

RTPID	Site Visted?	If no, why not?	Assessment of Achievability (Site Assessment Panel)										Years					
			Notes of assessment	Constraint	Access	Topography	More appropriate for employment	Other constraint	Undeliverable	Impact on yield	Reason	Timescale for delivery	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+		
1	yes		No problems. 3 phases	No								No		3 phases	1	1	1	
2	yes		Access a problem. Would need to be close to by pass. Existing industrial area so less attractive for housing, better for employment use. Possible flooding and contamination.	Yes	Inadequate - dangerous junction			Yes	Flooding, contamination			No		2 phase				2
3	yes		No problems	No								No		1 phase	1			
4	yes		Flooding the major issue. Also access difficult.	Yes					Flooding			No		1 phase		1		
5	no	Has now got planning permission																
6	yes		Access very narrow. Would be improved if developed along wit RTPID 217.	Yes	Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP217)							No		1 phase				1
7	yes		Same issue with capacity at A38 junction. Access difficult. Access through Besbury Park not adequat.	Yes	Inadequate - dangerous junction / road capacity							Reduction	Access, road capacity	1 phase		1		
8	yes		Main road access off T Hill Road is windy and very steep. Very steep site with limited potential - may even render sites undeliverable.	Yes	Topography (on site and onto site)	Steep						Reduction	Topgraphy, access, road capacity	2 phase				2
9	yes		No problem. 3 phases 2011 onwards. Issues from HA point of view. This would be second phase of Hunts Grove. 10-15 year period.	No								No		3 phases	1	1	1	
10	yes		Good site but land locked. Would need RTPID 227 or 272 to bring forward.	Yes	Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP227/272)							No		1 phase				1
11	yes		Access is fine but via a number of narrow roads that may need upgrading. Slightly sloped. Possible in longer term.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site, Topography (on site)							No		3 phase			1	2
12	yes		Access is difficult - probably require demolition of existing property.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required							No		1 phase		1		
13	yes		Steeply sloping site. Narrow lanes. Limited commercial potential (medium long-term).	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site, Topography (on site)	Steep						Reduction	Topgraphy, access, road capacity	1 phase		1		
15	yes		No problems	No								No		1 phase	1			
16	yes		Very noisy (proximity to M5). Likely contamination. Some potential for residential.	Yes					Contamination			No		1 phase		1		
17	yes		No problems	No								No		1 phase	1			
18	yes		Narrow lane (The Stanley) is a constraint. Could be overcome by both sites (168) being developed together. 5-10 year period.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP168)							No		1 phase		1		
20	yes		Remote site. Steep sloping site. Site in flood plain. Major constraint. Only frontage of site could be developed without access through RTPID 105 and adjacent garden. Only frontage is appropriate, so reduced yield - 9 units (although 2 and 3 storey development).	Yes	Topography (on site)	Steep						Reduction (max 9 dwellings)	Topography	1 phase	1			
21	yes		Access difficult - narrow lane or under bridge which floods. Contamination and access issues. Expensive site to	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site				Existing uses (employment)			Small reduction	Road capacity	1 phase				1
22	yes		Only 30% in use as industrial occupiers trying to move. Access good. Conservation area. Good potential. Application likely within 12 months for mixed use development (resid/office).	No								No		1 phase	1			
23	yes		No problems given size of site.	No								No		3 phase	1	1	1	
24	yes		No problems given size of site. (School Lane)	No								No		3 phase	1	1	1	
25	yes		No problems	No								No		2 phase	1	1		
26	yes		Owner reluctant to sell, but no problem	Yes					Unwilling seller			No		1 phase				1
27	yes		Listed building on site. Bottom part certainly available and has a planning permission. Access off Springfield. No problem.	No								No		1 phase	1			
28	yes		Restrictive covenant on site. But no other issues. Possibly a better commercial site.	Yes				Yes				NA	Alternative use	NA				
29	yes		No problems	No								No		1 phase	1			
30	yes		Noise - adjacent to motorway. HA would want to look at impact. Longer term possibility.	Yes					Noise - M5 adjacent			Reduction	Noise buffer	3 phase				3
33	yes		Noise (close to motorway). No problem	No								No		1 phase	1			
35	yes		No problem. Part in Glos City LP is expected to come forward post 2013 however Stroud part should come forward straight away.	No								No		1 phase	1			
