

# Battle Neighbourhood Plan

Site Assessment  
Final Report

July 2019

## Quality information

### Prepared by

---

Jo Beech  
Senior Consultant

Charlotte Simpson  
Senior Planner

### Checked by

---

Una McGaughrin  
Associate Planner

### Approved by

---

Una McGaughrin  
Associate Planner

## Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
V1	31/10/18	Draft	CS	Charlotte Simpson	Planner
V2	06/11/18	Technical Review	UM	Una McGaughrin	Associate
V3	05/12/18	Group Review	AR	Allan Russell	Battle Town Council
V4	21/01/19	Technical Review	UM	Una McGaughrin	Associate
V5	08/02/19	Locality Review	JW	John Wilkinson	Neighbourhood Planning Officer
V6	21/02/19	Final	JB	Jo Beech	Senior Consultant
V7	14/07/19	Correction made to one site assessment	UM	Una McGaughrin	Associate
V8	08/08/19	Correction made to one site assessment	LF	Laura Fogarty	Graduate Planner

**Prepared for:**

Battle Town Council

**Prepared by:**

Charlotte Simpson  
Senior Planner

© 2019 AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK 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 It is a 'snapshot' in time and may become superseded by more recent information. Battle 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 If landowners or any other party can demonstrate that any of the evidence presented herein is inaccurate or out of date, such evidence can be presented to Battle Neighbourhood Plan at the consultation stage.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

1.	Introduction .....	7
1.1	Background .....	7
1.2	Planning Policy and Evidence Base .....	9
1.2.1	Adopted Rother District Core Strategy (2014) .....	9
1.2.2	Emerging Development and Site Allocations Local Plan Proposed Submission for public consultation (October 2018) .....	11
1.2.3	Saved Policies from the Rother District Local Plan (2006), as of September 2014 .....	14
1.2.4	Rother District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, June 2013 .....	14
2.	Site Assessment Method .....	17
2.1	Task 1: Identify Sites to be included in the Assessment.....	17
2.2	Task 2: Initial Sift of Sites.....	17
2.3	Task 3: Site Assessment.....	18
2.4	Task 4: Consolidation and review of Results .....	18
2.5	Indicative Housing Capacity .....	18
2.6	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).....	19
3.	Identified Sites .....	21
3.1	Identified Sites - SHLAA .....	21
3.2	Identified Sites – Battle Town Council ‘Call for Sites’ .....	27
4.	High Level Assessments .....	35
5.	Site Assessment .....	47
6.	Conclusion .....	52
6.1	Site Assessment Conclusion and Local Criteria Assessment .....	52
6.2	Local Green Space Designations .....	57
6.3	Next Steps .....	57
6.4	Viability .....	58
	Appendix A Completed Site Appraisal Pro-Forms .....	59

## Abbreviations used in the report

### Abbreviation

BTC	Battle Town Council
DaSA	Development and Site Allocations Plan
DPD	Development Plan Document
Ha	Hectare
LP	Local Plan
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance (DCLG)
PDL	Previously Developed Land
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
RDC	Rother District Council
TPO	Tree Preservation Order

## Executive Summary

The Battle Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared in the context of the adopted Rother Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), saved policies from the Local Plan 2006 and has regard to the emerging Development and Site Allocations (DaSA) Local Plan Proposed Submission (October 2018). The Neighbourhood Plan will cover Battle Parish including the villages of Telham and Netherfield.

The emerging DaSA states that Neighbourhood Plans are expected to meet their minimum housing targets by allocating sites. The Battle Neighbourhood Plan has a housing target of 470-500 dwellings between 2011 and 2028. However, taking into account outstanding commitments and schemes which are not yet implemented (including the Blackfriars Site), there remains an outstanding housing need of 78 dwellings in Battle and 23 dwellings in Netherfield.

A large number of sites are identified for potential development within the parish through the 2013 Rother District Council SHLAA and the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites. AECOM has undertaken an assessment of these sites to establish which sites are the most appropriate to allocate in the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the housing requirement and to comply with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan objectives and policies.

The site assessment has found that there are fifteen sites that are potentially suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The remainder of the sites are not considered suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Out of these fifteen sites, four are more appropriate in meeting the Neighbourhood Plan's vision and objectives. However, this does not exclude the other potentially suitable sites, and the Town Council should now work with Rother District Council and the community to select the sites for allocation that best meet the Neighbourhood Plan objectives.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

AECOM has been commissioned to undertake an independent site appraisal for the Battle Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of Battle Town Council. The work undertaken was agreed with the Town Council and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) in July 2018.

The Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared in the context of the adopted Rother Local Plan Core Strategy<sup>1</sup> (September 2014) and saved policies from the Local Plan 2006<sup>2</sup> and has regard to the emerging Development and Site Allocations (DaSA) Local Plan<sup>3</sup>, Proposed Submission (October 2018). The DaSA Proposed Submission has been published for a six week public consultation ending 7<sup>th</sup> December 2018. June 2019 is currently the target date for its adoption.

The emerging DaSA will allocate sites where there are no Neighbourhood Plans, to help fulfil the Core Strategy's development requirements. It effectively forms part two of the Council's Local Plan. It will also review the existing development boundaries and will include detailed policies for the management of development. Neighbourhood plans are expected to play a significant part in meeting the overall housing target. Therefore it is anticipated that each neighbourhood plan will meet a minimum housing target. Battle has been allocated a remaining housing target of 475-500 dwellings between 2011 and 2028 within the DaSA and therefore has a requirement to allocate sites suitable for housing development within its boundary to ensure that it is in line with the emerging DaSA. However, taking into account outstanding commitments and schemes which are not yet implemented (including the Blackfriars Site), there remains an outstanding housing need of 78 dwellings for Battle and 23 dwellings for Netherfield<sup>4</sup>.

**Figure 1-1** provides a map of the Battle Neighbourhood Area, which covers the parish of Battle (this includes the town of Battle and the villages of Telham and Netherfield). This was designated as a Neighbourhood Development Plan Area by Rother District Council in April 2015. It is the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group that the Plan will include allocations for housing to meet the required housing target set out in the Core Strategy.

Battle Town Council are looking to allocate sites within their Neighbourhood Plan, and want to ensure that key aspects of their proposals will be robust and defensible.

The Rother Local Plan Core Strategy sets out the overall spatial vision and development strategy for the district including key policies. The strategic objective within the plan for Battle is *"to support the market town and tourist centre role and character of Battle, and conserve its historic core and setting."* The whole town of Battle and its immediate surrounding countryside is situated within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and also includes important historic designations as well as being visually exposed within the landscape.

In this context, the Town Council has asked AECOM to undertake an independent and objective assessment of the sites that have been identified as potential candidates for housing in the Neighbourhood Plan, including sites from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and sites submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites.

The sites are assessed to determine which of the identified sites are appropriate for allocation in the Plan, in particular whether they comply with both the National Planning Policy Framework and the strategic policies of the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy; and from this pool of sites, determine which are the best sites to meet the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. This will help to ensure that the Neighbourhood Planning site selection process, which is expected to follow the site assessment will be robust enough to meet the Basic Conditions considered by the Independent Examiner, as well as any potential legal challenges by developers and other interested parties. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have developed their own set of criteria based on the needs and priorities determined by consultations with the local community. This has been applied to the pool of sites assessed against the NPPF and strategic policies of the Rother Local Plan.


---

<sup>1</sup> Available here <http://www.rother.gov.uk/CoreStrategy>

<sup>2</sup> Available here: <http://www.rother.gov.uk/rotherdistrictlocalplan2006>

<sup>3</sup> Available here: <https://www.rother.gov.uk/dasa>

<sup>4</sup> Confirmed to Battle Town Council by Rother District Council on the 25<sup>th</sup> April 2018 by email



**Figure 1-1: Battle Neighbourhood Plan Boundary (Map submitted for Battle Neighbourhood Area Designation. Blue outline is off Battle Civil Parish which is the same as the Battle Neighbourhood Area Designation)**

(Source: <http://battleneighbourhoodplan.co.uk/>)

## 1.2 Planning Policy and Evidence Base

The Neighbourhood Plan policies and allocations must be in accordance with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan and have regard to the emerging local plan. The Local Plan evidence base also provides a significant amount of information about potential developments in Battle.

The key documents within the Rother District Council planning framework include:

- Adopted Rother Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014);
- Emerging Development and Site Allocations Local Plan Proposed Submission for public consultation (October 2018);
- Saved Policies from the Rother Local Plan 2006 (as of September 2014); and
- Rother District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, June 2013<sup>5</sup>.

### 1.2.1 Adopted Rother District Core Strategy (2014)

The policies of relevance to development in Battle (including the village of Netherfield) and that should be considered when determining site allocations through the neighbourhood plan process include:

*Policy OSS1: Overall Spatial Development Strategy* – The strategy for the Overall Spatial Development is to:

- i) Plan for at least 5,700 dwellings (net) in the district over the period 2011-2028;
- ii) Identify suitable sites in accordance with the following spatial distribution:
  - a) Provide for some development in Battle and Rye that helps maintain their small market town roles and is consistent with their respective environmental constraints and settings;
  - b) Facilitate the limited growth of villages that contain a range of services and which contributes to supporting vibrant, mixed rural communities, notably in relation to service provision and local housing needs, and is compatible with the character and setting of the village; and
  - c) Give a particular attention to the ecological, agricultural, public enjoyment and intrinsic value of the countryside, and continue to generally restrict new development to that for which a countryside location is necessary.

*This policy highlights the need for careful planning of new development in Battle to respect the environmental constraints and settings, in this case the AONB.*

*Policy OSS3: Location of development* - In assessing the suitability of a particular location for development, when both allocating land for development and determining planning applications, sites and/or proposals should accord with the relevant policies of this Core Strategy and be considered in the context of:

- (i) The spatial strategy for the particular settlement or area, and its distinct character;
- (ii) The capacity of, as well as access to, existing infrastructure and services, and of any planned or necessary improvements to them;
- (iii) The local need for affordable housing;
- (iv) Needs and priorities identified in approved Local Action Plans;
- (v) The low carbon and renewable energy potentials of the site;
- (vi) the character and qualities of the landscape;
- (vii) Making effective use of land within the main built-up confines of towns and villages, especially previously developed land, consistent with maintaining their character;

<sup>5</sup> Available here: <http://www.rother.gov.uk/article/13135/Homes-and-Housing>

(viii) Any constraints relating to land stability, contamination, air quality, agricultural land quality and coastal erosion, and the ability to satisfactorily address these;

(ix) The deliverability of development, including consideration of land ownership patterns and the viability of development; and

(x) The need for and access to employment opportunities.

*This policy highlights the need for careful planning of a new development in regards to the suitability of land, specifically relating to its agricultural status, contamination and making sure that the land in keeps with the character of the area.*

**Policy OSS4: General Development Considerations** - In addition to considerations set out by other policies, all development should meet the following criteria:

(i) It meets the needs of future occupiers, including providing appropriate amenities and the provision of appropriate means of access for disabled users;

(ii) It does not unreasonably harm the amenities of adjoining properties;

(iii) It respects and does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality;

(iv) It is compatible with both the existing and planned use of adjacent land, and takes full account of previous use of the site; and

(v) In respect of residential development, is of a density appropriate to its context, having due regard to the key design principles.

*This policy highlights the need for careful planning in regard to respecting the locality and being compatible with the existing developments.*

**Policy HF1: The Hastings Fringes** - The strategy for conservation and development in the Hastings Fringes is to maintain strategic countryside gaps between Hastings/St Leonards and Bexhill, Battle, Crowhurst and Fairlight.

*This policy highlights the need to maintain key strategic gaps between neighbouring settlements.*

**Policy BA1: Policy Framework for Battle** - Proposals for development and change in Battle will:

(i) Maintain the essential physical form, local distinctiveness, character and setting of the town, particularly in and adjacent to the Conservation Area;

(ii) Implement the ESCC Battle Local Area Transport Strategy, particularly measures that minimise the demand for cross-town vehicular traffic; and improve pedestrian and cycle access to services/ facilities from new and existing development;

(iii) Provide for 475-500 net additional dwellings in Battle over the Plan period 2011-2028, by developing new housing via opportunities both within the development boundary, and modest peripheral expansion opportunities that respects the setting of Battle within the High Weald AONB and supports community facilities;

(vii) Implement improvements to the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities, in accordance with adopted standards and strategies; and

(viii) Ensure that new development does not put pressure on local infrastructure, and that it makes appropriate contribution to community and other infrastructure.

*This policy highlights the need to maintain the essence and distinctiveness of Battle, especially in regard to the Conservation Area, whilst making sure transport pressures are not increased from new developments.*

**Policy RA1: Villages** - The needs of the rural villages will be addressed by:

(i) Protection of the locally distinctive character of villages, historic buildings and settings, with the design of any new development being expected to include appropriate high quality response to local context and landscape; and

(vi) Improved access to basic day-to-day services, particularly by public transport, walking and cycling. In order to facilitate this, new development will be sited in close proximity to key facilities and in locations accessible via a range of transport options.

*This policy highlights the need to maintain the character of rural villages, and protect historic buildings, whilst making sure developments remain accessible via public transport.*

**Policy CO3: Improving Sports and Recreation Provision** - The provision of sufficient, well-managed and accessible open spaces, sports and recreation facilities, including indoor sports facilities, will be achieved by:

(ii) Allocating land for open space, sports and recreation purposes, and permitting proposals for the improvement of existing or provision of new facilities, in localities where deficits in facilities are identified;

(iii) Application of the quantity, access and quality standards of Rother's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study across all open spaces, including indoor sports facilities within the district; and

(v) Increasing access to the countryside by promoting improvements to the rights of way network, especially around the urban areas, particularly in reference to Combe Valley Countryside Park.

*This policy highlights the need to retain and add to suitable land for sports and recreation facilities, as well as enhancing the rights of way access where applicable.*

**Policy EN1: Landscape Stewardship** - Management of the high quality historic, built and natural landscape character is to be achieved by ensuring the protection, and wherever possible enhancement, of the district's nationally designated and locally distinctive landscapes and landscape features; including:

(i) The distinctive identified landscape character, ecological features and settlement pattern of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;

(iii) Nationally designated historic sites including listed Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and the Registered Historic Battlefield at Battle;

(v) Open landscape between clearly defined settlements, including the visual character of settlements, settlement edges and their rural fringes;

(vi) Ancient woodlands;

(vii) Tranquil and remote areas, including the dark night sky; and

(viii) Other key landscape features across the district, including native hedgerows, copses, field patterns, ancient routeways, ditches and barrows, and ponds and water courses.

*This policy highlights the need for careful planning of new developments in Battle, to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic landscape of the area. This is highly important in regard to the AONB and nationally designations such as scheduled monuments and ancient woodlands.*

## 1.2.2 Emerging Development and Site Allocations Local Plan Proposed Submission for public consultation (October 2018)

In September 2014, the council adopted the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy which set out its vision, development strategy and strategic policies for Rother District up to 2028. The Development and Site Allocations (DaSA) Local Plan is effectively "part two" of the Council's Local Plan.

Together with the Core Strategy, the DaSA Local Plan will provide the basis for determining planning applications in much of the district and will supersede all generic policies and relevant spatial policies from the earlier 2006 Rother District Local Plan. The DaSA Proposed Submission has been published for a six week consultation period ending 7<sup>th</sup> December 2018. June 2019 is currently being targeted for its adoption.

Neighbourhood Plans will play a significant part in meeting the overall housing target and it is expected that each Neighbourhood Plan will meet their housing targets as a minimum. In addition there is a need to demonstrate that the DaSA and Neighbourhood Plans will together provide sufficient sites to meet the requirements for housing land set out in the Core Strategy. Rother District Council will continue to support the efficient preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and encourage the early development of sustainable and deliverable sites in order to contribute to both local and district level housing land supply.

The emerging Development and Site Allocations Local Plan identifies Battle as one of nine new Neighbourhood Plans currently being prepared (para 8.10).

### High Weald

The majority of Rother falls within the High Weald national character area (NCA). The High Weald is of national as well as local landscape value reflected by its designation as an Area of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB). The emerging DaSA sets out the following policy option in relation to High Weald:

*Policy DEN1: Maintaining Landscape Character* - The siting, layout and design of development should maintain and reinforce the natural and built landscape character of the area in which it is to be located, based on a clear understanding of the distinctive local landscape characteristics (see Figure 6 above), in accordance with Core Strategy Policy EN1. Particular care will be taken to maintain the sense of tranquillity of more remote areas, including through maintaining 'dark skies' in accordance with Policy DEN7.

*This policy highlights the need of developments to maintain the landscape character of the area, especially in regard to the tranquillity of more rural areas.*

*Policy DEN2: The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)* – All development within or affecting the setting of the High Weald AONB shall conserve and seek to enhance its landscape and scenic beauty, having particular regard to the impacts on its character components, as set out in the High Weald AONB Management Plan. Development within the High Weald AONB should be small-scale, in keeping with the landscape and settlement pattern; major development will be inappropriate except in exceptional circumstances.

