

No.	Plan Objective	Criteria	Information for Assessment - HUN15 / HUNNDP_A - Folly Dog Field
1	Allocate sites to meet the housing requirements in the West Berkshire Local Plan to 2041, where possible making best use of previously developed land and minimising encroachment into the countryside.	a. Is the site greenfield or brownfield?	Wholly greenfield site with current agricultural use confirmed
		b. What is the relationship to the existing settlement boundary (within, adjoining or separate)?	A small part of the western boundary of the site abuts the settlement boundary such that it has a limited relationship. The site does encroach significantly into the countryside although its shape, coupled with the location of the adjacent residential property, veterinary surgery and garden centre, mean it would extend Upper Eddington in a way that would not significantly change its form.
		c. Is the site adjacent to other proposed sites?	No
		d. Is the developer's proposed housing density appropriate for the site?	80 dwellings suggested across the whole of the 6ha site in the promoter's master plan represents a density of 13dph. Whilst the comparatively low density reflects its location on the edge of a small village (Upper Eddington) and the potential impact on the landscape of higher density development, it is considered to represent an overly low density that, subject to the availability of other sites, does not represent an effective use of land to address housing need. The promoter has suggested flexibility in this figure but it is doubtful that a higher density will be achievable without a more significant impact on the landscape.
2	Protect the landscape around Hungerford and support the charities and agencies which are responsible for its conservation	a. Would the site result in harm to the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB?	This field is developable in part in a line behind the existing garden centre (as far north as the Cottrell Close line of development), and not beyond its easterly line. The field then slopes considerably upwards into the North Wessex Downs AONB. Higher up the slope and further along towards Eddington is very visible and would considerably alter the feeling of the AONB in this area.
		b. Is development appropriate in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern, and character of the landscape?	Upper Eddington is a small community in its own right and separate from the main built-up area of Hungerford itself. The site does encroach significantly into the countryside although its shape, coupled with the location of the adjacent residential property, veterinary surgery and garden centre, mean it would extend Upper Eddington in a way that would not significantly change its form. In landscape terms, there is potential for development in part to the north of the garden centre and not beyond the Cottrell Close line of development. Anything above this contour would be highly visible, particularly from Hungerford Common.
3	Ensure that housing development provides a range of house types, sizes and tenures that meets the needs of all age groups and incomes	a. Does the site contribute in a balanced and appropriate way to meeting the overall Housing Needs Assessment?	Site is being promoted for approximately 80 homes therefore has the potential to provide for the full range of needs identified in the Housing Needs Assessment. The promoter is proposing to deliver 40% affordable housing and a range of unit sizes, with the emphasis on 2, 3 and 4-bed properties and an overall emphasis on family housing. This means it will not address the needs of the ageing population. However, the location on the edge of the town is likely to be less attractive to the older population and their housing needs, being comparatively more distant from shops and services.
		b. Is there a reasonable prospect of it providing some self-build or a community housing scheme?	Community housing possible but not proposed by promoter. Self-build has been suggested by the promoter as an option but has not been explicitly included on the masterplan.
4	Minimise the effects of traffic in the town centre and especially the High Street for the benefit of pedestrians and all road users	a. To what extent would the site cause an increase in traffic on the High Street and Bridge Street?	The location of the site means that a relatively low proportion of vehicular traffic will travel through the town.
5	Increase walking and cycling in the town	a. Is the site within a reasonable walking distance, providing a safe route for residents of all ages and mobilities, to:-	NB Path mapped on Google Earth to calculate distances and elevation changes.
		The town centre (measured from the Town Hall)?	Well outside preferred maximum distance. 1380m distance, +34 / -27m elevation. Along A4, along Charnham St, up Bridge St and High St. All pavements. Road crossings A4 (with Island at A338 junction), High St (pedestrian crossing)
		Hungerford Primary School?	Within preferred maximum distance. 1890m distance, elevation gain / loss +47 / -27m. Along A4, along Charnham St, up Bridge St and High St, through path to Fairview Rd. All pavements. Road crossings A4 (with Island at A338 junction), Park St, Fairview Rd.
		John O'Gaunt Secondary School?	Well outside preferred maximum distance. 2660m distance, elevation gain / loss +56 / -32m. Along A4, along Charnham St, up Bridge St and High St, through path to Fairview R, along Priory Avenue to Priory Rd.. All pavements. Road crossings A4 (with Island at A338 junction), Park St, Fairview Rd. Priory Rd.
	(NB distances and elevation changes will be measured from site centre)	Nursery School/Health Centre?	Within preferred maximum distance. 1584m distance, +23 / -27m elevation. Along A4, along Charnham St, up Bridge St and High St, through walkway to Croft. All pavements. Road crossings A4 (with Island at A338 junction), High St. (pedestrian crossing).

	Encourage public transport usage to and from the town	b. Is the site served by public transport within reasonable walking distance?	Bus within acceptable distance. Railway well outside preferred maximum distance. Bus stop at 300m along A4, Railway station 1600m, elevation +29 / -30m
6	Protect and enhance the appearance and historic environment of the town and parish	a. Would development of the site have a detrimental effect on neighbouring heritage properties or the Conservation Area?	Outside Conservation Area. Grade II Listed milestone on A4 Eastbound outside site.
		b. Does the site re-use or redevelop a currently poorly maintained building?	No - greenfield
7	Encourage businesses and support initiatives, including those which promote a vibrant high street and increase the range of shops, services and eating places in the town for the benefit of residents, tourists and visitors of all ages. Recognise that Hungerford acts as a service centre providing facilities to neighbouring villages. Promote an increase in the number and quality of employment opportunities within the town.	a. Does development of the site create new or remove existing retail, leisure or commercial space?	The promoter has suggested, through their HELAA submission, that if the site is not allocated for residential use then retail, employment or leisure uses could be appropriate. However, no such uses are proposed as part of the submitted masterplan (for residential use).
8	Protect and maintain existing public playgrounds and open spaces to a high standard and look at ways of increasing the range of facilities provided as the town grows	a. Does development of the site cause the loss of, or encroachment onto, any formal or informal public amenity or green space?	No loss or encroachment.
		b. Does the site provide public open space in addition to existing policy requirements?	The promoter proposes to provide new areas of open space that would be publicly accessible.
9	Reduce carbon emissions with more energy efficient buildings.	Does the site offer particular opportunities for low / no carbon emissions homes or community energy generation schemes?	There is potential for the dwellings to be provided with on site micro-grid PV generation and battery storage to meet a significant portion, if not all, of the total energy needs. The size of the site creates the possibility of providing a community energy scheme although this could have a detrimental landscape impact and has not been proposed by the promoter.
	Overall Summary		The site would expand the small village of Upper Eddington, rather than Hungerford town. It has a limited relationship with the settlement boundary. Its location separate from Hungerford town and relative distance from many key services and facilities may mean it is less attractive to older people. This distance and accessibility also means that more trips will be taken by car. Development of the whole site would have a detrimental impact on the AONB and the Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC and River Kennet SSSI would be vulnerable to both direct impacts from construction and changes to hydrology. Limited development of part of the site adjacent to the Garden Centre up to level with the line of Cottrell Close may be acceptable, however the community benefits that the scale of such a site could deliver would be more limited.
		Colour Coding used in the Site Assessments are as follows....	
			Significantly Positive
			Positive
			Uncertain
			Neutral
			Negative
			Significantly Negative