36	yes		Part of the site prone to flooding. Sloping but not significant. Has potential.	Yes					Flooding			Small reduction	Flooding	3 phase	1	1	1	
37	yes		No problems	No								No		3 phase	1	1	1	

RTPID	Site Visted?	If no, why not?	Assessment of Achievability (Site Assessment Panel)										Years				
			Notes of assessment	Constraint	Access	Topography	More appropriate for employment	Other constraint	Undeliverable	Impact on yield	Reason	Timescale for delivery	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+	
38	yes		Narrow lanes - tight network needed to be navigated. Problematic for this reason.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site						Small reduction	Road capacity	1 phase	1			
39	yes		No problem	No							No		2 phase	1	1		
40	yes		Owner has arrangement for access onto site. Possible issues of capacity at junction on A38. Difficult.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required, dangerous junction, road capacity						No		1 phase		1		
41	yes		Steeply sloped, accessdifficultLimited number of dwellings access difficult could be in conjunction with 136 - medium term potential.	Yes	Topography (on site), Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP136)	Steep					Reduction	Site access, Topography	1 phase		1		
42	yes		No problems given size of site. (School Lane)	No							No		1 phase	1			
43	yes		Access an issue - off roundabout. Flooding. RTP note - roundabout makes access easier	No							No		1 phase	1			
44	yes		Narrow lane so possible access issue.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site						Small reduction	Road capacity	1 phase	1			
45	yes		Access a problem - Tobacconist Road is very narrow. Glebe Road - possible to punch through but this is an existing cul-de-sac so not good for such a large site.Affordable housing 20 dwellings a possibility.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required						Small reduction	Road capacity	2 phase			1	1
46	yes		Access not clear where it would come from. Land locked.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track (private road)						Small reduction	Site access	1 phase		1		
47	yes		Access very narrow and poor usability within conservation area. Limited potential.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site						Small reduction	Road capacity	1 phase	1			
48	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
49	yes		No problems. Derelict natural extention open up waterway.	No							No		1 phase	1			
50	yes		No problems.	No							No		1 phase	1			
51	yes		Land slopes steeply and access limited so yield reduced.	Yes	Topography (on site)	Steep					Reduction	Topography	1 phase	1			
52	yes		No problems given size of site.	No							No		1 phase	1			
53	yes		Access difficult - so potential for reduced yield, maybe 5 dwellings.	Yes	Inadequate -						Reduction (max 5 dwellings)		1 phase	1			
54	yes		Steepness - small reduction in yields. Access - needs to be off London Road which would need to be down steep slope (so wide access).	Yes	Topography (on site)	Steep					Reduction	Site access/Topography	1 phase		1		
55	yes		Southern access constrained in its width and through water course. Power line across site will reduce yield. Highways constraint. Former tip	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track (with water course)				Powerlines across site and potential for contamination and land stability issues from former tip use		Small reduction	Powerlines	2 phase				2
56	yes		Virtually landlocked.Limited access - small existing road, single track. Would need to pull down attractive buildings.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required						No		1 phase		1		
57	yes		Only access to RTPID 57 would have to come through RTPID 63. Access a problem (London Road too steep). Improvements to Dalloway needed. Limited potential (long term)	Yes	Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP63), Topography (on site)	Steep					Reduction	Topography	1 phase				1
58	yes		If planning consent granted, Glos CC are legally obliged to provide access into sites off Dr Newtons Way.	No							No		1 phase		1		
59	yes		Limited access - only across bridge. Significant constraint	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track (difficult to resolve)						No		2 phase				2
60	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
61	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
62	yes		Very poor access	Yes	Inadequate				Existing use (housing)		Small reduction	Site access	1 phase			1	
63	yes		Only access to RTPID 57 would have to come through RTPID 63. Access a problem (London Road too steep). Improvements to Dalloway needed. Limited potential (long term)	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site, Topography (on site)	Steep					Reduction	Topography	1 phase				1