*This policy highlights the need of development to conserve the AONB, and follow the High Weald AONB Management Plan to provide as minimal impact as possible. It also indicates that development within the AONB should be minimal, and in keeping with the landscape and settlement areas.*

### Strategic Gap and Development Boundaries

The preferred option in relation to the Strategic Gap and Development Boundaries is as follows:

*Policy DEN3: Strategic Gaps* - The Strategic Gaps are identified on the Policies Map between the following areas:

- (i) Bexhill and Hastings/St Leonards;
- (ii) Crowhurst and Hastings/St Leonards;
- (iii) Battle and Hastings/St Leonards;
- (iv) Fairlight and Hastings/St Leonards; and
- (v) Rye and Rye Harbour

Within these Gaps, development will be carefully controlled and will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. Any development must be unobtrusive and not detract from the openness of the area. Enhancement of the Gaps through effective landscape management which strengthens and reinforces their significance as protected landscape areas will be supported.

*This policy highlights the need to maintain strategic gaps between settlement areas, and make sure the openness of the area is retained.*

*Policy DIM2: Development Boundaries* - The development boundaries of settlements, defined in accordance with Core Strategy Policy OSS2. New development shall be focused within defined settlement boundaries, principally on already committed and allocated sites, together with other sites where proposals accord with relevant Local Plan policies. In the countryside (that is, outside of defined settlement development boundaries), development shall be normally limited to that which accords with specific Local Plan policies or that for which a countryside location is demonstrated to be necessary.




Figure 1-2: Inset Map of Battle, Rother District Local Plan – adopted July 2006 (some designations may no longer apply)

(Source: Rother District Council Website)

### 1.2.3 Saved Policies from the Rother District Local Plan (2006), as of September 2014

*Policy BT2: Land at Blackfriars* - Land at Blackfriars, Battle, as defined on the Proposals Map (**Figure 1-2**), is allocated for housing, education and open space purposes, to be brought forward through a comprehensive scheme. Two areas, totalling approximately 7.3 hectares, would be allocated for residential use, providing at least 220 dwellings (40% of which would be affordable). Other land between the two areas for residential development is allocated for a single form entry primary school and to provide a large area of open space. The development will be accessed by a new spine road, from the south from Hastings Road, off The Spinney, and from the north via Harrier Lane off Marley Lane.

*Policy BT3: Land at North Trade Road* - Allocated for housing, as shown on the Proposals Map (**Figure 1-2**). Approximately 30 dwellings would be provided (40% of which to be affordable) with access to the site from North Trade Road. Development should be well set back behind the building line of the former hospital and with a clear separation alongside it.

*Policy EM13: Shopping and related commercial development in town/district centres* - Shopping and related commercial development shall be focussed within the main shopping areas of Bexhill, Battle and Rye town centres. Within the main shopping areas, as defined on the Proposals Map, the loss of significant existing ground floor retail floorspace falling within Use Class A1 will be resisted. The redevelopment of an A1 use to residential will likely be resisted by Rother District Council.

*This policy highlights that Battle is allocated as one of the centres for commercial and retail development. This will aid the development as it will provide amenities to residents. It also indicates that the sites allocated for housing in Battle need to avoid the retail areas as their redevelopment is restricted.*

### 1.2.4 Rother District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, June 2013

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies sites with the potential for housing, assessing their potential and whether they are likely to be developed. It supports the delivery of land for housing to meet Rother's housing requirements.

Within Battle a total of 47 sites were considered, of which three were considered suitable and developable, and with a further two sites considered as potentially suitable and developable subject to further investigations. Two sites are considered suitable as broad locations. 40 sites were found to be unsuitable.

Within Netherfield, ten sites were considered in total of which three sites (NE1 NE5a and NE11) were considered to be potentially suitable and developable subject to further investigations. Seven sites were found to be unsuitable.

The sites submitted in Battle and Netherfield are shown in **Figure 1-3** and **Figure 1-4** respectively.




Figure 1-3: Battle Sites considered in the SHLAA (June 2013)

(Source: Rother District Council Website)




Figure 1-4: Netherfield Sites considered in the SHLAA (June 2013) (Source: Rother District Council Website)

## 2. Site Assessment Method

The site assessment method is based on the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance. The relevant sections are Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (March 2015)<sup>6</sup>, Neighbourhood Planning (updated Feb 2018)<sup>7</sup>, and the Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment Toolkit<sup>8</sup>. These all help in determining whether a site is appropriate for allocation in a Development Plan based on whether it is suitable, available and achievable (or viable).

In this context, the methodology for carrying out the site assessment is presented below.

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

The first task is to identify which sites should be considered as part of the assessment.

This includes:

- All SHLAA sites identified in the 2013 SHLAA Review; and
- New sites identified in the Battle and Netherfield Call for Sites undertaken in 2017 and updated in 2018.

All sites included identified in the Battle and Netherfield Call for Sites are shown in **Figure 2-1**.

### 2.2 Task 2: Initial Sift of Sites

The second task is a sifting process, whereby sites that are clearly not suitable for development are screened out. This includes sites where there is evidence that development would directly conflict with a national planning policy objective or statutory environmental designation.

The criteria against which sites will be assessed at this stage are based on the following:

- Sites assessed as unsuitable within the 2013 SHLAA Review, and are considered to be unsuitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan following AECOM's review of the conclusions in the context of Neighbourhood Planning;
- National planning policy, e.g. avoiding isolated development in the open countryside;
- Avoidance of Flood Zone 3 (areas identified as having a high risk of flooding); and
- National environmental designations (both statutory and non-statutory), i.e. National Parks, existing or proposed Special Areas of Conservation, existing or proposed Special Protection Areas, SSSIs, Ancient Woodland, Biosphere Reserves, National Nature Reserves, existing or proposed Ramsar sites, and RSPB reserves.

Following the completion of the initial sift, sites are assigned one of three categories:

- 1) Not suitable for development and therefore not appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, based on the sifting stage.
- 2) Take forward for a high level assessment –for sites that have not been ruled out at the sifting stage but have already been assessed through the SHLAA or a planning application.
- 3) Take forward for a detailed site pro-forma assessment – for sites that have not been ruled out at the sifting stage and have not been assessed through the SHLAA or a planning application.

Point 2 relates to sites that have previously been assessed in the SHLAA and therefore their suitability does not need to be re-assessed. Instead the SHLAA conclusions will be reviewed, alongside any other relevant material considerations such as planning history, to evaluate whether the sites are potentially suitable to be allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan.

Point 3 is for sites that have yet to be assessed through the planning system, i.e. in the SHLAA or through a planning application. These sites will be assessed to establish whether they are potentially suitable for development and if so, whether they are appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

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

## 2.3 Task 3: Site Assessment

Sites are assessed according to which of the categories they fall into in Task 2.

Sites that have previously been assessed through the SHLAA have been assessed at a high level within this appraisal against a range of planning criteria.

Sites that have not previously been assessed through a SHLAA or planning application are assessed in more detail using an assessment pro-forma.

This pro-forma is based on the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance, the Site Assessment for Neighbourhood Plans: A Toolkit for Neighbourhood Planners (Locality, 2015) 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.

The pro-forma allows 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.); and
  - Planning history.
- 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 (willingness of landowner to sell or develop the site).

Completing the pro-forma is done through a combination of desk top assessment and site visits. The desk top assessment involves a review of the conclusions of the existing evidence and using 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 is also an opportunity to gain a better understanding of the context and nature of the neighbourhood area.

## 2.4 Task 4: Consolidation and review of Results

All the site assessment information is drawn together into a summary table which concludes which sites could be appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

A 'traffic light' rating of all sites is provided, indicating 'green' for sites that show no or few constraints and are appropriate as site allocations, 'amber' for sites which are potentially suitable if identified issues can be resolved or mitigated, 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**.

## 2.5 Indicative Housing Capacity

Indicative housing capacity; that is, the optimal number of new homes that could be provided on each site, for each site considered suitable and available have been calculated in a number of ways:

- Where sites were previously included in the SHLAA, indicative housing capacities used in this document have been reviewed and applied if appropriate; or
- If a planning application has been approved on a site then the dwelling number approved has been used; or
- If a site promoter has provided any development figures, e.g. through a masterplan, this figure is reviewed and applied if appropriate;
- Desktop assessment by AECOM shows that net residential development in a Battle context is approximately 20 dwellings per hectare.

## 2.6 Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

The whole of the parish of Battle is within the High Weald AONB. The NPPF (2018) (Paragraph 172) states that: *'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.'*

The adopted Core Strategy (September 2014) notes that the combination of the AONB designation, the historic core and the accessibility limitations, make a high level of future growth inappropriate in Battle. However, it also notes that there is a need to support the town's role and foster economic viability which will entail allowing appropriate residential development in and around Battle.

Therefore Policy BA1 states that Battle will need to provide 475-500 net additional dwellings over the Plan period 2011-2028, by developing new housing via opportunities both within the development boundary, and *modest peripheral expansion* opportunities that respects the setting of Battle within the High Weald AONB and supports community facilities. The use of the wording '*modest peripheral expansion*' indicates that allocating sites within the AONB around the town of Battle will be acceptable, to an extent.

This approach of developing appropriate housing within the AONB to meet the required housing need is also supported within the Inspectors Report. The report clarifies that all reasonable alternatives to having a further increase in housing in the AONB was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal, but it was clear why these alternatives to the preferred option were dismissed as they would not result in the full objectively assessed need for the District being met.

This is additionally emphasised in the Rother SHLAA (2013) Review Part 1, which states that "The Council has clarified that development will not be ruled out within the AONB, but will need to be in accordance with local needs and in conformity with the primary objective of AONB, namely the conservation of natural beauty, landscape and countryside".

As a result, even though national policy states that major development within AONB would normally be refused, as meeting the housing requirement for Battle is important to support the town's role and foster economic viability, allocating sites counts as an exceptional circumstance. Therefore, in this site appraisal, sites have not been ruled out for development because of being within the AONB, unless building in them significantly affects the setting of Battle within the High Weald AONB.




Figure 2-1: Sites offered in Battle's Call for Sites (Source: Battle Town Council)

### 3. Identified Sites

A large number of sites have been identified as potential candidates for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. These include sites identified in the 2013 Rother District Council SHLAA and sites identified through the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites (undertaken in 2017 and updated in 2018).

#### 3.1 Identified Sites - SHLAA

A total of 47 sites in Battle and 10 sites in Netherfield were considered in the 2013 SHLAA. The conclusions of these sites have been reviewed, to understand whether there are any that can be screened out of the more detailed assessment. The SHLAA conclusions and the results of the initial sift are shown below in **Table 3.1** and **Table 3.2**.

**Table 3.1: Sites Identified in Battle in the SHLAA (2013)**

Site Ref.	Site Address	SHLAA 2013 assessment	SHLAA 2013 Conclusions	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
BA1	Land at rear of Virgins Lane (north side)	Development behind frontage properties would be out of character with the grain of existing development resulting in an adverse effect upon the existing rural setting of Battle within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty created by the existing long and mature rear gardens.	Not suitable	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA2	North West Battle, Broad Location	Broad location, comprising some areas of ad-hoc low density development accessed by poorly maintained roads. Potential for redevelopment alongside highways improvements to adoptable standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Land off Chain Lane – site comprising low density residential and backlands (land behind an area which is built or otherwise developed) but advantage of good connections to town centre. ESCC Highways identified two feasible access points and landscape assessment concluded capacity close to urban edge.</li> <li>b) Land off Vale Road – backlands site with potential at rear of residential properties and fronting Vale Road</li> </ul>	Broad location	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Take forward for high level assessment
BA3	North Trade Road	South half already developed and northern section still to be developed although may have viability concerns regarding access ransom strip.	Suitable for development subject to investigation into green site	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Take forward for high level assessment
BA5	Adjacent to Battle Fire Station, A2100	Site currently in community use. Would be contrary to policy unless alternative provision is available.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.

Site Ref.	Site Address	SHLAA 2013 assessment	SHLAA 2013 Conclusions	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
BA6	Car Park off Battle High Street	Erosion of notable settlement pattern in Conservation Area.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA7	Battle High Street	Visibility at entrance inadequate and potentially an issue due to bend in the road.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA8	Station Approach	Existing employment site near station and should remain in business use. Scope for comprehensive and employment led redevelopment scheme for entire vicinity comprising sites BA66, BA8 and BA43. Further investigation into the most effective use of land at Station Approach required.	Not suitable for ad-hoc residential led development but may offer potential for comprehensive employment led regeneration with some potential residential for enabling development.	Agree with SHLAA conclusions. However employment may be maintained for mixed development and reconfiguration on this site combined with BA66 and BA43	Take forward for high level assessment
BA9	Land North of Abbots Close	Wooded area with protected species and no obvious potential for redevelopment. No access in own right and legal covenant relating to the railway stations requirements.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA11	Land at Blackfriars (including 3 separate areas)	Suitable and developable site with outline permission (RR/2007/1896/P) for up to 245 dwellings, new spine road, public open space, provision of land for primary school, play area.	Suitable and developable subject to more detailed investigations	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Take forward for high level assessment
BA12	Land at the rear of North Lodge	Majority rural and identified as Lowland Meadow BAP habitat, adjacent to Ancient and semi-natural woodland. Mature trees, setting of listed buildings and visibility all pose constraints.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA13	Land at Western end of Vale Road	Densely wooded area classed as ancient woodland. Provides attractive landscaped rural setting to neighbouring residential properties.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA18	Land at Almonry Farm (South) North Trade Road	Wholly rural and remote site partly within and adjacent to Ancient and Semi Natural and Wet Woodland. Multiple historic field boundaries across site.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA19	Land North of Caldbec Hill	AONB landscape exposure. Green space and key rural element to Caldbec Hill. No direct access.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA20	Land North of Caldbec Hill	No opportunities due to the landscape impact, rural character of the site and lack of suitable access.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA21	Land North of Car Park, Park Lane	Part of medieval Burgage plots within Conservation Area. Impact upon setting of Battlefield and Abbey.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA23	Land r/o 26 Hastings	Comprises two residential	Suitable and	Agree with SHLAA	Take forward for

Site Ref.	Site Address	SHLAA 2013 assessment	SHLAA 2013 Conclusions	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
	Road	gardens, close to station and A2100. Access requires further investigation. Would need to be developed in association with BA31a. Development should mitigate and minimise tree loss.	developable subject to more detailed investigations	conclusions.	high level assessment
BA24	Land South of Greatwood Cottage, Marley Lane	Part of wider AONB landscape and important green edge to town. Position of road and topography of the site is prominent in landscape. Partly within and adjacent to Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland and wet woodland as well as within the setting of listed buildings.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA25	Land at Lillybank Farm, London Road	Rural in context and character, on northern edge of urban fringe.	Not suitable for development	Disagree with SHLAA conclusions, site may be suitable for limited development potential.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA26	Land at Stream	Ruled out by lack of access as advised by ESCC highways. All options have issues. Other obstacles include landscape impact in AONB countryside, topographical constraints and partially within Flood Zones 2 & 3.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA27	Land adj Tollgates and Claverham Way	Prominence in countryside and adverse impact on the AONB. ESCC Landscape Assessment supports this conclusion.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions. However planning permission was approved conditionally (RR/2017/1259/P) for 63 dwellings.	Do not assess further.
BA28	Land North of Loose Farm	Largely not suitable, attractive countryside and long distance views. Majority of the site not currently accessible. Distance from services, no pavement or pedestrian access.	Not suitable for development	Access may be possible from existing private road off Hastings Road. A number of assisted living and care homes along this private road.	Take forward for high level assessment
BA29	Land at Whitehayes	Low density site occupied by attractive thatched property. Constrained by deliverability, viability and access.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA30	Land at Coultershaw	Majority of site designated as 1066 Historic Battlefield. BAP habitat – wet, deciduous and ghyll woodland. Highways authority also expressed concerns.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA31a	Land at Glengorse Farm (North)	Within AONB and strategic gap. Well contained and screened from wider landscape. Neighbours BA23 which could be developed concurrently. Vehicle access via Glengorse although it currently suffers commuter parking and therefore traffic management required.	Suitable and developable, subject to more detailed investigations	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Take forward for high level assessment

