HLX0016	HLX0004	HLX0003	HLX0013a	HLX0013a	HLX0006	HLX0006	HLX0006		
Site Location														
Size of site (hectares)				1.60	57.33	1.83	0.95	1.48	3.80ha. The landowner has offered an area of adjoining land which could be used in conjunction with the development of the site to provide additional public open space, structural landscape buffer planting and biodiversity net gain.	0.20	0.40	2.84	3.38	
No of dwellings proposed by promoter	20-25	1 to 20	100	21 - This would be on circa 0.8ha (including an attenuation pond and open space within the development). The balance of 0.8ha is proposed as a wildflower meadow. This is excluded from the developable area as much of it is within a flood zone. The net site density of the 21 dwellings on 0.8ha is equivalent to just over 26dph.	220 - This would be on 15.75ha representing a density of 13dph. This figure reflects the emerging Local Plan requirement for Lowood although this has since reduced to a minimum of 188 dwellings.	35-40	19	35	40 - this would be on a potential developable area of 2ha, representing a density of 20dph.	5	8	15 - This would be on 1.57ha, representing a density of 9.6dph.	51 - This would be on 2.65ha, representing a density of 19.2dph.	1
Theoretical potential nos of dwellings: 25-35 dwellings per hectare (dph)				25dph would deliver 40 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 56 dwellings. However, some of the site would not be suitable for housing as it is in the flood zone. On 0.8ha of the site (the area which the promoter is proposing for development), 25dph would deliver 20 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 28 dwellings.	25dph would deliver 1,433 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 2,007 dwellings. However, if only 15.75ha is suitable for development then 25dph would deliver 394 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 551 dwellings.	25dph would deliver 46 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 64 dwellings. It is likely that the site constraints and context mean a lower figure would be achievable.	25dph would deliver 24 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 33 dwellings.	25dph would deliver 37 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 52 dwellings. The presence of a TPO would not impact on the yield because the TPO can be designed into the scheme although in doing so, this would have to represent all the open space provided as part of any development.	35dph would deliver 95 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 123 dwellings. However, if only 2ha is suitable for development then 25dph would deliver 50 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 70 dwellings.	25dph would deliver 5 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 7 dwellings.	25dph would deliver 10 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 14 dwellings.	25dph would deliver 71 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 99 dwellings. However, if only 1.57ha is suitable for development then 25dph would deliver 39 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 55 dwellings.	25dph would deliver 85 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 118 dwellings. However, if only 2.65ha is suitable for development then 25dph would deliver 66 dwellings and 35dph would deliver 93 dwellings.	
Is the site available, i.e.. is the landowner willing to release the site?				Yes- call for sites promoter	Yes- call for sites promotor	Yes- call for sites promoter	Yes- Housing Developer	Yes- Call for sites promoter	Yes- Call for sites promoter	Yes- Call for sites promoter	Yes- Call for sites promoter	Yes- Call for sites promoter	Yes- Call for sites promoter	
Deliverability - are there any legal or ownership problems such as: unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners?				No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Context														
Development uses proposed	Residential and play space	Residential, café and play space	Residential	Residential, wildflower meadow	Residential, community uses such as play spaces, public open space, land for biodiversity net gain and an autism supported living centre is also being considered to provide accommodation for adults with autism.	Residential, open space	Residential	Residential, local area of play (LAP)	Residential	Residential	Residential	Residential	Residential	Residential
Current and previous uses				Greenfield - paddock / equestrian land	Greenfield- The site is in agricultural use	Residential - existing Lowwood House with gardens and a former plant nursery. The site is no longer heavily wooded since a storm in 2021 resulted in damage to trees on the site which were later removed.	The site currently consists of a bungalow with garden and garaging to the front, with a driveway leading to horse paddocks, storage building and stabling to the rear	Agricultural land with an area of hardstanding in the north	Greenfield- The site is in agricultural use	Greenfield/Open space- pasture land	Greenfield/Open space- pasture land	Open pasture	Open pasture	
