

SHLAA Proforma

Site location

Site name	Land rear of 52-88 Woodside	Site reference	BN001
Site address and post code	52-88 Woodside, PO13 0YX	Ward	Bridgemy North
Last updated	February 2019		

Site details

Site description	Area of green space to the east of properties in Woodside.
Topography	Steep bank from a former railway line.
Existing land use	None
Surrounding land use and storey heights	Residential (two storeys) and Henry Court Way (Bus Rapid Transit).
Site size (hectares)	0.8 ha
Development status	Some of the land has been used to extend residential gardens in Woodside.

Key

	Unconstrained
	Site may be acceptable, subject to further study, infrastructure or mitigation works, or policy requirements
	Site is not suitable for allocation

Suitability

Issue	Suitability	Comments	Actions
Local plan designations			
Is the site within the Urban Area Boundary?	Yes		
Is the site allocated for development?	No		
Is the site in the Strategic Gap?	No		
Is the site Protected Open Space?	No		
Is the site a Protected Employment Site?	No		
Does the site have a community, culture or leisure use?	No		
Is the site within a Defined Shopping Area?	No		

Issue	Suitability	Comments	Actions
Is the site currently tourist accommodation?	No		
Flooding			
Is the site in Flood Zone 2 or 3?	Yes	Site is in Flood Zone 2. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will be required.	
Is the site predicted to be in Flood Zone 2 or 3 in 2115?	No		
Ecology			
Does the site contain any irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland or ancient and veteran trees)?	Yes	There could be on-site ancient or veteran trees. An ecology assessment may be required. Development will not be permitted unless no adverse impact upon the habitat can be demonstrated.	
Does the site have any TPO trees?	Yes	TPO across the site (ref. 88/33660/TO). Proposals will need to protect and enhance the trees.	

Issue	Suitability	Comments	Actions
Does the site contain any protected species (bats, badgers, Great crested newts)?	Unknown	There is potential due to extensive trees and vegetation. Investigations would need to be undertaken and any species present protected.	
Does the site contain, or is within 400m of, a SAC or possible SAC, SPA or potential SPA, Ramsar site or proposed Ramsar site, a Brent Goose site or proposed Brent Goose site, or a biodiversity-offset site?	Yes	Site is within 75 m of Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar site. An ecology survey may be required. Development will not be permitted unless no adverse impact upon the habitat can be demonstrated.	
Does the site contain, or is in proximity of, a SSSI or candidate SSSI?	Yes	Site is within 75 m of Portsmouth Harbour SSSI. An ecology survey may be required. Development will not be permitted unless no adverse impact upon the habitat can be demonstrated.	
Does the site contain, or is in proximity of, a SINC, candidate SINC or a Local Green Space?	No		

Issue	Suitability	Comments	Actions
Access			
Can satisfactory vehicular access be achieved?	No	An access road would be required. This may be difficult to construct due to the topography and shape of the site. Highway infrastructure works would therefore likely be required.	
Can safe pedestrian and cycle access be achieved?	No	As above.	
Can adequate emergency service and refuse truck be provided?	No	As above.	
Heritage			
Is the site within or is adjacent to a Conservation Area?	No		
Does the site contain, or is adjacent to, any Designated Heritage Assets (listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments or registered parks and gardens)?	No		
Does the site contain, or is adjacent to, any locally listed buildings?	No		
Is the site likely to be of archaeological interest?	No		

Issue	Suitability	Comments	Actions
Contamination			
Is it likely the site could be contaminated?	Yes	Site is within a Contaminated Land buffer area. A Contaminated Land Assessment and potential mitigation will be required.	
Amenity			
Is development likely to have an adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity?	Yes	Existing adjacent properties would need to be considered to avoid any loss of privacy. Proposal will need to minimise amenity impacts.	
Are neighbouring uses likely to have an adverse impact upon the amenity of future occupiers (industrial uses, major roads)?	Yes	Noise and disturbance from buses travelling along the adjacent Bus Rapid Transit would need to be considered. Appropriate mitigation will be required.	
Services			
Is the site serviced by utilities?	No	Confirmation will be required from utilities that they can provide services.	

Issue	Suitability	Comments	Actions
Is the site within a Safeguarded Area (other than Southampton Airport Safeguarding Zone, which covers the whole borough)?	Yes	Site is within the Safeguarded Area for Daedalus aerodrome and Fleetlands helipad. Restrictions on development may apply. Statutory bodies will need to be consulted.	

Availability

Issue	Availability	Comments	Actions
Does the site have multiple owners?	Yes	Majority of the site is owned by one owner, but it appears that some garden plots have been sold to homeowners. Agreement would therefore be required from all the owners.	
Is the site owned by a developer or is the owner willing to sell?	Yes	Although the owner appears to have sold plots of land for gardens, a complex land ownership arrangement may make the site difficult to comprehensively develop.	
Is it necessary to acquire land off-site to develop this site?	Yes	Potentially would need GBC land between 86-88 and 60-58 Woodside. Would need to check whether adequate off-site land is available.	
Does the site have any legal issues (covenants, ransom strips)?	Unknown		

Issue	Availability	Comments	Actions
Are there any on-site constraints (pylons, rights of way, easements)?	Unknown		
Are there any existing tenancies or operations on site?	Yes	Yes, a number of properties have undertaken garden extensions. For comprehensive development confirmation would be needed if land owners would be willing to sell.	

Achievable

Issue	Achievability	Comments	Actions
Is there a realistic prospect that the site would come forward for development within the plan period?	Unknown		
Are there any known abnormal development costs (contamination, heritage conservation, demolition etc)?	Yes	Topography of land is steep which would require significant movement of earth to accommodate development. Funding or planning gain may be needed to make the site viable.	
Does the site require significant new infrastructure investment in order to be suitable for development?	Yes	New highway infrastructure would be required to access the site.	

Conclusion

Suitable	Available	Achievable
----------	-----------	------------

Issue	Figure	Assumptions
Developable area	0.8 ha	Total site area, this includes three extended gardens. Although it is important to note that this would be subject to land owner agreement first.
Local area density	Medium	50dph
Development density	15dph	Density of developable area.
Capacity for dwellings	8	Capacity is likely lower due to the sites constraints.

Concluding comments	Unsuitable housing site with substantial access, tree preservation order and biodiversity constraints. The site is an old railway embankment the topography of which is unsuitable for development. The site also has complex landownership. As a result, the site was found to be unsuitable for the SHLAA.
Concluding actions	No further action.