Site Ref.	Site Address	SHLAA 2013 assessment	SHLAA 2013 Conclusions	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
BA31r	Land at Glengorse Farm (North)	Site on ridge and visually exposed from the south. Within AONB and strategic gap. Limit on the quantum of development that Glengorse would be appropriate to serve in highways terms.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA32	Land r/o Hastings Road	Wholly rural area, relatively unrelated to urban area of Battle. Strategic Gap, adjacent to Ancient woodland and wet woodland crosses southern boundary.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA33	Land r/o 19 and 21 Virgins Lane	Within development boundary, recent rejection by PINS at appeal on AONB grounds. May be appropriate at lower scale of development.	Not suitable for development	Planning permission since been granted (RR/2016/3208/P - 13th February 2017)	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA34	Field by Water Tower, Hastings Road	Open to views within the wider AONB, strategic gap, far from existing development boundary.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA35	Land at eastern end of Marley Lane Business Park, Battle	Multiple environmental constraints: AONB, Ancient Woodland, TPO, Groundwater Source Protection Zones 1, 2 & 3.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA36	Land at Caldbeck House, Caldbeck Hill	Undeveloped valley side. Development would represent a departure from historic morphology. Historic field boundary bisects site.	Not suitable for development	Location close to amenities and clear access routes.	Take forward for high level assessment
BA37	Land at The Warren, Stevens Crouch, Battle	Very remote from settlements	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA38	Land at Whitelands Cottage, North Trade Road	Semi-rural location, detached from development boundary. Wooded and rural setting.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA39	Land adj. To Frederick Thatcher Place, North Trade Road	Wooded area that forms natural edge to development boundary. BAP habitat pond.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA40	Land adj to 73 North Trade Road	Infill opportunity subject to further investigations. This section of North Trade Road has seen recent redevelopment on north side. Topography sits well below level of road, trees at frontage should be retained. BAP habitat standard pond on west of site. Access at NE may limit loss of mature deciduous trees.	Suitable and developable subject to more detailed investigations	Agree with SHLAA conclusions	Take forward for high level assessment
BA41	Land at Netherfield Hill Farm	Remoteness from town centre, services and facilities.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA42	Land at Fuller's Farm, Mount Street	Rural landscape and reads part of open countryside, remote from town centre and heritage constraints.	Not suitable for development	May be possible to improve access	Take forward for high level assessment

Site Ref.	Site Address	SHLAA 2013 assessment	SHLAA 2013 Conclusions	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
BA43	Senlac Storage, Station Approach	Existing employment site near station and should remain in business use. Scope for comprehensive and employment led redevelopment scheme for entire vicinity comprising sites BA66, BA8 and BA43. Further investigation into the most effective use of land at Station Approach required.	Not suitable for ad-hoc residential led development but may offer potential for comprehensive employment led regeneration with some potential residential for enabling development.	Agree with SHLAA conclusions. However employment may be maintained for mixed-use development and reconfiguration on this site combined with BA66 and BA8	Take forward for high level assessment
BA44	Land at Almonry Farm (North), North Trade Road	Within walking distance of Battle Town Centre but prominent in the countryside. ESCC landscape study does not suggest any potential for development of any significant scale. AONB/heritage issues related to historic field boundaries crossing the site.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA46	Land at Glengorse Farm (South West), Glengorse	Remoteness from built form. Undulating countryside and interspersed with woodland. Elevated and exposed in landscape. Stream bisecting site.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA47	Land at Glengorse Farm (south east), Glengorse	Remoteness from built form. Undulating countryside, BAP Wet woodland and stream valley bisecting the site with SFRA flood issues.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA49	Blackfriars Community /Education allocation	Part of wider Blackfriars (BA11). Reserved as central hub for educational and community uses. Previously allocated for primary school but appropriate to reserve for community/educational use.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA52	Land at North Trade Road, Battle	Area of linear ribbon development along North Trade Road. Removed from town core and services. Includes former Battle Hospital (Grade II listed) adjacent Ancient Woodland and Wet Woodland.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA53	Land North of Upper Lake	Wooded rural parcel forming countryside edge to historic core of Battle. Archaeology Notification Area, partly crossed by historic field boundaries. Access constraints.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA54	Land r/o Tesco Express, Battle Hill	Highways advised they would not accept direct access onto Hastings Road. Glengorse access not possible as intervening land includes HW AON identified wild flower meadow.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA60	Land south Battle Pumping Station	Prominence in countryside, adverse impact on AONB, marked by historic field boundaries and inaccessible on its own	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA65	Market Square Broad Location	Potential for retail led regeneration scheme, with potential to include enabling	Broad Location	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Take forward for high level

Site Ref.	Site Address	SHLAA 2013 assessment	SHLAA 2013 Conclusions	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
		residential alongside.			assessment
BA66	Land south of Station Approach	Existing employment site near station and should remain in business use. Scope for comprehensive and employment led redevelopment scheme for entire vicinity comprising sites BA66, BA8 and BA43. Further investigation into the most effective use of land at Station Approach required.	Not suitable for ad-hoc residential led development but may offer potential for comprehensive employment led regeneration with some potential residential for enabling development.	Agree with SHLAA conclusions. However employment may be maintained for mixed development and reconfiguration on this site combined with BA43 and BA8	Take forward for high level assessment

Table 3.2: Sites Identified in Netherfield in the SHLAA (2013)

Site Ref.	Site Address	SHLAA 2013 assessment	SHLAA 2013 Conclusions	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
NE01	Land south of Darvel Down	Together with NE05 it is the preferred area for a comprehensive extension to Netherfield. Proximity to amenities. Landscape impact limited.  Highways will only accept vehicle access from north onto Darvel Down and not south on B2096. TPO issued in 2011 across the whole access area. Development of NE5 frontage does provide an option for pedestrian access. More direct pedestrian access required.	Suitable and developable, subject to more details investigations	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Take forward for high level assessment
NE02	Land east of Darvel Down	Not suited to built development. Restricted by landscape. BAP habitat and HW AONB feature Ghyll Woodland. BAP Habitat pond and stream on site.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
NE03	Land west of Netherfield Court	Rural location and related to existing development boundaries. Landscape impact. No opportunities.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
NE04	Land north-east of Darvel Down (cul-de-sac end)	Loss of woodland. Tree officer advice raised sufficient concerns to rule out site.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
NE05a	Land south of Darvel Down	See NE01	Suitable and developable, subject to more details investigations	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Take forward for assessment but consider as one site with NE1
NE05r	TPO area Swallow Barn	See description of main site 'Land South of Darvel Down' above. NE5r a small portion of the wider site encompassing TPO trees that may be appropriate to incorporate within neighbouring open space.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
NE06	White House Poultry Farm	Loss of existing rural business. Two storey buildings would have landscape impact. ESCC Notified mineral site. Setting of listed building.	Not suitable for development	Southern portion unsuitable but northern aspect may be suitable	Take forward for high level assessment

Site Ref.	Site Address	SHLAA 2013 assessment	SHLAA 2013 Conclusions	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
NE07	Land south of Darvel Down	Loss of value community open space. Exposed in AONB.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
NE10	Land north-east of Darvel Down	Loss of woodland, tree officer raised sufficient concerns to rule out this site.	Not suitable for development	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
NE11	Children's Play area	See NE01 and NE05	Suitable and developable, subject to more details investigations	Agree with SHLAA conclusions.	Take forward for assessment but consider as one site with NE1 and NE5a

### 3.2 Identified Sites – Battle Town Council ‘Call for Sites’

Battle Town Council (BTC) conducted a survey in both 2017 and early 2018 for residents of the parish to submit potentially suitable locations for new housing. These sites were submitted by both landowners and developers, so they are all assumed to be available. A total of 18 sites in Battle and 3 sites in Netherfield were considered. These are presented in **Table 3.3** and **Table 3.4** below. These sites have been sifted, to rule out any sites that have any insurmountable constraints, before a more detailed assessment is undertaken.

**Table 3.3: Sites submitted in Battle ‘Call for Sites’**

Site Ref.	Site Address	Within the SHLAA 2013?	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
BA NS101	Land at the Ceders, Telham Lane		Site situated away from high street and train station, although clear access from Telham Lane. Priority woodland bird species and SSSI Impact risk zone.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS102	Squirrel Field		Access from A271, location distant from main town centre and station. AONB, SSSI impact risk zone, woodland priority habitat network.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS103	Land to the east of Battle (west of Great Wood) Marley Lane		Location distant from town centre and railway station and outside of main urban area. Potential to upgrade access from Marley Lane. Site has planning permission for dwelling and garage (RR/2019/241/P) and new plans have been submitted for eight dwellings.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS104	Beech Farm - commercial use		Although some isolated dwellings around the Beech Estate the site is too distant from high street and train station as well as other amenities. Narrow country lane for access not suitable.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA NS105	Saxon Hill Farm	Additional to BA40 (Land adj to 73 North Trade Road)	Site not covered under BA40 but SHLAA suggests southern portion of BA40 directly adjoining the site would not be suitable for development. Access would be dependent on BA40 coming forward for access onto North Trade Road.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS106	Land west of Thatcher Place	Adjacent to BA38 (land at Whitelands Cottage) and BA39 (Land adj to Frederick Thatcher Place)	Neighbouring sites considered unsuitable on environmental grounds however no environmental designations on this site.	Take forward for proforma assessment

Site Ref.	Site Address	Within the SHLAA 2013?	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
BA NS107	North Lodge Land	Additional to BA12	Rural character and ancient woodland (Kelk Wood) but may be possible to develop small number of units around this.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS108	Land at Chain Lane, Battle between Watchoak House and Stone Cross, Chain Lane	Overlaps with portion of BA2	Access possible, potential loss of trees needs to be investigated.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS109	Site 1 Field east of Mount Street Car Park and south of lane leading to Little Park Farm		Proximity to amenities and town centre. New access needs to be established from country lane to the north which may not be possible to widen. AONB, Flood Risk management and woodland with high spatial priority on the site.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS110	Site 2 Field north of Upper Lake and St Mary the Virgin Church		Proximity to amenities and town centre. New access needs to be established from country lane to the north which may not be possible to widen. AONB, Flood Risk management and woodland with high spatial priority on the site.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS111	Site 3a Field north of Cherry Gardens allotment and east of Caldbec Hill		Potential access from Caldbec Hill with improvements to the road. Potential public pathway/rights of way across the site.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS112	Site 4 Field south of Hastings Road		The site is part of BA NS116.	Considered part of BA NS116.
BA NS113	Almony Farm	BA 18/44	Agree with SHLAA conclusions that site is not suitable.	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA NS114	Land south of Tesco	BA46 (Land at Glengorse Farm (south east)/BA54 (Land r/o Tesco Express, Battle Hill)	Agree with SHLAA conclusions that site is not suitable	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA NS115	Land South of 16 Virgins Lane	BA19	Agree with SHLAA conclusions that site is not suitable	Unsuitable for allocation in NP. Do not assess further.
BA NS116	Land at Loose Farm	BA28	Access possible from existing private road off Hastings Road. A number of assisted living and care homes along this private road.	Take forward for high level assessment
BA NS117	Site X		New Access would need to be established from country lane to the north which may not be possible to widen. Alternatively access may be possible from Mount Street Car Park.	Take forward for proforma assessment
BA NS118	Land to the NE of Cedarwood Care Home		No significant constraints identified.	Take forward for proforma assessment

Table 3.4: Sites submitted in Netherfield 'Call for Sites'

Site Ref.	Site Address	Within the SHLAA 2013?	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
NE NS101	Field to the east of B2096 and south of Netherfield Road on Ivyland Farm	No	No obvious constraints, take forward for assessment.	Take forward for proforma assessment
NE NS102	White House former poultry farm	Considered under NE 06 which concluded not suitable as above	Agree southern portion of site unsuitable due to loss of business but northern	Taken forward under NE06 High Level assessment.

Site Ref.	Site Address	Within the SHLAA 2013?	Sifting Comments	Sifting Result
			aspect may be suitable for development.	
NE NS103	Swallow Barn	Considered under NE5a and NE5r as discussed above.	Agree with conclusions	SHLAA Take forward as NE5a for high level assessment

The total number of sites collated was 78, where 43 sites were sifted out. Overall, 14 sites were assessed via proformas and 21 sites were taken forward to high level assessment. Of the 21 sites assessed at high level, the following have been grouped together (due to overlapping site boundaries):

- BA NS116 / BA28 / BA NS112;
- NE01/ NE05a/ NE11/ NE NS103; and
- NE06 / NE NS102.

**Figures 3-1 to 3-5** show all sites on maps to be taken forward in the assessment as high level or pro-forma level.




Figure 3-1: Sites to be taken forward in this assessment (Source: Google Earth and AECOM)




Figure 3-2: Sites to be taken forward in this assessment, Netherfield inset (Source: Google Earth and AECOM)




Figure 3-3: Sites to be taken forward in this assessment, Battle west inset (Source: Google Earth and AECOM)




Figure 3-4: Sites to be taken forward in this assessment, Battle east inset (Source: Google Earth and AECOM)



Figure 3-5: Sites to be taken forward in this assessment, Battle south inset (Source: Google Earth and AECOM)

## 4. High Level Assessments

This chapter assesses sites that have previously been found to be suitable in the SHLAA. These high level assessments take the SHLAA findings further, considering not only the suitability of sites for development, but whether the sites are appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, in terms of meeting both the housing requirement and Neighbourhood Plan objectives.

**Table 4.1** and **Table 4.2** sets out the high level site assessments. This includes the SHLAA conclusion regarding each SHLAA sites' 'developability', and the conclusions of this Neighbourhood Plan site assessment.

The final column 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. Green indicates the site is appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan. Amber indicates the site may be appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan if certain issues can be resolved or constraints mitigated.

All the sites are assumed to be available as they have either come forward in the SHLAA or have been promoted in the Battle 'call for sites' by the landowners or developers representing the landowners.

**Table 4.1: High Level Assessment for sites in Battle previously considered within the SHLAA 2013**

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
BA 28/ BA NS11 6 /BA NS11	Land at Loose Farm	Mixture	Battle Call for Sites and SHLAA (2013)	4.6 / 9 (wider BA28 site)	2-3 (based on the existing brownfield area)	Not suitable - Largely not suitable. Site is within attractive AONB countryside characteristic of the High Weald and enjoys long distance views. It predominantly comprises visually exposed landscape in southerly direction as far as Telham Lane and beyond. However, discrete smaller sections of far western fringes may prove suitable (if required) to serve the anticipated level of development via Glengorse. Majority of site is not currently accessible. ESCC Highways advise eastern access is not suitable due to substandard visibility in both directions. BA28 is also a fair distance (more than 1km) from services, the town centre and schools relative to other locations in Battle. No pavement or pedestrian access on south side of Hastings Road at present.	Northern section of SHLAA BA28 site has had an outline planning application dismissed at appeal (RR/1999/1391/P) for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 11 flats and 3 houses with alteration to access. The Inspector dismissed the application on the main issue of the proposal affecting the character and appearance of the High Weald AONB. The site occupies a prominent elevated position and the new dwellings here would be widely visible from the south.	The site is constrained by the natural topography of slopes. Access to the eastern boundary is constrained by a single narrow lane which has no safe pedestrian access along it. There is existing access on the western section of the site.  The site in the east also has fairly open views to the surrounding countryside. The site contains woodland and mature hedgerows, and is adjacent to Ancient Woodland, which may hold some ecological value.  Within Landscape Assessment (2009) it states that the area has low to moderate capacity to accept new housing development. The site is also within a 'Strategic Gap'. The Rother Local Plan (2006) states that development in strategic gaps will be carefully controlled and only in exceptional circumstances will development be permitted therein.	We agree with the SHLAA conclusions that majority of the site is not suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan.  The site has limited existing safe access. In addition, the site sits behind the current linear form of Battle and development here would undermine the historic shape of the village. In addition, the site is within a designated Strategic Gap.  The small portion of land that is existing brownfield (one dwelling and garden) may be suitable for redevelopment to accommodate 2-3 dwellings. This is a different part of the site from the dismissed planning application.
BA2	North West Battle, Broad Location	Mixture	SHLAA (2013)	Approximately 6.84 (broad location)	0	Broad location, comprising some areas of ad-hoc, low-density development accessed by poorly maintained private roads. Potential for redevelopment alongside highways improvements to adoptable standard.  (i) Land Off Chain Lane: Residential possibility. Site comprising very low density residential and backlands. Adjacent to development boundary	Only individual planning applications but no comprehensive redevelopment planning applications.	Other than the site being within AONB, there are no other environmental or heritage designations affecting the site.  There are small areas of TPO in the site. These should not be a constraint to development if the right mitigation is put in place.  As the site is exiting built up area,	The site is existing brownfield and greenfield land that has the potential for a comprehensive redevelopment with a better use of land space. However the site is currently in multiple ownership and would need a coordinated approach to bringing the site forward. In addition, as it is a broad location in the SHLAA, the availability of all of the land is



Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
						<p>and has advantage of good proximity to town centre, schools and shops. Constrained by groundwater source protection zone (north side only) and landscape, particularly on west side (although neighbouring Isherwood has already set a precedent). The area specifically highlighted as having some capacity in ESCC Landscape Assessment. ESCC Highways have identified two feasible access points, via Old Orchard or Wellington Gardens.</p> <p>(ii) Land off Vale Road. Backlands site within development boundary. Potential at rear of residential properties but also with a frontage onto Vale Road. ESCC Highways have noted the potential for development of the area to facilitate highways improvements, such as widening to be a shared surface and brought up to adoptable standard (which appears feasible on most sections and all sections fronting the site). Improvements would be dependent on a developer overseeing a comprehensive scheme.</p>		<p>the negative effect on the surrounding landscape would be minimal.</p> <p>unknown; therefore the site is not currently suitable for allocation.</p> <p>There may be opportunities for individual plots to be redeveloped, but this can be done through planning applications by individual landowners.</p>	
BA3	North Trade Road	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.47	14	<p>Suitable and developable. In line with previous 2006 Local Plan allocation. South half already developed. Northern section still to be developed. Some viability concerns regarding access ransom strip (via existing development) to be resolved via discussion between owners.</p>	None.	<p>The site has several large mature trees on the boundaries. Some of these would potentially need removing to provide access to the site. This could have a negative impact on the ecological value of the site.</p> <p>However landscape views are contained on this site, and therefore landscape sensitivity is low.</p>	<p>The site is potentially suitable for allocation and in line with a previous allocation. There are no environmental designations affecting the site and landscape views are contained within the site.</p> <p>However, suitable access through the ransom strip will need to be confirmed.</p>



Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
								The site is adjacent to a listed building to the west. However existing vegetation provides screening.	
BA8	Station Approach, Battle	Brownfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.73	0	<p>Not suitable. Existing employment site near station that should remain in business use. However, there is scope for a comprehensive and employment led redevelopment scheme for the entire vicinity comprising sites BA66, BA8, BA43, Station Approach, access to Marley Lane, the station car parks and possibly even land immediately east of the railway line at West Blackfriars.</p> <p>Piecemeal development and/or net loss of employment floorspace would not be acceptable in planning terms and this site (or part therein) is not suitable for residential in isolation.</p> <p>Station Approach access is problematic as narrow single carriageway due to presence of parking bays on both side of the road - it therefore has potential for widening if replacement parking area can be found elsewhere in the vicinity of the station. Secondary access to Marley Lane via BA8 would require further investigation. Further investigations of the most effective use of land at Station Approach (particularly for employment floorspace) may also examine the potential to rationalise and improve car parking provision.</p>	None relevant.	<p>No landscape concerns due to the site being an existing brownfield site.</p> <p>Battle station is a Listed Building. The design of new development may need to take the setting of this Listed Building into account.</p> <p>There are no environmental designations affecting the site.</p>	<p>Not suitable for housing as the existing employment use would need to remain. Policy EC3 of the adopted Core Strategy (2014) states 'land and premises currently (or last) in employment use will be retained in such use unless it is demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of its continued use for employment purposes'. Therefore, as the site is in existing active employment use, it would be against adopted policy to redevelop the site for housing.</p> <p>However, if the site is demonstrated not to be viable for economic use then the site can be considered for a mixed use scheme, as outlined in Policy EC3.</p>
BA11	Land at Blackfriars (includes	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	7.3	250	A suitable and developable site and also a live application site. RR/2007/1896/P - Outline application	RR/2007/1896/P Outline erection of up to 245 dwellings delegated to approve in	<p>- The site has previously been allocated in the Local Plan in 2006. The reason why previous applications failed was the</p>	As a result, this previous support to allocate the site by the Council, and now the recent funding results in the site being suitable

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
	3 separate areas)			separate sites as a whole)		<p>'Delegated to Approve' in Dec 2007 (principally for a legal agreement). BA11 comprises 3 discrete sections, two on the west and one on the east, approximately corresponding to the net developable area for housing. BA11 is part of wider allocation comprising areas of woodland/informal open space and a parallel allocation (SHLAA site BA49) that was previously for a primary school but is now appropriate to reserve for community/educational/religious purposes.</p> <p>The delegation to approve in 2007 was for up to 245 dwellings, new spine road, public open space, provision of land for primary school, play area). Blackfriars was previously allocated in 2006 for housing, education and open space purposes in 2006 Local Plan (3 Distinct housing areas of allocation separated by open space, school and road). Re-assessment of site suitability confirms Local Plan 2006 allocation conclusions regarding net developable areas.</p>	December 2007 – not built out.	<p>infrastructure cost of a new road linking Hastings Road and Marley Lane was a barrier to developers, but was required for the development to come forward. The various landowners could not agree on paying for this new road between them.</p> <p>However in February 2018, the Government allocated £3,240,000 to Rother District Council to create road infrastructure to allow 250 homes to be built at the Blackfriars site.</p>	<p>for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan for 250 dwellings.</p> <p>The site is currently adopted in Policy BT2 of the 2006 Local Plan for 220 dwellings. However, once the Development and Site Allocations (DaSA) Local Plan is adopted, it is understood that this policy will be superseded. Therefore, this site can be allocated within the NP and this would not be repeating existing policy (assuming the DaSA passes the upcoming examination). This should be discussed with RDC to ensure there is no double counting of housing figures or allocations between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
BA23	Land r/o 26 Hastings Road	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.75	70 (in combination with BA31a)	<p>Potentially suitable and developable for residential, possibly with associated amenity open space/ play area. BA23 comprises two residential gardens.</p> <p>Close to station and A2100. Access requires more detailed investigation. The Highways Authority have indicated a preference for access via Glengorse, which seems likely to limit scale of development to sites BA31</p>	None relevant.	<p>The site is within a wider area in the Landscape Assessment (2009) which was assessed as low to moderate capacity to accept more housing.</p> <p>The site is within a 'Strategic Gap'. The Rother Local Plan (2006) states that development in strategic gaps will be carefully controlled and only in exceptional circumstances will development</p>	<p>The site is potentially suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan, combined with BA31a. Without BA31a there is no viable access. A combined site BA23 and BA31a would represent a large extension to the existing settlement and careful consideration would be needed to understand the impact on the setting of the AONB and the adopted 'Strategic Gap'</p>

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
						and BA23. Therefore BA23 would need to be developed in association with adjacent BA31a. The existing tree belt boundary with SHLAA site BA31a (which connects to Glengorse) is an obstacle - development should minimise and mitigate tree loss and access would need to be via the least valued immature trees. Glengorse, at present, suffers from commuter parking and therefore as part of this development a relevant traffic management scheme should be explored.		be permitted therein.	designation that the site is in.
BA31a	Land at Glengorse Farm (North)	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	1.58	70 (in combination with BA23)	The site is suitable and developable. Although within AONB and strategic gap, site is also adjacent to development boundary, close to convenience shop, not far from train station. Although large sections of the land at Glengorse (BA31r) are not suitable, this particular section BA31a is well contained and screened from the wider landscape, as is neighbouring BA23 which could be developed concurrently, ideally providing pedestrian/cycle access north to the Hastings Road at the same time. Vehicle access via Glengorse, which, at present, suffers from commuter parking and therefore as part of this development a relevant traffic management scheme should be explored. A development of the scale described will require associated amenity open space, possibly a children's play area - although this offers a somewhat peripheral location for the latter.	None.	The site is within a wider area in the Landscape Assessment (2009) which was assessed as low to moderate capacity to accept more housing.  The site is within a 'Strategic Gap'. The Rother Local Plan (2006) states that development in strategic gaps will be carefully controlled and only in exceptional circumstances will development be permitted therein.	The site is potentially suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan, combined with BA23. Access would require a more detailed investigation. However, the site is within the strategic gap and would represent a large incursion into AONB. A smaller portion of the site, adjacent to the existing settlement, may be more suitable as it would minimise the impact on these constraints. Therefore we recommend that the capacity should be lower than the SHLAA figure of 70 dwellings (combined with BA23).
BA36	Land at Caldbec	Mixed	SHLAA (2013)	2.0	10 (based on the existing)	The site is not considered suitable for allocation. Undeveloped valley side	None relevant.	The site is a historic field which carries a long established history	Only the existing built area of the site is considered suitable for

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
	House, Caldbeck Hill				brownfield area)	<p>which forms important rural setting to northernmost part of town. This land reads as part of the surrounding countryside allied with BA20 and BA42, which are contiguous with one another.</p> <p>Past development on Caldbeck Hill has been entirely linear and development of this site would represent a departure from the historic morphology. High Weald AONB historic field boundary bisects site, closely reflecting the rear of existing</p>		<p>for the community of Battle.</p> <p>The undeveloped part of the site has no existing access. The road from the town centre has no safe pedestrian route either.</p> <p>There is a slight slope on the site and trees and hedgerows on the boundaries which could hold ecological value. However all the views into and out of the site have existing screening.</p> <p>The undeveloped part of the site is within the Landscape Assessment (2009) area that was assessed as low to no capacity to accept new housing.</p> <p>There are a couple of Listed Buildings to the west of the site. Due to existing screening though, new development here should not affect the setting of these Listed Buildings.</p>	<p>redevelopment to accommodate additional housing.</p> <p>The remaining part of the site has limited existing access. It is also an historic field which holds a long established history for Battle, and development here would represent a departure from the historic morphology of the surrounding area.</p>
BA40	Land adjacent to 73 North Trade Road	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	1.56	25 (taken from the 2017 Planning Application)	<p>Suitable and developable infill opportunity subject to further investigation, although not without constraints.</p> <p>This particular section of North Trade Road has seen much recent development, albeit on the north side of the road, and benefits from an adjacent bus stop. ESCC Landscape Assessment commented "Some potential infill but retaining some open views from the ridge is important". The topography is such that this site sits well below the level of the road and a well-designed layout should</p>	<p>The site has an outline planning application currently being decided (RR/2017/2390/P) for the erection of up to 25 dwellings including affordable housing and creation of new access off North Trade Road. Moreover, the report to Planning Committee in May 2018 recommends for the planning application to be granted subject to a s106 planning obligation being</p>	<p>SHLAA conclusions are thorough; therefore no more analysis has been made on this site.</p>	<p>The recommendation from the planning officers for the approval of the outline planning application suggests that the site is suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>



Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
						ensure preservation of some gap/views. Trees at frontage should be retained as far as possible, subject to site access. Boundary planting would be necessary at southern boundary to limit landscape impact. The southern sections of the site are unlikely to be suitable for built development so as to avoid overly compromising the prevailing built form morphology on the southern side of North Trade Road. BAP Habitat standard pond on west of site should be retained in public amenity land.	granted.		
BA42	Land at Fuller's Farm, Mount Street	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	5.93	0	The site is not considered suitable for development. Wholly rural, undulating landscape, that 'reads' as part of the open countryside. Remote from town centre and services. Heritage constraints, ASA and criss-crossed by historic field boundaries.	None.	The existing access is from a bridleway, therefore this would need upgrading to be suitable for development. Powerlines go along the southern boundary which may affect the site developable area.  There are views into the surrounding open countryside to the north. The field also has a slope. The Landscape Assessment (2009) considered the wider area to only have low capacity for new housing in the form of infill development. Development of this site would not be considered infill development.  There are some mature trees and hedgerows on the site boundaries which may have some ecological potential.  Aside from the AONB, there are no other environmental or heritage designations that affect	The site is not considered suitable for allocation. The site 'reads' as part of the open countryside that is within an area considered only suitable for infill development. The site is also remote from the town centre and services, with existing access only from a bridleway.



Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
								the site.	
BA43	Senlac Storage, Station Approach	Brownfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.88	0	<p>Existing employment site near station that should remain in business use. However, there is scope for a comprehensive redevelopment scheme for the entire vicinity comprising sites BA66, BA8, BA43, Station Approach, access to Marley Lane, the station car parks and possibly even land immediately east of the railway line at West Blackfriars.</p> <p>Station Approach access is problematic as narrow single carriageway due to presence of parking bays on both side of the road - it therefore has potential for widening if replacement parking area can be found elsewhere in the vicinity of the station.</p> <p>This may be necessary to enable development of any significant scale and would therefore inevitably add to the cost of development and raise questions regarding viability.</p> <p>Further investigations of the most effective use of land at Station Approach (particularly for employment floorspace) will also examine the potential to rationalise and improve car parking provision. There is a possible need for a Battle Parking Strategy covering a wider area.</p>	<p>RR/2012/1295/P Change of use of the office building to mixed C3 residential and B1 office accommodation to provide live/work unit, associated parking, amenity space, fenestration alterations, re-cladding and a single storey link structure – approved conditionally 29<sup>th</sup> August 2012.</p>	<p>– No landscape concerns due to the site being an existing brownfield site.</p> <p>Battle station is a Listed Building. The design of new development may need to take the setting of this Listed Building into account.</p> <p>There are no environmental designations affecting the site.</p>	<p>Not suitable for housing as the existing employment use would need to remain.</p> <p>Policy EC3 of the adopted Core Strategy (2014) states 'land and premises currently (or last) in employment use will be retained in such use unless it is demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of its continued use for employment purposes'. Therefore, as the site is in existing active employment use, it would be against adopted policy to redevelop the site for housing.</p> <p>However, if the site is demonstrated not to be viable for economic use then the site can be considered for a mixed use scheme, as outlined in Policy EC3.</p>
BA65	Market Square Broad Location	Brownfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.51	Approx 4 based on the existing building footprint	Broad location in the SHLAA. Market Square has potential for retail led regeneration scheme, with potential to include some enabling residential apartments alongside development. This site offers the most sequentially	None relevant.	Existing hardstanding area used for parking, market and some retail. This area acts as a public open space and is important to the residents of Battle.	The site is potentially suitable for a small amount of residential as part of a retail led mixed use scheme

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
-----------	--------------	---	-------------	----------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	----------------------	--



preferable option to accommodate the town's retail need for 1000sq.m of convenience floorspace, as set out in Policy BA1 (vi), supported by Policy EC7. Area is indicative only - The actual area of 'broad location' for regeneration and rationalisation may actually be larger, incorporating a wider area in the vicinity of Battle Roundabout in practice.

BA66	Land south of Station Approach	Brownfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.22	0				
------	--------------------------------	------------	--------------	------	---	--	--	--	--



Existing employment site near station that should remain in business use, in line with Policy EC3. As per BA8 there is scope for a comprehensive redevelopment scheme for the entire vicinity comprising sites BA66, BA8, BA43, Station Approach, access to Marley Lane, the station car parks and possibly even land immediately east of the railway line at West Blackfriars. Such regeneration should be employment led in this location, but may require a small amount of residential development as part of an overall intensification of the area (which would count as a large site windfall in the event of taking place).

None relevant.

Existing MOT Garage. There is existing suitable access, with limited mature trees on the boundaries. There is a slight slope on the site.

Not suitable for housing as the existing employment use would need to remain.

Policy EC3 of the adopted Core Strategy (2014) states 'land and premises currently (or last) in employment use will be retained in such use unless it is demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of its continued use for employment purposes'. Therefore, as the site is in existing active employment use, it would be against adopted policy to redevelop the site for housing.

However, if the site is demonstrated not to be viable for economic use then the site can be considered for a mixed use scheme, as outlined in Policy EC3.

**Table 4.2: High Level Assessment for sites in Netherfield**

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Material	Neighbourhood (AECOM) Site Assessment	Plan Conclusions
NE01/NE05a/NE11/NE13	Land south of Darvel Down	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.88/0.34/0.11/1.33 in total	25 (based on the planning permission)	All three sites are a preferred area for a comprehensively extension to Netherfield village. In reasonable proximity to primary school, shop/PO and bus service. Landscape impact is limited to a short distance, with views only from the western side. ESCC landscape officer commented "High quality development in a strong landscape setting could enhance the local landscape character. Areas visually contained from wider AONB" (Sept 2010).	RR/2017/941/P – Outline erection of up to 30 dwellings – Refused and appeal dismissed 17th October 2018 (only on NE1). Refused at planning because: the density of the proposed development is significantly greater than the existing adjacent estate and therefore would result in cramped and undesirably dense, overdevelopment of this small site at odds and out of character with the historic core of Darvel Down. In addition, the proposed vehicular access arrangements submitted are unsatisfactory and would fail to provide adequate and safe manoeuvring space for large vehicles from the narrow carriageway of Darvel Down. It would result in the loss of several on street parking spaces. The proposed access would also harm the future viability of or involve the total loss of a mature oak tree.	The SHLAA conclusions are extensive. No new material considerations can be added.		Originally, the sites (in combination) were considered suitable for allocation. However, recent outline planning permission on just NE01 (since the initial site assessment of this group of sites) would indicate that the development of NE05a and NE11 would no longer be suitable. Therefore only the allocation of NE01 is considered suitable for allocation.	
						The Highways Authority will only accept vehicle access from north onto Darvel Down, and not southwards onto B2096 for safety reasons. Public transport provision is poor, and reaching the bus stop currently involves lengthy detour for pedestrians. This issue may be addressed by new more direct pedestrian access via NE5 to B2096 and bus stops. Permeability for pedestrians/cycles is key from both NE1 and NE5, layout needs to allow access to east (school, shop, open space), north (footpaths and wider residential area) and south (bus routes, pub).	RR/2017/2308/P – Outline erection of 25 dwellings – Approved conditionally on 22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2018 (only on NE1) – same scheme as			As this site has planning permission, it does not need to be allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan as it already counts towards and fulfils the housing requirement for Netherfield. However, BTC may wish to allocate this site in support of development here in case the planning permission is not implemented.	



Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield/Mixture)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Capacity (no. dwellings)	SHLAA Conclusion (2014)	Planning History	Other Considerations	Material	Neighbourhood (AECOM) Site Conclusions	Plan Assessment
-----------	--------------	---	-------------	----------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	----------------------	----------	--	-----------------

point. above but for five less dwellings.

NE06/NE NS10 2	White House Poultry Farm	Mixed	SHLAA (2013)	3.15	36 (based on the greenfield area)	Not suitable. Valued business use, predominantly single storey. Two storey buildings would have a landscape impact. Loss of existing rural business. Unsustainable development boundary extension. AONB, ESCC Notified Mineral Site, Setting listed building issues.	None relevant.				
----------------	--------------------------	-------	--------------	------	-----------------------------------	--	----------------	--	--	--	--



The site is mostly flat land consisting of business use in the south and fallow agricultural land in the north. The site has existing suitable access.

The site has existing screening on the boundaries from mature trees.

The site is adjacent to a Listed Building which may require some mitigation.

Even though the SHLAA concluded that this site is not suitable for development, we consider that the northern part of the site is potentially suitable. However, it should only be considered as an allocation for a 'reserve' or contingency site to be released if the other Netherfield sites do not come forward. If the site is allocated, the impact on the AONB would need to be carefully considered and discussed with Rother District Council before considering it as a 'reserve' site for allocation.

Sensitive design would be required to minimise impact on the setting of the adjacent Listed Building. In addition, suitable access to the northern part of the site would need to be confirmed, so it does not affect the existing business use on site.

## 5. Site Assessment

The site assessment should be viewed in the context of the adopted and emerging planning policy documents of Rother District Council. This includes the adopted Rother Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), the saved policies from the Local Plan 2006, and the emerging Development and Site Allocations (DaSA) Local Plan. Battle has been allocated a housing target of 475-500 in the emerging DaSA. The Neighbourhood Plan has been given the responsibility to allocate sites suitable for development to meet this housing requirement.

Battle Town Council have confirmed with Rother District Council that the remaining housing requirement, taken into account outstanding commitments and schemes which have not yet been implemented, including the Blackfriars Site, is 78 dwellings for Battle and 23 dwelling for Netherfield, 101 dwellings in total up to 2028.

A number of sites were assessed to consider whether they would be appropriate for allocation in the Battle Neighbourhood Plan. These included sites considered in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2013); and sites resulting from the Neighbourhood Plan 'Call for Sites'.

Initially, there were 78 sites in total from both sources. 65 of these were in Battle and 13 in Netherfield. Due to the number of sites, a sift was undertaken to rule out the sites that were clearly unsuitable for development. The sites sifted out were those that were assessed as unsuitable within the SHLAA, where the conclusions were still relevant, and sites that clearly contradicted national planning policy or environmental designations.

The sifting stage resulted in 43 sites being sifted out, leaving 35 sites taken forward for assessment. These were either assessed at a high level (21 sites), because they had already been assessed in the SHLAA, or at a more detailed level through pro-formas (14 sites), to establish whether they would be appropriate for allocation in the Battle Neighbourhood Plan.

**Table 5.1** sets out a summary of the site assessments. This includes the development capacity of each site if found suitable, the conclusions of this Neighbourhood Plan site assessment, and a 'traffic light' rating. **Table 5.1** should be read alongside the completed pro-formas presented in **Appendix A** and the high level assessments in **Chapter 4**.

The 'traffic light' rating for each site indicates whether the site is appropriate for allocation. Red indicates the site is not appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan. Green indicates the site is appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan. Amber indicates the site may be appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan if certain issues can be resolved or constraints mitigated.

Table 5.1: Site Assessment Summary Table (35 sites taken forward)

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/Brownfield)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Capacity (no. dwellings)	Assessment Method	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
BA2	North West Battle, Broad Location	Mixture	SHLAA (2013)	Approximately 6.84	0	High Level Assessment	The availability of the site is unknown; therefore it is not currently appropriate for allocation.
BA3	North Trade Road	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.47	14	High Level Assessment	The site is potentially suitable for allocation. There are no environmental designations affecting the site and landscape views are contained within the site. However, suitable access through the ransom strip would need to be confirmed.
BA8	Station Approach, Battle	Brownfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.73	0	High Level Assessment	Not suitable for housing as the existing employment use would need to remain, according to Policy EC3 of the adopted Core Strategy (2014).
BA11	Land at Blackfriars (includes 3 separate areas)	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	7.3 (all three separate sites as a whole)	250	High Level Assessment	The previous support to allocate the site by the Council, and now the recent funding results in the site being suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan for 250 dwellings. However this should be discussed with RDC to ensure there is no double counting of housing figure or allocations between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan.
BA23	Land r/o 26 Hastings Road	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.75	70 (in combination with BA31a)	High Level Assessment	The site is potentially suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan, combined with BA31a. Without BA31a there is no viable access. A combined site BA23 and BA31a would represent a large extension to the existing settlement and careful consideration would be needed to understand the impact on the setting of the AONB and the adopted 'Strategic Gap' designation that the site is in.
BA25	Land at Lillybank Farm, London Road	Mixture	Battle Call for Sites and SHLAA (2013)	3.28	50 (as per planning application)	Proforma Assessment	Planning permission granted for 50 dwellings including associated open space, access and landscaping. As this site has planning permission, it does not need to be allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan as it already counts towards the housing requirement for Battle. However, BTC may wish to allocate this site in support of development here in case the planning permission is not implemented. The housing supply figures should not be double counted with the LPA housing land supply.
BA NS116 / BA28	Land at Loose Farm	Mixture	Battle Call for Sites and SHLAA (2013)	4.6 / 9 (wider BA28 site)	2-3 (based on the existing brownfield area)	High Level Assessment	Majority of site is unsuitable however there is a small portion of land that is existing brownfield (one dwelling and garden) may be suitable for redevelopment to accommodate 2-3 dwellings.

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/ Brownfield)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Capacity (no. dwellings)	Assessment Method	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
BA31a	Land at Glengorse Farm (North)	Mixture	SHLAA (2013)	1.58	70 (in combination with BA23)	High Level Assessment	The site is potentially suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan, combined with BA23. Access would require a more detailed investigation. However, the site is within the strategic gap and would represent a large incursion into AONB. A smaller portion of the site, adjacent to the existing settlement, may be more suitable as it would minimise the impact on these constraints. Therefore we recommend that the capacity should be lower than the SHLAA figure of 70 dwellings (combined with BA23).
BA36	Land at Caldbeck House, Caldbeck Hill	Mixed	SHLAA (2013)	2.0	10 (based on the existing brownfield area)	High Level Assessment	Only the existing built up area of the site is considered suitable for redevelopment to accommodate a greater number of dwellings. The remaining part of the site has limited existing access. It is also an historic field with historical significance for Battle, and development here would represent a departure from the historic morphology of the surrounding area.
BA40	Land adjacent to 73 North Trade Road	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	1.56	25 (taken from the 2017 Planning Application)	High Level Assessment	The recommendation from the planning officers for the approval of the outline planning application suggests that the site is suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan.
BA42	Land at Fuller's Farm, Mount Street	Greenfield	SHLAA (2013)	5.93	0	High Level Assessment	The site is not considered suitable for allocation. The site 'reads' as part of the open countryside that is within an area considered only suitable for infill development. The site is also remote from the town centre and services, with existing access only from a bridleway.
BA43	Senlac Storage, Station Approach	Brownfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.88	0	High Level Assessment	Not suitable for housing as the existing employment use would need to remain, according to Policy EC3 of the adopted Core Strategy (2014).
BA65	Market Square, Broad Location	Brownfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.51	4 (based on existing built footprint)	High Level Assessment	The site is potentially suitable for a small amount of residential as part of a retail led mixed use scheme
BA66	Land south of Station Approach	Brownfield	SHLAA (2013)	0.22	0	High Level Assessment	Not suitable for housing as the existing employment use would need to remain, according to Policy EC3 of the adopted Core Strategy (2014).
BA NS101	Land at the Ceders, Telham Lane	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	2.1	0	Proforma Assessment	Site considered unsuitable for allocation due to the likelihood of suitable access being created to the site. If suitable access could be confirmed this could be allocated in the future.

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/ Brownfield)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Capacity (no. dwellings)	Assessment Method	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
BA NS102	Squirrel Field	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	8.8	0	Proforma Assessment	Site has steep topography and impact on landscape considered to be too high. Location does not relate well to existing settlement and development of the entire site would represent major development in the AONB.
BA NS103	Land to the east of Battle (west of Great Wood) Marley Lane	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	0.78	Approx. 2	Proforma Assessment	Site potentially suitable for a small number of 'infill' dwellings on the western boundary adjacent to Marley Lane, allowing the character and form of the settlement to be retained. The site contains mature trees and the eastern part of the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat area and partly Flood Zones 2 and 3 which are likely to reduce the developable area of the site. Site currently has planning permission for one dwelling and garage RR/2019/241/P.
BA NS105	Saxon Hill Farm	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	4.92	0	Proforma Assessment	No current access to site without passing on another sites land. Until access can be confirmed the site is considered not suitable.
BA NS106	Land west of Thatcher Place	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	1.31	0	Proforma Assessment	Existing tree coverage of whole site means unsuitable for allocation.
BA NS107	North Lodge Land	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	0.4	0	Proforma Assessment	Removal of large tracts of mature trees unlikely to be supported by LPA.
BA NS108	Land at Chain Lane, Battle between Watchoak House and Stone Cross, Chain Lane	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	0.38	7-8	Proforma Assessment	Potentially suitable for allocation but does have significant landscape sensitivity to development. Access also not confirmed due to Chain Lane's ownership being unknown.
BA NS109	Site 1 Field east of Mount Street Car Park and south of lane leading to Little Park Farm	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	1.39	0	Proforma Assessment	Landscape has a high sensitivity to development, as per the Market Towns and Villages Landscape Assessment (2009) and lack of access except through existing car park, which may be third party land. Site also on a steep slope.
BA NS110	Site 2 Field north of Upper Lake and St Mary the Virgin Church	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	5.25	0	Proforma Assessment	No suitable access to site. Landscape has a high sensitivity to development. In a steep sided bowl landscape and is accessible countryside to the town and highly valued.
BA NS111	Site 3a Field north of Cherry Gardens allotment and east of	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	1.8	0	Proforma Assessment	Landscape has a high sensitivity to development. In a steep sided bowl landscape and is accessible countryside to the town and highly

Site Ref.	Site Address	Site Type (Greenfield/ Brownfield)	Site Source	Site Area (Ha)	Capacity (no. dwellings)	Assessment Method	Neighbourhood Plan (AECOM) Site Assessment Conclusions
	Caldbec Hill						valued. Long views to the church and gatehouse.
BA NS117	Site X, Caldbec Hill	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	1.63	16	Proforma Assessment	Site is unlikely to be suitable for development due to sensitive landscape.
BA NS118	Land to the NE of Cedarwood Care Home	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	0.64	3-4	Proforma Assessment	Whilst the site is considered poorly located and within an area of moderate sensitivity to landscape changes, the site is considered appropriate for limited infill development.
NE01/NE05a/NE11/NENS103	Land south of Darvel Down	Mixed	SHLAA (2013)	1.33  (in total between the three sites)	25 (based on the planning permission)	High Level Assessment	<p>Originally, the sites (in combination) were considered suitable for allocation. However, recent outline planning permission on just NE01 (since the initial site assessment) would indicate that the development of NE05a and NE11 would no longer be suitable. Therefore only the allocation of NE01 is considered suitable for allocation.</p> <p>As this site has planning permission on it, it does not need to be allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan as it already counts towards the housing requirement for Battle. However, BTC may wish to allocate this site in support of development here in case the planning permission is not built out.</p>
NE06/NENS102	White House Poultry Farm	Mixed	SHLAA (2013)	3.15	36 (based on the greenfield area)	High Level Assessment	Even though the SHLAA concluded that this site is not suitable for development, we consider that the northern part of the site is potentially suitable. However, it should only be considered as an allocation for a 'reserve' or contingency site to be released if the other Netherfield sites do not come forward. If the site is allocated, the impact on the AONB would need to be carefully considered and discussed with Rother District Council before considering it as a 'reserve' site for allocation.
NE NS101	Field to the east of B2096 and south of Netherfield Road on Ivyland Farm	Greenfield	Battle Call for Sites	3.1	0	Proforma Assessment	The site is considered unsuitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan because of landscape sensitivity issues. There are significant views from the site onto the surrounding countryside and the landscape has been assessed to have low capacity to accommodate change.

## 6. Conclusion

### 6.1 Site Assessment Conclusion and Local Criteria Assessment

The assessment has found that there are five sites<sup>9</sup> suitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan. These sites include the Blackfriars site, which has outstanding planning permission and investment from the government for a new link road, sites with recent planning permission and sites suitable for a small amount of infill development.

Ten sites<sup>10</sup> were found to be potentially suitable to be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan, if identified issues could be resolved or mitigated. Constraints include lack of suitable access, departure from the historic form of the town, and high landscape sensitivity to development.

Fourteen sites are not considered suitable/available for allocation. A number of sites were considered to have a high enough landscape sensitivity to change that they would not be able to accommodate new housing development. Other constraints include; sites being remote from the town centre and services, suitable access not being available, steep topography, tree coverage on the whole of the site, sites being put forward for mixed-use and sites where availability is unknown.

The site assessment therefore shows that there are fifteen sites potentially suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the number of sites and the development capacity far exceeds the residual housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore a set of local criteria have been applied to each site rated as green and amber, to see what sites are best placed in meeting the Neighbourhood Plan principles and objectives, as shown in **Table 6.1**.

These criteria were developed by Battle Town Council and are Battle specific. However it must be noted that the below table only indicates which sites are better placed to meet the Neighbourhood Plan vision and objectives. The findings of the site assessment should be discussed with the Rother District Council and a site selection process should involve community consultation. However, all sites listed in Table 6.2 as suitable or potentially suitable can be included in the site selection process.

---

<sup>9</sup> This includes the three separate sites at Blackfriars (BA11) and sites NE01, NE05a and NE11 assessed as one site and counted as one in this total.

<sup>10</sup> This includes sites BA NS116 and BA28 being assessed together as they cover the same portion of land, and therefore counted as one in this total.

**Table 6.1: Local Criteria Assessment**

Site Ref.	Site Assessment Suitability Rating	High-level Principle: Traffic Impact (all assumptions are high level and not verified by technical transport specialists)	Local Site Criteria: Site should have road access to the existing network	Local Site Criteria: Minimal impact on vegetation	Local Site Criteria: Minimal impact on existing views	Local Site Criteria: Environmental and historic designations	Local Site Criteria: Sites that are considered to be 'brownfield' shall be preferred for selection	Other Criteria: Strategic Gap	Rating for sites most likely to meet the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives
BA3	Amber	The capacity of the site is relatively small; therefore development here should not significantly increase vehicle traffic.	Suitable access would need to be created which would result in the loss of mature trees on the boundaries.	The creation of suitable access would result in the loss of mature trees.	Landscape views are contained within the site.	Existing vegetation provides screening to the adjacent listed building.	Greenfield	Not within strategic gap	
BA11	Green	The new ring road proposed should alleviate potential traffic increases.	New ring road proposed already has funding approved.	Significant trees and vegetation on part of the site.	Views were not assessed on site visit.	None.	Greenfield	Not within strategic gap	
BA23	Amber	Site size, in combination with BA31a, is large enough to have traffic impacts. However the A2100 provides routes to both Battle and Hastings which should help distribute new traffic.	Access would require a more detailed investigation.	A large part of the site has trees and vegetation.	Views were not assessed on site visit.	None.	Greenfield	Not within strategic gap	
BA25	Green	The accompanying Transport Assessment to the planning permission concludes that the new development would have a negligible impact on the local highway network, with the traffic increase being just approximately 3% on	Existing access off Rowlands however enhanced access would be required if site were to come forward.	Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential.	All views are screened.	Flood zone 2 and 3 on edge of site and adjacent to some listed buildings.	Mixture	Not within strategic gap	

Site Ref.	Site Assessment Suitability Rating	High-level Principle: Traffic Impact (all assumptions are high level and not verified by technical transport specialists)	Local Site Criteria: Site should have road access to the existing network	Local Site Criteria: Minimal impact on vegetation	Local Site Criteria: Minimal impact on existing views	Local Site Criteria: Environmental and historic designations	Local Site Criteria: Sites that are considered to be 'brownfield' shall be preferred for selection	Other Criteria: Strategic Gap	Rating for sites most likely to meet the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives
		London Road during peak hours.							
BA NS116 / BA28	Amber	The capacity of the site is a relatively small figure, therefore should not significantly increase the concentration of vehicle traffic.	The part of the site seen as suitable has existing suitable access.	The part of the site seen as suitable has limited vegetation.	The site in the east has fairly open views to the surrounding countryside.	Adjacent to an area of Ancient Woodland and is within attractive AONB countryside characteristics of the High Weald.	Mixture	Not within strategic gap	
BA31a	Amber	Site size, in combination with BA23, is large enough to have traffic impacts. However the A2100 provides routes to both Battle and Hastings which should help distribute new traffic.	Access would require a more detailed investigation.	Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential.	Views were not assessed on site visit.	None.	Mixture	Not within strategic gap	
BA36	Amber	The capacity of the site is a relatively small figure, therefore should not significantly increase the concentration of vehicle traffic.	The brownfield part of the site has existing suitable access.	The part of the site seen as suitable has limited vegetation.	All the views into and out of the site have existing screening.	There is existing vegetation which provides screening for the adjacent listed buildings.	Mixed	Not within strategic gap	
BA40	Green	The accompanying Transport Assessment to the planning application concludes that the new development would have a	The outline planning application proposes suitable road access.	Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential.	Some views.	BAP Habitat standard pond on west portion of site.	Greenfield	Not within strategic gap	