Relevant recent planning history				15/02498/FUL- Change of use of land from paddock or equestrian use to residential use. Application withdrawn.	No	No	21/00347/FUL- Demolition of an existing bungalow and redevelopment to provide 18 residential dwellings. 20/01541/PRESMP- Development of 10 no. dwellings with associated landscaping and parking. 24/01316/FUL- Demolition of 1 no. existing bungalow, garage and outbuilding and redevelopment of the site to provide 19 no. dwellings, associated access and landscaping.	22/01726/FUL- Erection of 32 no. residential dwellings with associated access, infrastructure, drainage and landscape works. Withdrawn in September 2023	22/01726/FUL- Erection of 32 no. residential dwellings with associated access, infrastructure, drainage and landscape works. Withdrawn in September 2024. This was for an adjacent site and not the Pawlies Farm site itself.	LX/21/02849/FUL- 5 no. residential dwellings, vehicular and pedestrian access and hard and soft landscaping. Withdrawn October 2023	LX/21/02849/FUL- 5 no. residential dwellings, vehicular and pedestrian access and hard and soft landscaping. Withdrawn October 2024	No	No	
Surrounding land uses				The land is surrounded by large, detached housing to the east, wrapping round to the north east of the site. These houses have large open gaps between them and no screening at the rear where they abut the site boundary. A canal and pathway is present to the south of the site. Further, agricultural fields exist to the west on the far side of a mature tree belt.	The land is surrounded by agricultural land in the north wrapping round to the west. In the south of the site large dense mature trees and woodland provide screening to the canal. To the east there is there are a number of houses and trees.	Residential use to the east, open space to the south (although this land has planning permission for residential development) and agricultural land to the north and west. All four sides of the site are contained to a certain extent by inconsistent tree cover.	The site is surrounded on three sides (north, east and south) by residential development. All four corners of the site is strongly bounded by mature dense trees.	The site is surrounded by housing to the east and south, agricultural land to the north and west. The agricultural land is contained by mature tree belt	All surrounding land uses are open countryside or land. The land is surrounded by agricultural land to the north and west. A farmhouse is present in the north east. To the south there is woodland, a pond and further open space. There is mature tree belt on the boundary in the south and east.	The site is surrounded by residential development to the north east and west. North of the site is a residential development under construction. To the east and south there is mature tree belt on the boundary.	The site is surrounded by residential development to the north east and west. North of the site is a residential development under construction. To the east and south there is mature tree belt on the boundary.	The site is surrounded by woodland to the east, Lowwood Road to the north, woodland and open countryside to the south and a farmhouse and open countryside to the west. The east, south and west contain mature tree belt on their boundary.	To the north the site is surrounded by woodland to the west, a combination of woodland and open countryside to the north. In the west open countryside mostly surrounds the site. However, at the further point west the site meets residential development and High Street. To the south, a canal and pathway is present. All four sides of the site have mature tree belt on their boundary.
Proximity to existing urban area				The site is currently outside and clearly separate from the Lowood settlement boundary. However, the site immediately to the north is adjacent to the settlement boundary and has planning permission for residential development. Once this is constructed, site 4 could form an extension of the settlement boundary, although this would not form a wholly logical extension of the settlement boundary.	The site is currently outside the Lowood settlement boundary, although part of it is adjacent to the boundary on its eastern side. Proposed development (with outline planning permission) and development under construction (3 sites) adjacent to the eastern part of the site will greatly improve the relationship of the site with the settlement boundary.	Adjacent to Lowood settlement boundary	The site is currently outside but adjacent to the Lowood settlement boundary on its southern and eastern sides.	The site is currently outside but adjacent to the Lowood settlement boundary on its eastern side. It is also adjacent to built development to the south which, whilst outside the settlement boundary, itself forms a logical extension to the settlement boundary.	The site is clearly separate from the settlement boundary. The offer of additional adjoining land by the landowner for the use of public open space would mean the site would then be adjacent to the boundary. However, the site would have a limited functional relationship with the settlement due to the proposed location of built development on the site being a significant distance from the settlement boundary.	The site is currently outside but adjacent to the Lowood settlement boundary, albeit only on a small section of its north eastern corner. However, new development under construction immediately to the north - which is well located adjacent to the settlement boundary - would greatly improve the relationship with the settlement boundary.	The site is currently outside but adjacent to the Lowood settlement boundary.	The site is well outside the settlement boundary.	The site is well outside the settlement boundary.	