64	yes		Bad neighbour	Yes					Bad neighbour		Reduction	Buffer	2 phase	1	1		
65	yes		No problems	No							No		3 phase	1	1	1	
66	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
67	yes		No problems.	No							No		1 phase	1			
68	yes		No problems.	No							No		1 phase	1			
69	yes		Conservation area. Old and modern industrial buildings on site. No problem.	No							No		1 phase	1			

RTPID	Site Visted?	If no, why not?	Assessment of Achievability (Site Assessment Panel)										Years				
			Notes of assessment	Constraint	Access	Topography	More appropriate for employment	Other constraint	Undeliverable	Impact on yield	Reason	Timescale for delivery	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+	
70	yes		Existing nursing home on north of site. Sheltered Accommodation to the South. Retain childrens play area at south. No problem	No							No		1 phase	1			
71	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
73	yes		No problem	No							No		1 phase	1			
75	yes		No problem. Farmhouse is listed.	No							No		1 phase	1			
76	yes		Access not great. But otherwise okay.	No							No		1 phase	1			
77	yes		No problem	No							No		1 phase	1			
78	yes		More suited to commercial uses. Access is 'industrial'.	Yes	Inadequate - dangerous junction			Yes			NA	Alternative use	NA				
79	yes		CC site playing site. Access may be an issue but could come through current development to South East.	No							No		1 phase	1			
80	yes		All part of previous AAP. Some existing residential within existing industrial area. Contamination. Mixed use potential long time frame (mid-long term opportunity).	Yes						Contamination, flooding and ownership	No		2 phase			1	1
81	yes		Existing care home, so depends on ownership. County council?	Yes						Ownership and existing use	No		1 phase		1		
83	yes		Site on 3 distinctive levels which would reduce yield. Clay site so very unstable - could render undevelopable.	Yes			3 different levels			Unstable land potential	Reduction	Topography	1 phase		1		
84	yes		Two sides of canal. Noisy and dusty. Not suitable for housing.	Yes				Yes			NA	Alternative use	NA				
85	yes		No problem - consent for 65 dwellings	No							Consent for 65 dwellings		1 phase	1			
86	yes		Steep slope towards A46. Capacity of road to allow access questionable.	Yes	Topography (on site and onto site)	Steep					Reduction	Site access/Topography	1 phase			1	
87	yes		Narrow access through Farmhill Crescent - problematic	Yes	Inadequate - site size require more substantial access options						No		3 phases		1	1	1
88	yes		Steep access but no problems (RTP note - site did not have a steep access constraint)	No							No		1 phase	1			
89	yes		No problems	No							No		2 phase	1	1		
90	yes		Industrial site in use - all around it. So a noise issue. But some potential for housing.	No							No		1 phase	1			
91	yes		No problems	No							No		3 phase	1	1	1	
93	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
94	yes		Access of Besbury Park is very narrow. Site linked with 97	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track						Small reduction	Site access	1 phase	1			
95	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
96	yes		Access would be off narrow lanes. Very problematic.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site						Reduction	Road capacity	1 phase	1			
97	yes		Access of Besbury Park is very narrow. Site linked with 94	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track						Small reduction	Site access	1 phase	1			
98	yes		Access through Patches View. No problems.	No							No		1 phase	1			
99	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
100	yes		No problem, but possible access issue. May have limited scope	Yes	Inadequate - dangerous junction						No		1 phase		1		
103	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
104	yes		Possible access issue - orchard?	No							No		1 phase	1			
105	yes		Occupied employment use. Remote from Town Centre. Very steep access - not a good housing site.	Yes	Topography (on site and onto site)			Yes			NA	Alternative use	NA				
106	yes		Narrow strip of land. Conservation area. Some access via Oak Villa. Could be developed in isolation.	No							No		1 phase	1			
107	yes		All part of previous AAP. Some existing residential within existing industrial area. Contamination. Mixed use potential long time frame (mid-long term opportunity).	Yes						Contamination, flooding and ownership	No		2 phase			1	1
108	yes		Narrow road. Small amount of potential - limited yield	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site						Small reduction	Road capacity	1 phase	1			