Site Ref.	Site Assessment Suitability Rating	High-level Principle: Traffic Impact (all assumptions are high level and not verified by technical transport specialists)	Local Site Criteria: Site should have road access to the existing network	Local Site Criteria: Minimal impact on vegetation	Local Site Criteria: Minimal impact on existing views	Local Site Criteria: Environmental and historic designations	Local Site Criteria: Sites that are considered to be 'brownfield' shall be preferred for selection	Other Criteria: Strategic Gap	Rating for sites most likely to meet the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives
		minimal impact on the local highway network.							
BA NS103	Amber	The capacity of the site is a relatively small figure, therefore should not significantly increase the concentration of vehicle traffic.	There is potential to provide suitable vehicle access to the site.	Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential.	All views are screened.	The eastern half of the site is designated as High Spatial Priority Woodland Priority Habitat and within Flood Zone 2 and 3. The site is directly adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	Greenfield	Not within strategic gap	
BA NS108	Amber	The capacity of the site is a relatively small figure, therefore should not significantly increase the concentration of vehicle traffic.	The only access is off Chain Lane which is assumed to be privately owned (according to Battle Town Council). Access to the site would need to be confirmed.	Site includes some trees and is very overgrown which may have ecology potential.	There are fairly significant views to the surrounding countryside to the north of the site.	None.	Greenfield	Not within strategic gap	
BA NS117	Amber	The site's only access onto the public highway is Mount Street which may increase traffic due to the proximity to the town centre and one of the main car parks serving the town centre.	Vehicle access may exist as site is occasionally used as an overflow car park.	Site only has vegetation on the boundaries.	There are some exposed views.	Situated in close proximity to the high street which has a number of heritage assets along with Little Park Farmhouse (Grade II) and on the edge of the	Greenfield	Not within strategic gap	

Site Ref.	Site Assessment Suitability Rating	High-level Principle: Traffic Impact (all assumptions are high level and not verified by technical transport specialists)	Local Site Criteria: Site should have road access to the existing network	Local Site Criteria: Minimal impact on vegetation	Local Site Criteria: Minimal impact on existing views	Local Site Criteria: Environmental and historic designations	Local Site Criteria: Sites that are 'brownfield' shall be preferred for selection	Other Criteria: Strategic Gap	Rating for sites most likely to meet the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives
						Battle Conservation area.			
BA NS118	Green	The capacity of the site is a relatively small figure, therefore should not significantly increase vehicle traffic.	Site access already established although access would need to be enhanced.	Site has limited vegetation.	There are some moderate views out to the surrounding countryside from the site.	Listed building adjacent to the site.	Greenfield	Not within strategic gap	
NE01/NE05a/NE11	Green	The accompanying Transport Assessment to the planning permission concludes that the new development would have a minimal increase in traffic generation on the surrounding road network.	The outline planning permission proposes suitable road access.	Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential.	Area visually contained from wider AONB.	TPOS across site.	Mixed	Not within strategic gap	
NE06	Amber	The Transport Assessment on the adjacent site would indicate that development at this site would also have a minimal increase in traffic generation on the surrounding road network.	There is existing suitable access due to the existing business use.	Site only has vegetation on the boundaries.	The site has existing screening.	The site is adjacent to a Listed Building which may require some mitigation.	Mixed	Not within strategic gap	

## 6.2 Local Green Space Designations

Early discussions with BTC indicate that they are interested in protecting valued open spaces within their Neighbourhood Plan area. If the community wishes to include policies to protect open spaces in the Neighbourhood Plan, this can be done through a Local Green Space (LGS) designation. This can provide or protect green areas such as pocket parks, areas of recreational value, allotments or community gardens.

However the criteria used to justify these designations are less reliant on technical data, such as Magic Maps or Local Plan designations, and more on the understanding and knowledge of an area a local resident would have. Therefore it is recommended that BTC choose the sites they wish to allocate as Local Green Space designations, which would need to meet the criteria below (taken from the NPPF, July 2018):

- a) In reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; (i.e. whether it is in walkable distance from the community);
- b) Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and (this is normally based on local knowledge, and therefore this criteria is best evidenced by the Steering Group); and
- c) Local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

Local Green Space designations should not be used in a way to undermine the aim of plan making, in particular, the aim of plans identifying sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs. Further guidance can be found on Locality's 'Neighbourhood Planning Local Green Spaces: A toolkit for neighbourhood planners'<sup>11</sup>.

## 6.3 Next Steps

Assessing the sites against the Battle specific local criteria shows that there are four sites more suitable to meet the Neighbourhood Plan's vision and objectives. These are BA NS116 / BA28, BA36, NE01/NE05a/NE11 and NE06. Combined these could provide land for 73-74 dwellings (although NE01/NE05a/NE11 would not need to be allocated as it has recent planning permission on it and therefore the dwellings proposed count nevertheless towards meeting Battle's housing requirement).

The next steps would be for the Neighbourhood Plan group to select the preferred sites to meet the approximate housing requirement of 78 dwellings in Battle and 23 dwellings in Netherfield up to 2028. This excludes the housing requirement that will be met by the Blackfriars site (BA11)<sup>12</sup>.

Excluding the Blackfriars site (BA11), all the sites assessed as suitable could provide land for 103-104 dwellings. All the sites assessed as potentially suitable could provide land for 160-163 dwellings. However, we consider the SHLAA figures to be too high in some cases, for example Site BA31a, and that the overall achievable housing yield will therefore be lower.

The site selection process by Battle Town Council should be based on the following:

- The findings of this site assessment;
- Discussions with Rother District Council;
- The extent to which the sites support the vision and objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan; and
- The potential for the sites to meet identified infrastructure needs of the community, including through Community Infrastructure Levy contributions<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> Available at <https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/making-local-green-space-designations-neighbourhood-plan/>

<sup>12</sup> Confirmed to Battle Town Council by Rother District Council on the 25<sup>th</sup> April 2018 by email.

<sup>13</sup> Suffolk Coastal District Council adopted the CIL Charging Schedules in April 2016, available here <http://www.rother.gov.uk/CIL>

## 6.4 Viability

As part of the site selection process, it is recommended that the Steering Group discusses site viability with Rother District Council. Viability appraisals for individual sites may already exist. If not, it is possible to use the Council's existing viability evidence to test site viability. This can be done by 'matching' site typologies used in existing reports with sites proposed by the Steering Group, to give an indication of whether a site is viable for development and therefore likely to be delivered. In addition, any landowner or developer promoting a site for development should be contacted to request evidence of viability.

## Appendix A Completed Site Appraisal Pro-Formas

## Site Assessment Proforma

General information	
Site Reference / name	BANS101
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Land at the Ceders, Telham Lane
Current use	Agriculture (pasture) and garden
Proposed use	Residential
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	2.1
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	N/A
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Battle Town Council



Context				
<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	None relevant.			

## Suitability

<b>Suitability</b>	
<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	There is no existing vehicle access to this site. The creation of access would be difficult because of the topography and mature trees along Telham Lane.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	There are good size grass verges for pedestrian access along Telham Lane which provide some level of safe pedestrian access to the site. It would be recommended that these are improved for the site to be suitable for development. There are pedestrian paths along Hastings Road.

<b>Environmental Considerations</b>		
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Assessment guidelines</b>	<b>Observations and comments</b>
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Some impact and some potential mitigation required on the nearby SSSI</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>Adjacent to Priority Habitat – Deciduous woodland</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone. 200m south of Blackhorse Quarry SSSI. However there is existing screening from this SSSI.</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Some potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes some mature trees in the entrance and periphery which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>Moderate sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Located within High Weald AONB.</p> <p>Area identified as strategic gap on the Landscape Assessment.</p> <p>Close Proximity to area of Ancient Monuments 2006 and B4 (Glengorse/Telham) within the landscape assessment.</p> <p>The area is of typically broad rolling countryside as a setting for town and Battle Abbey from some aspects. There are some large fields and areas of paddocks around Glengorse. There are few detractors.</p>

		<p>Woodland and open pasture are characteristic with a well wooded appearance and open pasture between. There has been some loss of historic field pattern.</p> <p>Wider area is enclosed urban edge. Very quickly within countryside when away from the main road and away from the town and road noise.</p> <p>Low – Moderate capacity to accommodate change. Limited capacity close to the built up edge of ribbon development on the ridge. Any development further out would require substantial woodland planting to contain it in this area of remote countryside</p> <p>Scope to mitigate - Moderate/low. Some scope to strengthen garden edges on ridge. Scope to plant hedges and shaws/tree belts form new urban edge with woodland tree planting. This would screen long views out.</p> <p>The site has very open views to the surrounding countryside. Sea views can always be seen to the south due to the natural topography of the site. However development of the site would not block sea views for any other nearby property. Therefore the site has a moderate sensitivity to development.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p><b>Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land</b></p>	<p>Contains Grade 3 Good to Moderate Agricultural Land.</p>

*Heritage considerations*

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> </ul>	<p><b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b></p>	<p>There are no heritage assets or designations within the site.</p> <p>Telham High Farmhouse Grade II listed building situated within close proximity to the site although unlikely to pose a</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>Registered Battlefield</li> <li>Listed building</li> <li>Known archaeology</li> <li>Locally listed building</li> </ul>		significant constraint.
---	--	-------------------------

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>Employment location</li> <li>Public transport</li> <li>School(s)</li> <li>Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>Health facilities</li> <li>Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Moderately Located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>The site is approximately 2.72km away from the railway station however there is a bus stop within 350m and therefore public transport to the station and town centre.</p>
---	----------------------------------	--

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None	There are no TPOs; however there are mature trees surrounding the site which may restrict the area of development.	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Potentially as site includes some mature trees and adjacent to some woodland which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.	
Public Right of Way	None	No Public Rights of Way across the site	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	No community uses on site	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Telephone poles and lines across the site along Telham Lane which could easily be rerouted/or development can be built around the location of these lines.

**Characteristics**

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient</p>	<p><b>Two thirds of the site is flat and the remaining third has a steep slope on it. This would restrict some</b></p>

	<b>development on the site.</b>
<b>Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	<b>Potentially – site within area identified as strategic gap</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</b>	<b>No – if only a few dwellings proposed on the site</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	0
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is considered unsuitable for allocation. This is mainly due to the likelihood of suitable access being created to the site. However if a developer could confirm suitable access to the site, this site may be suitable for allocation in the future. If the group are interested in allocating this site, it would be recommended that they have discussions with</li> </ul>

	<p>the Highways Officer at the Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a steep slope on the site which also might restrict development.</li><li>• There is some safe pedestrian access to the site.</li><li>• There is some potential ecological value because of mature trees.</li><li>• There would be a moderate impact to the landscape because of development.</li><li>• No heritage designations would be affected.</li></ul>
--	---

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS102
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Squirrel Field
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture (pasture)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	8.8 ha
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council



### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None relevant on the Rother planning application search.			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access</b>	There is limited existing access to the site, but this is off a busy road. Safe access would need to be established from
---	--

<b>to be provided?</b>	the A271.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b> Provide details of site's connectivity	There is some level of safe pedestrian access from the town via small grass verges. However further enhancement would be required if this site was to come forward. The site is adjacent to bus stops with services to Battle.

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>		<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Adjacent to Priority Habitat - Ancient Woodland and Deciduous Woodland</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Potential value</b>	Site includes some mature trees in the entrance and periphery which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>High sensitivity to development</b>	<p>Landscape Character assessment – close proximity to area B1 Saxon Hill Farm/Claverham.</p> <p>Typically a heavily wooded rolling rural landscape. Few detractors apart from the busy road into Battle and distant pylons on the opposite ridge.</p> <p>Ribbon development extends along the main road out of Battle town. There are typically detached houses and some historic buildings (north lodge and old hospital). Large gardens extend down to rolling valleys and AONB countryside.</p> <p>Low capacity to accommodate change. Infill between houses only. Character of established gardens. Value of mature trees and garden character. This creates a soft edge to the</p>

		<p>AONB countryside difficult to replicate.</p> <p>Low scope to mitigate – little scope to change the edge of the built up area as it has a stable character. The long views should be retained – new planting would obscure them.</p> <p>There are very open views to the surrounding countryside, especially views to the south.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p><b>No loss</b></p>	<p>Contains land classified as non-agricultural land or poor.</p>

*Heritage considerations*

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p><b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b></p>	<p>No assets within site boundary. Nearest asset is Squirrel Farmhouse which is Grade II listed.</p>

*Community facilities and services*

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Moderately located</b></p>	<p>The site is moderately located at 1.7km from the railway station and centre with access to bus services with a bus stop approximately 214m away</p>

*Other key considerations*

<p>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>There are no TPOs; however there are mature trees surrounding the site which may restrict the area of development.</p>
--	--------------------	---

<b>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	Potentially as site includes some mature trees and adjacent to some woodland which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.	
<b>Public Right of Way</b>	<b>None</b>	A public right of way runs along the eastern boundary.	
<b>Existing social or community value (provide details)</b>	<b>No</b>	No community or social uses currently on the site	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Ground Contamination</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None
<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No visible infrastructure

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Steep slope southwards</b>
<b>Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</b>	<b>No – site access and scale would limit capacity to a couple of dwellings</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> <b>Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown

<b>Any other comments?</b>	
----------------------------	--

#### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

##### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	0
--	---

<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site is considered unsuitable for allocation.</li> <li>• The site has a steep topography which also emphasises the open views southwards. The impact on the landscape is considered to be too high.</li> <li>• The site is also separated from the main built up area of Battle and has limited safe pedestrian paths to the town centre.</li> <li>• It would be difficult to create safe access to the site because of the existing traffic on the A271.</li> </ul>
--	--

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS103
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land to the east of Battle (west of Great Wood) Marley Lane
<b>Current use</b>	Garden with small storage building
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	Approximately 0.78
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council



### Context

<p><b>Is the site:</b></p> <p>Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<p><b>Site planning history</b></p> <p>Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p> <p>Reference RR/2019/1355/P Status Undecided Proposal Variation of approved scheme RR/2019/241/P to propose alterations and extension of house and garage to include an infill extension to the rear of the dwelling together with the addition of a door and a log store to the garage. Decision By 09-08-19</p> <p>Reference RR/2019/241/P Status APPROVED CONDITIONAL</p>			

	<p>Proposal Proposed dwelling and garage. Decided 24-04-19</p> <p>Reference RR/2018/1897/P Status REFUSED Proposed dwelling &amp; garage. Decided 17-10-18</p>
--	--

## Suitability

### Suitability

<p><b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b></p>	<p>There is potential to upgrade existing access from Marley Lane.</p>
<p><b>Is the site accessible?</b></p> <p>Provide details of site's connectivity</p>	<p>There are no pedestrian footpaths and narrow isolated grass verges for pedestrian access from Battle town centre, therefore this would need to be enhanced if the site were to come forward. There is a bus stop just over 150m from the site.</p>

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>		<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Ground water Vulnerability – Drinking Water Protected Area, Drinking Water Safeguard Zone</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Directly adjacent to ancient woodland (Great Woods), Deciduous Woodland Priority habitat and a Forestry Commission Legal Boundary</p> <p>Flood Zone 2 and 3 partially in area</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Potential value</b></p>	<p>The site has some mature trees which could hold some potential ecological value. The eastern part of the site is within a Woodland Priority Habitat Network (Category: High Spatial Priority)</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p>	<p><b>Low sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Located within High Weald AONB.</p>

<p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>		All the views have existing screening.
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>No Loss</b>	Contains non-agricultural and poor quality agricultural land.