Is the size of the site and the scale of development proposed large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?				No	Yes if built out in full. If only part of the site is built out in order to deliver the 220-dwelling requirement for Lowood (now 188 dwellings) then the impact would be reduced but there would be some impact from such a comparatively large development in a single location.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Potentially	
Would development of the site significantly increase the likelihood of neighbouring settlements merging into one another?				No	Yes if development were to be delivered on the far western parts of the site then it would significantly decrease the gap between Lowwood and Ifold. However, it is assumed that development will be focused on the eastern part of the site, closest to Lowwood. As such, this would not significantly increase the likelihood of merging.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Site boundary - existing screening where site borders open countryside				Site is well screened from open countryside to the north west and west by mature trees and hedges. However, there are gaps in screening to the south where the site is visible from the canal.	No screening in the north west of the site. However, site is well screened in the south west by mature trees and hedges. The eastern boundary of the site (where built development would be expected to be located) is adjacent to existing development.	Site is inconsistently screened from open countryside to the north, south and west by trees and hedges	Site is well screened from open countryside to the west by mature trees and hedges	Site is well screened from open countryside to the north and west by mature trees and hedges	There is no screening from open countryside in the north and west of the site	The site does not border open countryside and is surrounded by built development	The site does not border open countryside and is surrounded by built development	Site is well screened from the open countryside to the east, south and west by woodland. The northern boundary abuts a road, however open countryside is visible beyond this.	Site is well screened from open countryside to the north, east and west by mature tree belt. To the south it abuts the canal, with mature trees beyond.	
Landscape sensitivity - low/medium/high				Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is medium/low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is medium/high. However, the landscape impact is low because the site is well screened from open countryside.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is medium/low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is medium/high. However, the landscape impact is low because site is well screened in the south west and by adjacent development to the east.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is medium/low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is medium/high. However, the landscape impact is low because the site is well screened from open countryside.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is medium/low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is medium/high. However, the landscape impact is low because the site is well screened from open countryside.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is medium/low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is medium/high. However, the landscape impact is low because the site is well screened from open countryside.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is medium/low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is medium/high. A detrimental landscape impact is likely due to there being no screening of the site from open countryside.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is high. However, the landscape impact is low because the site does not border open countryside and is surrounded by built development.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is high. However, the landscape impact is low because the site does not border open countryside and is surrounded by built development.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is high. Some detrimental landscape impact is likely due to open countryside not being screened on the northern boundary of the site.	Based on findings presented in the Chichester Landscape Capacity Study, the landscape capacity for change is low, meaning the landscape sensitivity is high. However, the landscape impact is low because the site does not border open countryside.	
Housing														
Able to accommodate affordable housing (40% on greenfield sites/30% on PDL sites - 10+ dwellings)				Could deliver a small amount of affordable housing under Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 34 (8 units)	Could deliver a significant amount of affordable housing under Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 34 (circa 88 units if 220 total dwellings delivered or 75 dwellings if 188 total dwellings delivered)	Could deliver some affordable housing under Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 34 (circa 14-16 units)	Could deliver a small amount of affordable housing under Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 34 (6 units)	Could deliver some affordable housing under Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 34 (circa 14 units)	Could deliver some affordable housing under Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 34 (circa 16 units)	Would not provide any on site affordable housing	Would not provide any on site affordable housing	Could deliver a small amount of affordable housing under Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 34 (circa 6 units)	Could deliver some affordable housing under Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 Policy 34 (circa 20 units)	
Able to provide a range of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet local needs				The site could provide a limited range of housing types, sizes and tenures	The site could provide a significant range of housing types and tenures	The site could provide a range of housing types and tenures	The site could provide a very limited range of housing types, sizes and tenures	The site could provide a range of housing types and tenures	The site could provide a range of housing types and tenures	The site could only provide a very limited range of housing types	The site could only provide a very limited range of housing types	The site could provide a limited range of housing types, sizes and tenures	The site could provide a good range of housing types and tenures	
Community Facilities and Access to Services														
Loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities				No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	No loss of community/recreation/cultural facilities	
Opportunity to provide open space/ recreation/ community facilities				There is potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facilities and the site promotor is willing to do so - a wildflower meadow is proposed and this will have public access.	There is potential for the site to deliver significant open space/recreation/community facilities and the site promotor is willing to make some form of provision.	There is relatively limited potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facilities. A small amount of open space is proposed by the promotor.	There is limited potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facilities. A small amount of open space is proposed by the promotor for informal play.	There is potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facilities and the site promotor is willing to do so through public open space and a Local Area for Play (LAP).	There is significant potential for the site to deliver open space/recreation/community facilities although the site promotor has not proposed any such uses. However, the site is poorly located to serve the existing population of Lowood on foot and, to a lesser extent, by bicycle.	The site is not large enough to provide any community/recreation facilities or open space	The site is not large enough to provide any community/recreation facilities or open space	Given the size of the site, there would be potential to deliver some community/recreation facilities/open space. However, the site is not well located to directly serve the existing population of Lowood on foot or by bicycle.	Given the size of the site, there would be potential to deliver some community/recreation facilities/open space. However, the site is not well located to directly serve the existing population of Lowood on foot or by bicycle.	