109	yes		No problem. Develop in isolation or as part of comprehensive development.	No							No		1 phase	1			
110	yes		Allotments in use. Access very difficult via Arundel Drive. Would need to be through RTPID 111 if this came forward.	Yes	Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP 111)						No		1 phase			1	

RTPID	Site Visted?	If no, why not?	Assessment of Achievability (Site Assessment Panel)										Years				
			Notes of assessment	Constraint	Access	Topography	More appropriate for employment	Other constraint	Undeliverable	Impact on yield	Reason	Timescale for delivery	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+	
111	yes		Allotments in use. Access very difficult via Arundel Drive. Would need to be through RTPID 111 if this came forward.	Yes	Inadequate - may require demolition or preferable requires development of neighbouring site (RTP 147) if land between is						No		1 phase		1		
112	yes		Access a problem - a narrow lane.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site						Small reduction	Road capacity	1 phase	1			
113	yes		Narrow roads, only low density. Other than that, no problems.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track						Reduction (low density)	Site access	1 phase	1			
114	yes		Very large site in small village, but no problem	No							No		3 phase	1	1	1	
115	yes		Access - very narrow, single track lane. Very problematic	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track						No		2 phase				2
116	yes		Difficult access, but some potential for low yield.	Yes	Topography (on site)	Steep					Reduction (max 2 dwellings)		1 phase	1			
118	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
119	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
120	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
121	yes		Access would have to come off main road, not Upper Kit Lane (which is too narrow and steep in parts) but not a problem.	No							No		1 phase	1			
124	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
125	yes		Access off A38. No problem (being promoted for traveller site).	Yes					Alternative use (gypsy, traveller, travelling show)		NA	Alternative use	NA				
126	yes		Existing employment uses in occupation. Potential for town houses. No problems.	Yes					Existing uses (employment)		No		1 phase		1		
127	yes		Ownership - owned by private company who are unlikely to move out (part of expansion plans). Access an issue - would need to be across playing fields. Multiple ownership.	Yes	Inadequate - access required through other land				Ownership and existing uses (employment)		NA	Alternative use	NA				
128	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
129	yes		Access a possible issue. But has potential. RTP note - no access issue	No							No		1 phase	1			
130	yes		Isolated site but no problem.	No							No		1 phase	1			
131	yes		Listed buildings (Carpet Factory). Good potential for conversion and some new build.	No							No		1 phase	1			
133	yes		No problems. Possible HA concerns certainly post - 2014	No							No		3 phase		1	1	1
134	yes		Adjacent to Bovis scheme to north, so access could be provided. Would therefore be post Bovis (10+years).	No							No		2 phase			1	1
135	yes		Flooding is a big issue. But no other problems.	Yes					Flooding		Reduction	Flooding	1 phase	1			
136	yes		Steeply sloped, so yield limited.	Yes		Steep					Reduction	Topography	1 phase	1			
137	yes		Flooding, listed building and difficult	No							No		2 phase		1	1	
138	yes		Limited access off Borough Close - possible ransom strip. Would require access through estate not in ownership.	Yes	Inadequate - access required through other land (ransom strip)						No		1 phase				1
139	yes		Road is very steep. (RTP note - road is not steep) Very isolated but next to railway station in an area of Cordon Sanitaire (adjacent to sewage works). Potential	Yes					Cordon Sanitaire		Reduction	Cordon Sanitaire	3 phase	1	1	1	
140	yes		No problems. Conversion of Grade 1 listed building. Flooding issues on north side of site. Nearby electricity substation to the north - flow of electricity a possible issue, discussion held for a long time about the site.	Yes					Powerlines, adjacent substation, flooding		Reduction		1 phase	1			
141	yes		Steep access - problematic. Adjacent railway may reduce yield.	Yes	Topography (on site)	Steep					Small reduction	Site access/Topography	1 phase		1		
142	yes		Four different owners of 202. If developed with RTPID 202, then access would require relocation of existing members club.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required should be developed in conjunction with neighbouring site (RTP202)						No		1 phase		1		