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</b>	<p>There are no heritage assets on the site or immediately surrounding the site.</p> <p>Nearest asset is Battle Great Barn (Grade II) and Marely House (Grade II)</p>

### Community facilities and services

Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):		Observations and comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<b>poorly located</b>	<p>The site is poorly located for access to services, situated approximately 1.7km from a railway station, the site has access to an irregular local bus services with a bus stop approximately 155m from the site. The site is greater than 800m away from all other local amenities.</p>

### Other key considerations

<p><b>Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?</b></p>	<b>No</b>	<p>There are a number of trees in and around the site some of which are within the Woodland Priority Habitat Network (Category: High Spatial Priority), although these are not</p>
---	-----------	--

		subject to a TPO.	
<b>What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	The site includes some mature trees on the site and is partially within a Woodland Priority Habitat, and adjacent to Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland which have the potential to have significant ecological value. A Phase 1 Habitat Survey would be required to assess development impact on these habitats.	
<b>Public Right of Way</b>	<b>Minimal constraint</b>	There is a public footpath along the eastern edge of site for pedestrians which would pose a limited constraint but would need to be maintained.	
<b>Existing social or community value (provide details)</b>	<b>No</b>	No existing community or social facilities on the site	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Ground Contamination</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No visible infrastructure on the site

<b>Characteristics</b>	
<b>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Gentle slope
<b>Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</b>	<b>No</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

<b>Availability</b>			
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown

<p><b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Any other comments?</b></p>			

#### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<p><b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>This site has minor constraints</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>The site has significant constraints</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Potential housing development capacity:</b></p>	<p>Less than the landowner capacity estimate of 8 dwellings due to potential reduction in developable area of the site due to flood risk and proximity within and to High Spatial Priority Woodland Habitats. Site is suitable for infill development of approx 2 dwellings.</p>
<p><b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site has potential to upgrade current access onto Marley Lane;</li> <li>• The site is poorly located with regard to local amenities and services;</li> <li>• The site contains mature trees with the eastern part of the site within a Woodland Priority Habitat Network (Category: High Spatial Priority) and Flood Zones 2 and 3, which will potentially reduce the developable area of the site;</li> <li>• The site is potentially suitable for approximately two infill dwellings on the western boundary along Marley Lane. The site currently has planning permission for one dwelling.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS105
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Saxon Hill Farm
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture (pasture)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	4.92
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	Land adjacent and additional to that within SHLAA site BA40
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council

### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None relevant on the Rother planning application search			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Existing dirt track access from North Trade Road however would require connection across land outside of the site boundary. Access would need to be enhanced for vehicles. Access would be dependent on BA40 also coming forward
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Pedestrian footpath along North Trade Road towards town and bus stop within close proximity to the site.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
-----------	-----------------------	---------------------------

<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Mitigation would be required</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Adjacent to Phipps Gill and Birchen Shaw Ancient and Semi Natural Woodland, and Priority Habitat – Deciduous Woodland</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Near Flood Zone 2 and 3</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b>          Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Some potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes trees and adjacent to ancient woodland which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>Medium sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Located within Character area B1.</p> <p>Typically a heavily wooded rolling rural landscape. There are few detractors apart from the busy road into Battle and distant pylons on the opposite ridge. Feature open pastures divided by neat hedges and extensive deciduous woodland. There is a remote countryside experience further away from the main road.</p> <p>Ribbon development extends along the main road out of Battle town. There are typically detached houses and some historic buildings (north lodge and old hospital). Large gardens extend down to rolling valleys and AONB countryside.</p> <p>Low capacity to accommodate change. Infill between houses only. Character of established gardens. Value of mature trees and garden character. This creates a soft edge to the AONB countryside difficult to replicate.</p> <p>Low scope to mitigate – little scope to change the edge of</p>

		the built up area as it has a stable character. The long views should be retained – new planting would obscure them.
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>No</b>	Contains poor quality agricultural land (grade 4)

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	<p>None on site however asset directly opposite – Battle Hospital including perimeter wall (Grade II)</p>

### Community facilities and services

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p>Moderately Located</p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>The site is 2.12km away from the high street but bus service can be accessed approximately 240m away</p>
---	---------------------------	---

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	<b>No</b>	No TPO directly within the site however some mature trees on site and around the site. Ancient woodland adjacent to the site.
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	<b>Unknown</b>	Potentially as site includes some trees and adjacent to woodland which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.
Public Right of Way	<b>None</b>	No Public Rights of Way across the site
Existing social or community value	<b>No</b>	No community uses on site

(provide details)			
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Ground Contamination</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None visible

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Undulating as per landscape assessment</b>
<b>Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</b>	<b>No – if only a few dwellings proposed on the site</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> <b>Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> <b>0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

**Conclusions**

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	0
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is currently not suitable for allocation.</li> <li>• There is no existing suitable access to the site without passing through another site's land. Until the access can be confirmed, the site cannot be considered suitable for allocation.</li> <li>• The site is also adjacent to Phipps Gill and Birchen Shaw Ancient and Semi Natural Woodland and therefore development would likely adversely affect these woodland and habitats within them.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BA NS106
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land west of Thatcher Place
<b>Current use</b>	Woodland
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	1.31
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A – situated between SHLAA sites BA38 and BA39
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council

### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None relevant on the Rother planning application search			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	There is existing suitable access from North Trade Road because of the adjacent new development.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Pedestrian footpath on the opposite side of the road along North Trade Road towards the town centre. There are also bus stops in close proximity to the site.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
-----------	-----------------------	---------------------------

<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Mitigation would be required</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Drinking Water Safeguard zone</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>National Forest Inventory Conifer Woodland</p> <p>Adjacent to Kelk Wood Ancient &amp; Semi-Natural Woodland and Priority Habitat – Deciduous Woodland</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>High potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes a number of mature trees which would most likely have ecology potential.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>Low to medium sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Landscape Area B12 - North of N. Trade Road, Kelkwood.</p> <p>Characterised by the wooded ridge on the north side of North Trade Road. The area has scattered ribbon development. Features include North Lodge and the old hospital.</p> <p>The area has scattered ribbon development. There are larger houses in bigger gardens than on south side of North Trade Road. More recently some tight infill estates have been built in cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>Moderate capacity to accommodate change. Some capacity as infill. This needs to be of a high quality and in character with the existing development. The countryside becomes more remote away from the road.</p> <p>Moderate scope to mitigate. Some scope to enhance and strengthen the existing wooded and garden character.</p>

		There are limited views from this site into the surrounding area.
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>No</b>	Contains poor quality (Grade 4) Land.

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Limited impact which may require some mitigation</b>	Adjacent to Battle Hospital (Grade II Listed), however this Listed Building is screened from the site because of the new development.

### Community facilities and services

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<b>Moderately Located</b>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>The site is approximately 1.96km away from the high street however there is a bus stop within 182m and therefore public transport to the station and town centre.</p>

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	<b>None</b>	There are no TPOs within the Site; however there are mature trees on and surrounding the site which may restrict the area of development.
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	<b>Highly likely</b>	Highly likely as site is inclusively woodland and is also adjacent to further woodland.
Public Right of Way	<b>None</b>	No Public Rights of Way across the site
Existing social or community value (provide details)	<b>No</b>	No community uses on site
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
		<b>Comments</b>

<i>any of the following?</i>			
<b>Ground Contamination</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Telephone poles and lines across the site which could be rerouted

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</b>	<b>No</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability?</b> 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	0
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is considered unsuitable for allocation because of the existing tree coverage across the whole of the site.</li> <li>• The tree coverage is extensive and therefore has a good potential to have a high ecological value.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS107
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	North Lodge Land
<b>Current use</b>	Woodland
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.4
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A – additional to BA12
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council

### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	No relevant planning history from Rother planning search			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Existing narrow access to residential dwelling which could be extended into the site. This could provide suitable access to the site for one dwelling.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Pedestrian access through narrow lane could be established. North Trade Road has pedestrian footpaths

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
-----------	-----------------------	---------------------------

<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Mitigation would be required</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Drinking Water Safeguard Zone</p> <p>Ancient Woodland Kelk Wood</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Priority Habitat Inventory - Deciduous Woodland (England)</p> <p>Priority Habitat Inventory - Lowland Meadows (England)</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Most likely ecological value</b></p>	<p>Site is covered in trees which most likely will have ecology potential.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>Low to medium sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Landscape Area B12 - North of N. Trade Road, Kelkwood.</p> <p>Characterised by the wooded ridge on the north side of North Trade Road. The area has scattered ribbon development. Features include North Lodge and the old hospital.</p> <p>The area has scattered ribbon development. There are larger houses in bigger gardens than on south side of North Trade Road. More recently some tight infill estates have been built in cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>Moderate capacity to accommodate change. Some capacity as infill. This needs to be of a high quality and in character with the existing development. The countryside becomes more remote away from the road.</p> <p>Moderate scope to mitigate. Some scope to enhance and strengthen the existing</p>

		wooded and garden character. The existing views are protected/screened on all sides.
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>No</b>	Site consists of poor quality agricultural land

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Moderate impact which will require mitigation</b>	There is a nearby North Lodge Listed Building which is adjacent to the site. Screening this Listed Building may provide difficult.

### Community facilities and services

Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):		Observations and comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<b>Moderately Located</b>	The site is approximately 1.5km away from the high street however there is a bus stop within 290m and therefore public transport to access the station and town centre.

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	<b>None</b>	There are no TPOs; however there are mature trees on and surrounding the site which may restrict the area of development.
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	<b>Unknown</b>	Potentially as site is covered in trees and adjacent to some woodland.
Public Right of Way	<b>None</b>	No Public Rights of Way across the site
Existing social or community value (provide details)	<b>No</b>	No community uses on site

<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Ground Contamination</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

### Characteristics

<b>Characteristics which may affect development on the site:</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Flat</b>
<b>Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</b>	<b>No</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	0
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is considered unsuitable for allocation.</li> <li>• It is covered in trees and therefore has a high potential for ecological value.</li> <li>• It is also adjacent to a listed building and therefore it may be difficult to provide screening.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS108
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land at Chain Lane, Battle between Watchoak House and Stone Cross, Chain Lane
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture/ overgrown vegetation
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.38 ha
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	Overlaps with portion of BA2
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council

### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None relevant on Rother planning search.			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	The only access is off Chain Lane which is assumed to be privately owned (according to Battle Town Council). Access to the site would need to be confirmed. Access onto Chain Lane is off a tight corner from the A271. There are potentially flood issues on this access point as well.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Pedestrian access already exists from Chain Lane, and pedestrian footpaths along North Trade road. There are bus stops located 250m away from the site.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>No – minimal or limited constraint</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Drinking Water Safeguard Zone</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Near to Priority Habitat – Good quality Semi-Improved Grassland</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Some potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes some mature trees in the entrance and periphery. The site also is very overgrown, which may have some ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>High sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Landscape area B9 The Old Mill</p> <p>Historic meadows are the remnants of the ancient field pattern.</p> <p>The settlement pattern is of fairly recent housing development surrounding the old mill and scattered historic buildings on ancient routes.</p> <p>Low capacity for change. Valued as historic meadows and setting for old mill. The area is valued as established Green Infrastructure. Little to no capacity as irreplaceable.</p> <p>Low scope to mitigate – little scope as this space should remain as open meadow.</p> <p>There are fairly significant views to the surrounding countryside to the north of the site.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Site poor quality (grade 4)</p>

3a)		
-----	--	--

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	<p>No historic assets within or immediately surrounding the site.</p> <p>Clarendon, Netherfield road within 500m of the site</p>

**Community facilities and services**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p>Moderately Located</p>	<p>The site is approximately 587m from the high street to access local facilities.</p>

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None	There are no TPOs; however there are mature trees surrounding the site which may restrict the area of development.	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Potentially as site includes some mature trees within and adjacent, and the site is overgrown vegetation, which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.	
Public Right of Way	Some	Footpath on the perimeter to the north and east of the site	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	No community uses on site	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<b>Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None visible on site
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	The site has some gentle slope
<b>Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	No
<b>Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</b>	No

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?</b> Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<p><b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Potential housing development capacity:</b></p>	<p>7-8</p>
<p><b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is considered potentially suitable for allocation but does have significant landscape sensitivity to development. Development here would need to be sensitive to the surrounding setting.</li> <li>• Access to the site is also not confirmed due to Chain Lane's ownership being unknown. This would need to be confirmed.</li> <li>• The site has limited environmental and heritage designations affecting it.</li> <li>• The site is moderately located to services and community facilities.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

General information	
<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS109
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Site 1 Field east of Mount Street Car Park and south of lane leading to Little Park Farm
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture (pasture)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	1.39
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council



Context				
<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None relevant on the Rother planning application search			

## Suitability

Suitability
-------------

<p><b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b></p>	<p>No existing points of vehicle access. Access could be created through the adjacent car park but this would result in the loss of valued car parking spaces.</p>
<p><b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity</p>	<p>Pedestrian access through back streets already exists and rights of way. This would need to be enhanced for residential access.</p>

**Environmental Considerations**

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Some Mitigation may be required for woodland and flood zone.</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zones</p> <p>Drinking Water Protected Area and Safeguard Zone</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Next to a Priority Habitat – Deciduous Woodland</p> <p>Flood zone 1 runs along edge of site</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Some potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>High sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Landscape area B8 - Lake Meadow / Little Park Farm</p> <p>The area has a very strong sense of place as a steep sided bowl landscape of open countryside to the north of the town. It is accessible countryside to the town and highly valued. The historic town is a feature and there are no detractors.</p> <p>Edge of Battle Conservation Area. High quality tight knit town centre</p> <p>Low to No capacity for change. High quality countryside setting to the historic town centre. Little capacity for change.</p>

		<p>Low capacity to mitigate. There is little scope as stable character and distinctive. The edge of the town is part of the setting. Long views in and out should not be obscured.</p> <p>There are some views from the site northwards which may need to be mitigated. Existing trees protect the views southwards.</p>
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>No</b>	Land considered non-agricultural

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Potential impact which would require mitigation</b>	<p>Situated in close proximity to the high street which has a number of heritage assets along with Little Park Farmhouse (Grade II)</p> <p>On the edge of the Battle Conservation area for the Town Centre</p>

### Community facilities and services

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<b>Favourably Located</b>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>The site is approximately 336m from the main high street to access local amenities.</p>
---	---------------------------	--

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	<b>None</b>	There are no TPOs; however there are mature trees surrounding the site which may restrict the area of development.
What impact would development	<b>Unknown</b>	Potentially as site includes some trees and adjacent to

have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?		some woodland which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.	
Public Right of Way	Yes	Yes footpath right of way	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	None but access creation would result in the loss of valued car park spaces.	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	Yes	No	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Steep slope eastwards. Access would be via this steep slope.
Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No
Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	No – if only a few dwellings proposed on the site

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Any other comments?			

## 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	0
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site is not considered suitable for allocation due to a number of reasons.</li> <li>• The landscape here has a high sensitivity potential.</li> <li>• The creation of access would result in the loss of some much needed car park space.</li> <li>• The site is constrained by a steep slope.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS110
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Site 2 Field north of Upper Lake and St Mary the Virgin Church
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture (pasture)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	5.25
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council

### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None relevant on the Rother planning application search			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	No existing access. Access may be possible through enhancement of existing private road or creation of new access but may depend on adjoining sites.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Pedestrian access through private road and existing rights of way. This would need to be enhanced for residential access.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
-----------	-----------------------	---------------------------

<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Mitigation would be required</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Drinking Water Protected Area and Safeguard Zone</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Includes Priority Habitat – No main habitat but additional habitat exists</p> <p>Adjacent to Ancient &amp; Semi-Natural Woodland, and Priority Habitat Inventory – Deciduous Woodland</p> <p>Flood Zone 1 nearby. BTC note that there are occurrences of flooding in the south of the site.</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Some potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes some trees and vegetation on the boundaries which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>High sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Landscape area B8 - Lake Meadow / Little Park Farm</p> <p>The area has a very strong sense of place as a steep sided bowl landscape of open countryside to the north of the town. It is accessible countryside to the town and highly valued. The historic town is a feature and there are no detractors.</p> <p>Edge of Battle Conservation Area. High quality tight knit town centre</p> <p>Low to No capacity for change. High quality countryside setting to the historic town centre. Little capacity for change.</p> <p>Low capacity to mitigate. There is little scope as stable character and distinctive. The edge of the town is part of the setting. Long views in and out</p>

		should not be obscured.
<b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	<b>No</b>	Land considered non-agricultural

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Potential impact which would require mitigation</b>	<p>Situated in close proximity to the high street which has a number of heritage assets along with Little Park Farmhouse (Grade II)</p> <p>On the edge of the Battle Conservation area for the Town Centre</p>

### Community facilities and services

Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):		Observations and comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<b>Moderately Located</b>	<p>There is currently no vehicle access for the site however it is located approx. 500m to the high street and 700m to the railway station depending on where a new access is situated on the site.</p>

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	<b>None</b>	There are no TPOs; however there are mature trees surrounding the site which may restrict the area of development.	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	<b>Unknown</b>	Potentially as site includes some trees and adjacent to some woodland which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.	
Public Right of Way	<b>Yes</b>	Yes footpath right of way	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	<b>No</b>	None although site may be used for recreation & Leisure	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>

Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Steep slope downwards
Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No
Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	No – although would represent an extension to the Battle Town Centre

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Any other comments?			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

The site is appropriate for allocation	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------