Proximity and accessibility of facilities - Primary School				661m approx to Primary School (within acceptable walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along the High Street (a main route) and do require crossing of roads more than once.	706m approx to Primary School (within acceptable walking distance). Along the route there is a PROW and footways although these are narrow in places along the High Street (a main route) and do require crossing of roads more than once.	845m approx to the Primary School (within acceptable walking distance). There are footways along the entire route which is narrow in places along High Street and Station Road (two main routes) and do require crossing of roads more than once.	886m approx to the Primary School (within acceptable walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along Guildford Road (a main route) and do require crossing of roads more than once.	1146m approx to Primary School (within maximum walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along the High Street (a main route) and do require crossing of roads more than once.	1308m approx to the Primary School (within maximum walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along the High Street (a main route) and do require crossing of roads more than once.	716m approx to primary school (within acceptable walking distance). There are footways along the entire route and crossing the road is only required once.	716m approx to primary school (within acceptable walking distance). There are footways along the entire route and crossing the road is only required once.	869m approx to the primary school (within acceptable walking distance). However, there are no footpaths or pavements on Lowood Road into the village until the junction with Spy Lane.	702m approx to Primary School (within acceptable walking distance). There is a footway along the entire route. However, on Station Road this is narrow and only on one side of the road with residents parked cars limiting the space.	
Proximity and accessibility of facilities - Shops				608m approx to shop (within acceptable walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along the High Street (a main route) and do require crossing of roads.	631m approx to shop (within acceptable walking distance). Along the route there is a PROW. There are footways along the entire route which are narrow in places along the High Street (a main route).	246m approx to the shop (within desirable walking distance). The route is direct along Nursery Green and doesn't require crossing a main road.	384m approx to the shops (within desirable walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along the High Street (a main road).	664m approx to shops (within acceptable walking distance). This route is direct along Hollyview Close and Thistle Way and doesn't require crossing a main road.	806m approx to the shops (within preferred maximum walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along Guildford Road (a main road).	861m approx to shop (within preferred maximum walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places. The route is direct along the main roads of Station Road and Guildford Road and requires crossing the road more than once.	861m approx to shop (within preferred maximum walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places. The route is direct along the main roads of Station Road and Guildford Road and requires crossing the road more than once.	1,013m approx to the shop (within preferred maximum walking distance) This route also contains no footpaths or pavements on Lowood Road into the village until the junction with Spy Lane.	906m approx to the shop (within preferred maximum walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although the route involves walking along the village's two main roads - Station Road and Guildford Road - which are narrow in parts.	