<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	0
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not appropriate for allocation because of the landscape having high sensitivity to development and there being no existing access to the site.</li> <li>• The area has a very strong sense of place as a steep sided bowl landscape of open countryside to the north of the town. It is accessible countryside to the town and highly valued. The historic town is a feature and there are no detractors.</li> <li>• A number of environmental constraints including Ancient &amp; Semi-Natural Woodland, and Priority Habitat Inventory.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS111
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Site 3a Field north of Cherry Gardens allotment and east of Caldbec Hill
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture (crops)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	1.8
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council



### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)	<b>Greenfield</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Brownfield</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Mixture</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unknown</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.				
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None relevant on the Rother planning application search			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	No existing points of vehicle access although there is a narrow lane directly to the north. This would need enhancement for access to be achieved for vehicles. However this would result in the loss of mature hedgerows.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Pedestrian access through back streets from the high street and rights of way.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>No – minimal or limited constraint</b>	High Weald AONB  SSSI Impact Risk Zone  Drinking Water Protected Area and Safeguard Zone  Turtle Dove Habitat
<b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?	<b>Some potential value</b>	Site includes some mature trees and hedgerows which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.
<b>Landscape</b>  <b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b>  Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained  Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on	<b>High sensitivity to development</b>	Landscape area B8 - Lake Meadow / Little Park Farm  The area has a very strong sense of place as a steep sided bowl landscape of open countryside to the north of the town. It is accessible countryside to the town and highly valued. The historic

<p>landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>		<p>town is a feature and there are no detractors.</p> <p>Edge of Battle Conservation Area. High quality tight knit town centre</p> <p>Low to No capacity for change. High quality countryside setting to the historic town centre. Little capacity for change.</p> <p>Low capacity to mitigate. There is little scope as stable character and distinctive. The edge of the town is part of the setting. Long views in and out should not be obscured.</p> <p>From the top of the field (northern boundary) there are long views to the church and gatehouse. There are also long views southwards. This site acts as an important landscape setting for adjacent dwellings.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Land considered non-agricultural</p>

*Heritage considerations*

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p><b>Potential impact which would require mitigation</b></p>	<p>Situated in close proximity to the high street which has a number of heritage assets along with Little Park Farmhouse (Grade II)</p> <p>On the edge of the Battle Conservation area for the Town Centre</p>

*Community facilities and services*

<p><b>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure</li> </ul>	<p><b>Favourably Located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>There is currently no vehicle access for the site however it is located approx. 400m to the high street and 700m to the railway station depending on where a new access is situated on the site.</p>
--	----------------------------------	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>		
---	--	--

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	Yes	TPOs exist on Caldbec Hill and a number of mature trees which may limit areas for development.	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Potentially as site includes some mature trees and adjacent to some woodland which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.	
Public Right of Way	Yes	Yes footpath right of way	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	None although site may be used for recreation & leisure	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	Yes	No	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Large slope (rolling fields)</b>
Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No
Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>No – although would represent an extension/sprawl of the Battle Town Centre</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments

Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Any other comments?			

#### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

The site is appropriate for allocation	<input type="checkbox"/>
This site has minor constraints	<input type="checkbox"/>
The site has significant constraints	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The site is unsuitable for allocation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential housing development capacity:	0
Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is not considered appropriate for allocation because the site has high landscape sensitivity to development.</li> <li>The area has a very strong sense of place as a steep sided bowl landscape of open countryside to the north of the town. It is accessible countryside to the town and highly valued. The historic town is a feature and there are no detractors.</li> <li>From the top of the field (northern boundary) there are long views to the church and gatehouse. There are also long views southwards. This site acts as an important landscape setting for adjacent dwellings.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS117
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Site X, Caldbec Hill
<b>Current use</b>	Agriculture (crops)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	1.63
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council

### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	None relevant on the Rother planning application search			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	No clear existing points of vehicle access via google however part of site used as overflow carpark and therefore vehicle access may exist.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Pedestrian access through back streets from the high street and rights of way.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following</b>	<b>No – minimal or limited</b>	High weald AONB

<p><b>policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>constraint</b></p>	<p>SSSI Impact Risk Zones</p> <p>Drinking Water Protected Area and Safeguard Zones</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Flood zone 1 running along edge of Site</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Some potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>High sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Landscape area B8 - Lake Meadow / Little Park Farm</p> <p>The area has a very strong sense of place as a steep sided bowl landscape of open countryside to the north of the town. It is accessible countryside to the town and highly valued. The historic town is a feature and there are no detractors.</p> <p>Edge of Battle Conservation Area. High quality tight knit town centre</p> <p>Low to No capacity for change. High quality countryside setting to the historic town centre. Little capacity for change.</p> <p>Low capacity to mitigate. There is little scope as stable character and distinctive. The edge of the town is part of the setting. Long views in and out should not be obscured.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Land considered non-agricultural</p>

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</b></p>	<p><b>Potential impact which would require mitigation</b></p>	<p>Situated in close proximity to the high street which has a number of heritage assets along with Little Park Farmhouse</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>		<p>(Grade II)</p> <p>On the edge of the Battle Conservation area for the Town Centre</p>
--	--	--

**Community facilities and services**

<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p><b>Favourably Located</b></p>	<p><b>Observations and comments</b></p> <p>There is currently no vehicle access for the site however it is located approx. 300m to the high street.</p>
---	----------------------------------	---

**Other key considerations**

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	No	No TPO within the site but a number of mature trees which may limit developable area.	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Potentially as site includes some trees and adjacent to some woodland which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.	
Public Right of Way	Yes	Yes footpath right of way	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	None although site may be used for recreation & leisure	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Characteristics**

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	<b>Comments</b>
Topography:	<b>Slight slope</b>

Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	
<b>Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement</b>	<b>No – although would represent an extension/sprawl of the Battle Town Centre</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	16
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is potentially considered appropriate for allocation but has high landscape sensitivity to development and therefore would need sensitive design to mitigate effects on the adjacent landscape.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Site is situated in close proximity to the high street which has a number of heritage assets which would pose a constraint on development. Again sensitive design would be needed here.</li><li>• Suitable access would also need to be created to the site.</li></ul>
--	--

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BA25
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land at Lillybank Farm, London Road
<b>Current use</b>	Agricultural
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	3.28
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	BA25
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council

### Context

<b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)  Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	RR/2017/1136/P - Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval RR/2016/725/P for residential development of 50 dwellings - details of the landscaping and appearance, layout and scale.  RR/2016/725/P - Outline: Residential development with associated open space on land to the west of London Road, with all matters reserved other than access. approved			

## Suitability

### Suitability

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	Existing access off Rowlands however enhanced access would be required if site were to come forward. Access could be established from the London Road.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	Existing access off Rowlands, and footpaths already exist along London Road.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Green Belt</b></li> <li>• <b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b></li> <li>• <b>National Park</b></li> <li>• <b>European nature site</b></li> <li>• <b>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</b></li> <li>• <b>Site of Geological Importance</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Zones 2 or 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Mitigation may be required</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Drinking Water Safeguard Zone</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p> <p>Adjacent to Priority Habitat – Deciduous Woodland</p> <p>Flood zone 2 and 3 on edge of Site</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Some potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>High Sensitivity</b></p>	<p>Character area B10 - North of Virgins Lane</p> <p>There are long and well established gardens, allotments and small holdings. These form an edge to very high quality AONB landscape. There are few detractors and some characteristic feature trees.</p> <p>The settlement pattern is of ribbon development along an ancient lane. This is modern development in a leafy setting.</p> <p>Low capacity to accommodate change. Infill between houses only. Character of established gardens. Value of mature trees and garden character. This creates a soft edge to the AONB countryside difficult to replicate.</p> <p>Scope to mitigate visual intrusion Low – little scope to change the edge of the built up area as it has a stable character. The long views should be retained – new planting would obscure them.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>Poor Quality/non agricultural</p>

3a)		
-----	--	--

### Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p>Some mitigation will be required</p>	<p>Adjacent to The Cottage (Grade II) and 1&amp;2 Wattles Wish (Grade II)</p>

### Community facilities and services

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>	<p>Favourably Located</p>	<p>Observations and comments</p> <p>The site is located within 1km of the high street however has a bus stop within 130m, to access public transport.</p>

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None	No TPO within the site however a number of mature trees on and around the site	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Potentially as site includes some trees and adjacent to some woodland which may require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.	
Public Right of Way	None	No rights of way within the site	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	None	Not used for any community or social uses, appears to have a paddock of some description from street view	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site includes pylons/telephone masts

the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations			
---	--	--	--

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Unknown – unable to visit
Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No
Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	No although would represent a sprawl of the Battle urban area

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Any other comments?			

### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

The site is appropriate for allocation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
This site has minor constraints	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The site has significant constraints	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	50 dwellings (as per planning application)
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Planning permission granted for 50 dwellings including associated open space, access and landscaping.</li></ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

### General information

<b>Site Reference / name</b>	BANS118
<b>Site Address (or brief description of broad location)</b>	Land to the NE of Cedarwood Care Home
<b>Current use</b>	Agricultural (pasture)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Residential
<b>Gross area (Ha)</b> Total area of the site in hectares	0.64
<b>SHLAA site reference (if applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)</b>	Battle Town Council



### Context

<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<b>Greenfield</b>	<b>Brownfield</b>	<b>Mixture</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	<p>RR/2018/767/P - 4 Loose Farm Barns, Proposed garden room extension to replace existing conservatory. (Refused)</p> <p>RR/2016/1607/P - 4 Loose Farm Barns, Proposed two-storey rear extension. (Refused)</p> <p>RR/2015/2242/P - Greenacres Farm - Land at, Loose Farm Lane, Change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for one gypsy family comprising the stationing of two caravans of which no more than one would be a mobile home as well as the</p>			

provision of an amenity building and hardstanding. (Approved Conditional) – not been implemented to date (as of site visit September 2018).

## Suitability

### Suitability

<p><b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b></p>	<p>Site access already established although access would need to be enhanced. Can use the same existing route to Cederwood House Care Home.</p>
<p><b>Is the site accessible?</b></p> <p>Provide details of site's connectivity</p>	<p>Hastings road has safe pedestrian access to the town centre but along the lane to Cederwood House, there are limited safe pedestrian routes. This would need enhancing. Site less than 600m from bus stops.</p>

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<p><b>No – minimal or limited constraint</b></p>	<p>High Weald AONB</p> <p>SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Turtle Dove Habitat</p>
<p><b>Ecological value?</b></p> <p>Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p><b>Some potential value</b></p>	<p>Site includes some trees which may have ecology potential and require a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<p><b>Medium sensitivity to development</b></p>	<p>Character area B4 - Glengorse/Telham</p> <p>The area is of typically broad rolling countryside as a setting for town and Battle Abbey from some aspects. There are some large fields and areas of paddocks around Glengorse. There are few detractors. Woodland and open pasture are characteristic with a well wooded appearance and open pasture between. There has been some loss of historic field pattern.</p> <p>Enclosed urban edge. Very</p>

		<p>quickly in countryside when move away from main road and away from town and road noise.</p> <p>Low – Moderate capacity to accommodate change. Limited capacity close to the built up edge of ribbon development on the ridge. Any development further out would require substantial woodland planting to contain it in this area of remote countryside</p> <p>Scope to mitigate - Moderate/low. Some scope to strengthen garden edges on ridge. Scope to plant hedges and shaws/tree belts form new urban edge with woodland tree planting. This would screen long views out.</p> <p>There are some moderate views out to the surrounding countryside from the site.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>	<p>Land considered poor quality (grade 4)</p>

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<p><b>Potential impact which may require mitigation</b></p>	<p>No 4 Loose Farm Cottages Grade II adjacent to the site</p>

**Community facilities and services**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poorly Located</b></p>	<p>The site is poorly located to services, but is situated approx. 1.6km to the railway station and 660m to a bus stop.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m, <b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if &lt; 400m from services.</p>		
---	--	--

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	No	No TPO within the site	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	Unknown	Potentially, site contains grass and pasture which may be habitat for small invertebrates, mammals etc.	
Public Right of Way	No	No rights of way across the site.	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	No	No existing community facilities on the site although adjacent to care home.	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	Mostly flat
Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Located within area identified for strategic gap
Scale and/or nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	No – if only few dwellings.

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in

<b>(if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.</b>			both the Battle Town Council 'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

#### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	3-4 dwellings
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is considered appropriate for limited infill development.</li> <li>• This is because the site is poorly located to services and facilities and is within an area of moderate sensitivity to landscape changes.</li> <li>• The site is also located within an area identified as a strategic gap.</li> </ul>

## Site Assessment Proforma

General information	
Site Reference / name	NE NS101
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Field to the east of B2096 and south of Netherfield Road on Ivyland Farm
Current use	Agricultural (pasture)
Proposed use	Residential
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	3.1
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	N/A
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Battle Town Council



Context				
<p><b>Is the site:</b> Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)</p> <p>Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Greenfield</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Brownfield</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Mixture</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Unknown</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Site planning history</b> Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?</p>	None relevant.			

## Suitability

Suitability
-------------

<b>Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?</b>	There is existing suitable access to the site off Netherfield Road.
<b>Is the site accessible?</b>  Provide details of site's connectivity	The site is opposite the services and amenities within Netherfield. The site is also adjacent to bus stops.

### Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p><b>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• European nature site</li> <li>• SSSI Impact Risk Zone</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Site of Geological Importance</li> <li>• Flood Zones 2 or 3</li> </ul>	<b>Impact highly likely on AONB due to the location of the site and the natural topography</b>	High Weald AONB
<p><b>Ecological value?</b> Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<b>Limited potential value</b>	Site has limited hedgerows and trees on boundaries, therefore ecological value limited.
<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p><b>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</b></p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible, existing landscape is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: Site has only moderate impact on landscape character (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would significantly detract from the landscape and important features unlikely to be retained- mitigation not possible</p>	<b>High sensitivity to development</b>	<p>Character area N1 – Darwell Valley Netherfield – Playing Fields</p> <p>This is the countryside surrounding the ridge top village. It is open agricultural landscape to the west, south and east. There are areas of woodland to the north enclosing large fields with some hedges and tree belts.</p> <p>Settlement is a ridge top village centred on a cul-de-sac with mainly post war houses. There are some older buildings in scattered farmsteads and along main roads.</p> <p>Low capacity to accommodate change. Capacity would be limited to infill within the existing developed areas. There may be some scope in larger enclosed plots and brownfield land.</p>

		<p>Scope to mitigate - Moderate. Some scope to strengthen landscape structure, replace lost field boundaries and link up existing woodlands.</p> <p>There are significant views from the site onto the surrounding countryside. The opposite properties currently enjoy these long views. A planning application (RR/2007/1266/P) for an extension to a dwelling opposite the site was refused because of concerns to the landscape views. This precedent, alongside the long views witnessed on the site visit, indicate that development here would have a negative impact on the setting of the AONB.</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Land</b> Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<b>Some</b>	Land Grade 3 (good to moderate)

**Heritage considerations**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation area</li> <li>• Scheduled monument</li> <li>• Registered Park and Garden</li> <li>• Registered Battlefield</li> <li>• Listed building</li> <li>• Known archaeology</li> <li>• Locally listed building</li> </ul>	<b>Potential impact which would require mitigation</b>	The site is adjacent to two Grade II Listed Buildings.

**Community facilities and services**

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre/local centre/shop</li> <li>• Employment location</li> <li>• Public transport</li> <li>• School(s)</li> <li>• Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities</li> <li>• Health facilities</li> <li>• Cycle route(s)</li> </ul> <p>Where a site is <b>poorly located</b> if &gt; 800m,</p>	<b>Favourably Located</b>	The site is situated within the centre of Netherfield, adjacent to majority of its services and facilities.

<b>Moderately located</b> if 400m to 800m, and <b>favourable located</b> if < 400m from services.		
---	--	--

### Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	<b>No</b>	No TPO within the site	
What impact would development have on the site's habitats and biodiversity?	<b>Limited</b>	Site has limited hedgerows and trees within and adjacent to the site.	
Public Right of Way	<b>No</b>	No rights of way across the site.	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	<b>No</b>	No existing community facilities on the site.	
<b>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Power lines run adjacent to the site on the northern boundary but these should not restrict development.

### Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
<b>Topography:</b> Flat/ slope/ steep gradient	<b>Slight slope</b>
<b>Coalescence:</b> Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	<b>No</b>
<b>Scale and/or nature of development</b> would be large enough to significantly change size and/or character of settlement	<b>Yes – Netherfield is a small settlement and site is large enough to significantly change the character of the village</b>

### 3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Availability

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assumed so as submitted in both the Battle Town Council

<b>Please provide supporting evidence.</b>			'Call for Sites'.
<b>Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<b>Any other comments?</b>			

#### 4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

#### Conclusions

<b>The site is appropriate for allocation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>This site has minor constraints</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site has significant constraints</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>The site is unsuitable for allocation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Potential housing development capacity:</b>	0
<b>Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is considered unsuitable for allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan because of landscape sensitivity issues.</li> <li>There are significant views from the site onto the surrounding countryside and the landscape has been assessed to have low capacity to accommodate change. Capacity would be limited to infill within the existing developed areas.</li> </ul>