Proximity and accessibility of facilities - Health centre				446m approx to Medical Practice (within desirable walking distance). There is a footway along the route but these are narrow in places on High Street. There is a shorter route avoiding main roads along a public bridleway.	792m approx to Medical Practice. The route is direct with crossing of the road only required once at a junction between High Street and Station Road. There is a footway along the entire route.	933m to Medical Practice (within acceptable walking distance). The route is along the main roads in the village, Guildford Road and Station Road, which are narrow in places.	870m to the Medical Practice (within acceptable walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along the High Street (a main road).	1233m approx to medical Practice (within maximum walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along Guildford Road (a main route) and do require crossing of roads more than once.	1394m approx to Medical Practice (within maximum walking distance). There are footways along the entire route although these are narrow in places along Guildford Road (a main route) and do require crossing of roads more than once.	260m (with desirable walking distance). The route is direct and involves no main roads or crossing	260m (with acceptable walking distance). The route is direct and involves no main roads or crossing	604m approx to the medical practice (within acceptable walking distance). However, there are no footpaths or pavements on Lowood Road into the village until the junction with Spy Lane.	301m approx to medical Centre (within desirable walking distance). This route involves cutting through a Public Bridleway	
Biodiversity														
Tree Preservation Order (within site/on boundary)				There are two TPOs on the boundary of the site along High Street but these would not be affected by the development proposed.	No	No	There is a TPO on the boundary of the site, on the junction of Hollyview Close and High Street, but this would not be affected by the development.	There is an area TPO (22/00326/TPO) running through the middle of the site, covering around 15% of the total area. This would split the site into two parts which could create a challenge for delivering the scale of development proposed without requiring the area of TPO trees to be used as public open space. There would be potential issues with also delivering a LAP.	No	No	No	No	No	
Ancient woodland				No	Ancient Woodland adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. If development is delivered predominantly in the eastern part of the site then this ancient woodland is unlikely to be affected.	No	No	No	There is ancient woodland adjacent to the south boundary of the site. Development would need to be located away from this part of the site which would serve to push the developed area further from the existing village.	No	No	No but ancient woodland to east of site	No but ancient woodland to east of site	
Biodiversity sites and protected species				Bat movement corridor to the south. Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Bat movement corridor to the south. Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Bat movement corridor on site. Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Bat movement corridor on site. Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Bat movement corridor on site. Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Bat movement corridor on site. Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Bat movement corridor on site. Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	Bat movement corridor on site. Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SACin wider vicinity - potential to impact on bat flight lines.	
Heritage														
Proximity to Listed Buildings				The site - and the areas proposed for built development - are adjacent to listed buildings on High Street. Potential harm is likely to be capable of mitigation	No	No	No	No	There are two listed buildings adjacent to the north east corner of the site on Guildford Road. Potential harm is likely to be capable of mitigation	There are listed buildings on High Street to the south and west of the site. Potential harm is likely to be capable of mitigation	There are listed buildings on High Street to the south and west of the site. Potential harm is likely to be capable of mitigation	There are listed buildings either side of Lowood Road to the west of the site. Mature tree belt on the west boundary mitigates potential harm	The site and area proposed for development are adjacent to a listed building over the canal to the south west. Mature tree belt on this boundary mitigates any potential harm	
Archaeological Areas				No- archaeological areas to the north and north east of the site along High Street	No- there are archaeological areas to the east of the site further south along High Street	No	No	No	No- Archaeological areas to the east along Guildford Road	No- archaeological areas to the west along High Street	No- archaeological areas to the west along High Street	No- Archaeological areas to the north east and west along Lowood Road	No- Archaeological areas to the south west along High Street	
Transport														
Access to highway				Vehicular access would be on to the High Street to the north east. Visibility could possibly be an issue as the access point is narrow and relatively close to a bend in the road. However, this was not raised by the Highway Authority in respect of previous pre-application advice. Similarly, the proposed access point is close to a TPO but evidence from a transport consultant demonstrates that this can be delivered without harm to the tree.	The access would be via the approved junction to the High Street serving the residential development of 24 x dwellings at "land south of Lowood Farm Place" (outline application 20/01617/OUT), which is land under the same ownership. It will be important to engage with West Sussex County Council, as highway authority, to confirm the acceptability of this.	Vehicle access will be from the spur road off Nursery Green. Pre-application advice was sought from West Sussex County Council Highways by the site promoter and no concerns were raised with the proposed access or any other highways elements.	Vehicular access would be achieved via the existing access which would likely need to be modified to accommodate vehicular movements for 19 dwellings. It will be important to engage with West Sussex County Council, as highway authority, to confirm these matters.	Vehicular access would be on to the High Street to the north east. Visibility could possibly be an issue as the access point is narrow and relatively close to a bend in the road. However, this was not raised by the Highway Authority in respect of previous pre-application advice. Similarly, the proposed access point is close to a TPO but evidence from a transport consultant demonstrates that this can be delivered without harm to the tree.	Access would be provided off the B2133 Guildford Road. There is a pedestrian footway along this road which provides access into the village centre. the road at this point is relatively narrow and visibility could be an issue. However, the site also has a frontage onto Guildford Road within control of the landowner which provides sufficient space to develop an access that would likely mitigate the visibility issue. It will be important to engage with West Sussex County Council, as highway authority, to confirm these matters.	Access would be provided through the new development under construction and then on to Willets Way. It is understood that an access point has been reserved.	Access would be provided through the new development under construction and then on to Willets Way. It is understood that an access point has been reserved.	Vehicular access into the site would be from Lowood Road to the north. The alignment of Lowood Road close to the potential site entrance creates potential blind spots. It will be important to engage with West Sussex County Council, as highway authority, to confirm these matters.	A new vehicular access into the southern parcel would be from Farm Close. This would require agreement with developers for pedestrian and vehicular access through any allocated scheme. The promotor has stated that discussions have been held regarding this matter but have not been agreed.	
Site potential to generate significant additional traffic/congestion				The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	The scale of development, coupled with access being through a new housing estate and on to the main road through the village, means it has significant potential to create vehicle congestion problems. These problems would be likely to increase with the scale of development. It will be important to engage with West Sussex County Council Highways Team to assess this in more detail.	The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	The development is of a scale that is unlikely to create significant additional traffic.	
Pedestrian access				Pedestrian access is proposed at two points on the site. The first is to the south of the site along the existing linkages to the footbridge and public footpath. The second is also proposed onto the High Street via a 2-metre wide access the leading from the site onto a proposed footway and pedestrian crossing across High Street. The existing footway is on north/east side of the High Street and, as suggested by the Highway Authority in response to previous pre-application advice, an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing (dropped kerb/tactile paving) has been proposed.	Pedestrian access will be to the east of the site along existing linkages to the public footpath	Pedestrian access will be from the spur road off Nursery Green which is a direct pedestrian route to access the villages facilities.	Pedestrian access would be achieved alongside the modified vehicular access.	Two pedestrian access routes are proposed be provided via the adjacent development to the south	There are three current points of pedestrian access to the site.	Pedestrian access will be provided by Willets Way and land to the north, currently under construction. It is understood that an access point has been reserved. Willets Way already has an existing footway.	Pedestrian access will be provided by Willets Way and land to the north, currently under construction. It is understood that an access point has been reserved. Willets Way already has an existing footway.	Pedestrian access is available via an existing PROW (WS) LOX(3769/1) that runs along the western perimeter of the site. However, this would not provide a direct route into the village. Connectivity with the network of PROWs and bridleways is good. Pedestrian access could be created onto Lowood Road but this has no footways.	Pedestrian access is available via an existing PROW (WS) LOX(3769/1) that runs along the western perimeter of the site. However, this would not provide a direct route into the village. Connectivity with the network of PROWs and bridleways is good. Pedestrian access could be created onto Lowood Road but this has no footways.	
Public rights of way (PROW) present				PROW (LOX/809/9) runs along the southern boundary of the site. Development would impact on this. Poor screening to the south of the site means the development will be visible so development would have a possible detrimental impact on enjoyment of the PROW.	PROW (LOX/816/1) runs alongside the east boundary of the site and provides access onto High Street. Development would not impact on this.	Bridleway LOX/810/7 lies adjacent to the site's western boundary providing access into adjoining countryside. Public Right of Way LOX/799_2/1 abuts the southern boundary and provides direct access into Lowood Village. Inconsistent tree cover along the south and west boundary of the site restricts views of the site to a certain extent so development would not have a fully detrimental impact on enjoyment of the PROW.	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site	PROW (LOX/811_1/1) runs adjacent to the north of the site. Development would not impact on this. Mature trees along the southern boundary of the site restrict views of the site at present so development would not have a detrimental impact on enjoyment of the PROW.	PROW (LOX/799/1) runs adjacent to the site in the north, PROW (LOX/812/2) runs adjacent to the site in the west and PROW (LOX/811/1) runs adjacent to the site in the south. Development would have no impact on these PROWs.	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site	No PROW runs through or adjacent to the site	PROW (LOX/3769/1) runs along the western boundary of the site. Development would not impact on this. Mature trees along the western boundary of the site restrict views of the site at present so development would not have a detrimental impact on enjoyment of the PROW.	PROW (LOX/3769/1) runs along the western boundary of the site. Development would not impact on this. Mature trees along the western boundary of the site restrict views of the site at present so development would not have a detrimental impact on enjoyment of the PROW.	
Flooding														
Within Flood zone 1, 2 or 3 (low risk)				The site is mostly in Flood Zone 1. However, a small part of the site along the south boundary is in flood zone 2 and 3 on the Way and Arun Canal. Based on the proposed layout of development, this would not encroach on any properties.	The site is in flood zone 1.	The site is in flood zone 1.	The site is in flood zone 1	The site is in Flood Zone 1	The site is in Flood Zone 1	The site is in Flood Zone 1	The site is in Flood Zone 1	The site is in Flood Zone 1	The southern and eastern part of the site lie in Flood zone 2 and 3. The vast majority of the site's northern and western parts (over 75%) are in Flood Zone 1. The most appropriate area for development in the western half of the site is in Flood Zone 1.	A small amount of the site boundary in the north, east and south is in flood zone 2 and 3. However, the vast majority of the site, over 90%, is in Flood Zone 1.	
Surface water flooding issues				There is some risk of surface water flooding in the south of the site that would need to be mitigated. +E41	There is some risk of surface water flooding in isolated parts of the site which would need to be mitigated	The site is not likely to be subject to the surface water flooding	The site is not likely to be subject to the surface water flooding	There is some risk of surface water flooding in the east which would need to be mitigated	There is some risk of surface water flooding in the east of the site which would need to be mitigated or avoided through design and layout	The site is not likely to be subject to surface water flooding	The site is not likely to be subject to surface water flooding	The east part of the site is subject to surface water flooding which would need to be mitigated	Over 60% of the site in the north, east and south is subject to a high chance of surface water flooding	
Other sources of flood risk				Some groundwater flood risk	Some groundwater flood risk	Some groundwater flood risk	Some groundwater flood risk	No	No	No	No	No	Some groundwater flood risk	
Environmental Quality														
Agricultural land classification				Mostly Grade 3 and some Grade 4 land to the north. Whether the Grade 3 land represents best and most versatile agricultural land would need further assessment.	Nearly all of the site (88%) is Grade 3 agricultural land, except for a small section in the south east which is in Grade 4 agricultural land. Whether the Grade 3 land represents best and most versatile agricultural land would need further assessment.	All of the site is Grade 3 agricultural land. Whether this Grade 3 land represents best and most versatile agricultural land would need further assessment. However, the scale, nature and current use of the site mean it does not have any realistic potential to serve as productive agricultural land.	All of the site is Grade 3 agricultural land. Whether this Grade 3 land represents best and most versatile agricultural land would need further assessment. However, the scale, nature and current use of the site mean it does not have any realistic potential to serve as productive agricultural land.	All of the site is Grade 3 agricultural land. Whether this Grade 3 land represents best and most versatile agricultural land would need further assessment.	All of the site is Grade 3 agricultural land. Whether this Grade 3 land represents best and most versatile agricultural land would need further assessment.	All of the site is Grade 3 agricultural land. Whether this Grade 3 land represents best and most versatile agricultural land would need further assessment. However, the scale, nature and current use of the site mean it does not have any realistic potential to serve as productive agricultural land.	All of the site is Grade 3 agricultural land. Whether this Grade 3 land represents best and most versatile agricultural land would need further assessment. However, the scale, nature and current use of the site mean it does not have any realistic potential to serve as productive agricultural land.	All of the site is Grade 4 agricultural Land. There would be no loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	All of the site is Grade 4 agricultural Land. There would be no loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	

Deliverability														
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities				Presence of an overhead line in the south west corner of the site. Based on the proposed layout, this will not encroach on the built development.	N/A	Presence of a mobile phone mast in the north west corner of the site. Based on the proposed layout, this will not encroach on the built development	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SUMMARY	Site remote from settlement boundary therefore not considered a sustainable location for residential development.	Site remote from settlement boundary therefore not considered a sustainable location for residential development.	Site remote from settlement boundary therefore not considered a sustainable location for residential development.	The promoter has demonstrated that challenges relating to pedestrian and vehicle access can be addressed. The site has minor flooding issues on a small part nearest the canal although it is expected that this could be address satisfactorily given that development is not proposed in this location. The development will have possible detrimental impacts on the view from the Canal path. Overall, the site has some minor constraints although these can be mitigated.	If the whole site or a significantly larger proportion of the site than proposed was brought forward for development, then the impact mainly on traffic congestion would be considerably more significant than if the 220 dwelling figure required by the emerging Chichester Local Plan (now 188 dwellings) were proposed on this or other sites. Development would also increase the potential of coalescence with Rkd and the limited screening would mean a detrimental visual impact. Such scales of development would also change the character of the village. Set against this would be a number of benefits including the opportunity for substantial community facilities, recreation and open space as well as high levels of affordable housing and a mix of housing types to address needs. Overall though, high levels of growth in this location are considered to have detrimental impacts. If 188 dwellings (the residual requirement from the emerging Chichester Local Plan requirement for Loxwood) were delivered on the 15.75 ha of land in the south east part of the site, the detrimental impacts identified above would be reduced (e.g. traffic congestion, visual impact) or eliminated (likelihood of coalescence). The corresponding potential for community benefits would also be reduced but would still be considerable. Overall it is considered that the development would have a positive benefit.	The site is reasonably well located adjacent to the Loxwood settlement boundary. Apart from the site's limited potential to deliver benefits in terms of community facilities, there are no significant detrimental impacts.	The site is well located off a main route through Loxwood and despite being outside the settlement boundary is well related to it. There are no significant constraints to the delivery of the site.	The site is comparatively poorly located for pedestrian access to key facilities. Surface water flooding and vehicle access would need further investigation but are not likely to be fundamental constraints. There is the potential for the site to deliver some benefits for the community, albeit its poor location could reduce the ease of access to such facilities. The presence of an area TPO would mean any scheme would likely need to design this in as the public open space that would expect to be included as part of such a development.	The site is separate from the settlement boundary and away from the village's facilities and services. To the north the site is not screened from the open countryside and is separated from the village by ancient woodland. This is exacerbated by the high degree of sensitivity to change of the landscape. There are also a number of matters which would require further investigation to determine whether detrimental impacts could be mitigated.	The site is well located and has few constraints. Whilst its limited size offers little opportunity to address a range of housing needs or provide any community benefits, there are no fundamental constraints to the delivery of the site. It would not be possible to allocate both sites 10a and 10b. However, there will be further opportunity for engagement with the Parish Council to determine which of the sites are best pursued.	The site is well located and has few constraints. Whilst its limited size offers little opportunity to address a range of housing needs or provide any community benefits, there are no fundamental constraints to the delivery of the site. It should be noted that this is predominantly the same site as Site 10a, with a small extension. It would not be possible to allocate both sites 10a and 10b. However, there will be further opportunity for engagement with the Parish Council to determine which of the sites are best pursued.	The relatively isolated location of the site from the settlement boundary and its accessibility to the centre of the village by pedestrians represent significant constraints to sustainable development of the site. Additionally, part of the site is at risk of flooding and safe vehicular access could be an issue. There are also likely to be impacts on the landscape which is sensitive to change.	The relatively isolated location of the site from the settlement boundary and its accessibility to the centre of the village by pedestrians represent significant constraints to sustainable development of the site. Additionally, over half of the site is at risk of flooding and access by vehicle to the site has not been resolved. There may also be impacts on the landscape which is sensitive to change.	Site remote from settlement boundary therefore not considered a sustainable location for residential development.

Appraisal framework:

Red	**Significant detrimental impact likely,** e.g. directly affects Listed Building with no mitigation.
Pink	**Some detrimental impact likely**
Amber	**Possible detrimental impact,** e.g. adjacent to Listed Building, or **unlikely to contribute positively towards achievinv NP objective**
Light Green	**Some positive impact likely or some positive contribution towards achieving NP objective.**
Dark green	**Sionificant positive imoact likelv.**
White	**No Issue/Neutral imoact**

Distances to services and facilities
(From Institute of Hathways and Transportation)

Dark Green
Light Green
Amber

	Facilities, e.g shops, bus stop.	Commuting / school	Other
Desirable	200m	500m	400m
Acceptable	400m	1000m	800m
Preferred maximum	800m	2000m	1200m

Source: Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot (IHT 2000)