143	yes		No problem	Yes							No		3 phase	1	1	1	
144	yes		Access - would need to knock down no 87 which is owned by same owner. But Summer Street busy, so not ideal. Better to access from 10 if this is developed.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required or requires development of neighbouring site (RTP10)						No		2 phase		1	1	
145	yes		Access a real problem as would need ??? Two different land owners.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP 146)						No				1		

RTPID	Site Visted?	If no, why not?	Assessment of Achievability (Site Assessment Panel)										Years				
			Notes of assessment	Constraint	Access	Topography	More appropriate for employment	Other constraint	Undeliverable	Impact on yield	Reason	Timescale for delivery	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+	
146	yes		Supposed to provide access to RTPID 145. Owners of 145 and 146 have agreement. But access makes site and RTPID 145 difficult.	Yes								NA	Site is access for 146				
147	yes		If planning consent granted, Glos CC are legally obliged to provide access into sites off Dr Newtons Way.	No										1 phase		1	
148	yes		For such a large site, access would need to be off A46 which could be an issue.	No										3 phase	1	1	1
149	yes		No problems	No										1 phase	1		
150	yes		Access poor. Long term strategic prospects. Potential for bypass (using RTPID 16). No problem	Yes	Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring sites (RTP 139)									3 phase		1	1
151	yes		Access poor. Long term strategic prospects. Potential for bypass of (using RTPID 16). No problem	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track									3 phase		1	1
152	yes		Access would be off Manor Avenue, adjacent to farm is okay. No problems	No										3 phase	1	1	1
153	yes		Existing regional leisure facility. Very good commercial site. No commercial potential for housing.	Yes					Alternative use (Regional Equestrian Centre)			NA	Alternative use	NA			
154	yes		Access would be through existing petrol station at eastern edge. Power lines through site. But otherwise deliverable.	Yes					Powerlines			Small reduction	Powerlines	3 phase	1	1	1
155	yes		Topography - very steep. Not sure you would be able to build anything on such a steep slope. RTP note - North west segment of site developable	Yes			Steep (majority of site)					85% Major reduction	Topography - only north west segment developable	2 phase	1	1	
156	yes		Very isolated. Only suitable for small no of large houses. Highly contaminated. Application imminent.	Yes					Contamination			No		1 phase	1		
157	yes		Access an issue. Should be part of comprehensive development of medical centre and hospital. Medium term prospect.	Yes					Existing use (health centre)			No		1 phase		1	
158	yes		Flooding but no particular problem. Farm buildings suitable for conversion.	No								No		1 phase	1		
159	yes		Narrow lane, brow of hill. Almost impossible. Very steep site, dangerous corner.	Yes	Topography (on site), Inadequate - dangerous junction		Steep (majority of site)					Reduction	Site access/Topography		1		
160	yes		Access very difficult, if not impossible.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track				Existing uses (employment)			Reduction	Site access	1 phase			1
161	yes		No problems	No								No		1 phase	1		
162	yes		No problems	No								No		1 phase	1		
163	yes		No problems	No								No		1 phase	1		
164	yes		Undulating which may cause problems. Developer wouldn't look at site as too expensive to promote?	Yes					Ground conditions			Small reduction	Ground conditions	1 phase		1	
165	yes		All part of previous AAP. Some existing residential within existing industrial area. Contamination. Mixed use potential long time frame (mid-long term opportunity).	Yes					Contamination, flooding and ownership			No		2 phase			1
166	yes		Access difficult. Medium to long term prospect.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site				Existing uses (employment)			Small reduction	Road capacity	1 phase			1
167	yes		No problems	No								No		2 phase	1	1	
168	yes		Narrow lane (The Stanley) is a constraint. Could be overcome by both sites (18) being developed together. 5-10 year period.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow lane network to access site - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP18)							No		1 phase		1	
169	yes		Site bought by PCT from NHS Estates, so likely to be reused for health uses (so unavailable). Possibly some key worker housing.	Yes					Alternative use (healthcare)			NA	Alternative use	NA			
170	yes		No problem.	No								No		2 phase	1	1	
171	yes		No problems. Owned by Whitcliffe School so unlikely to come forward	No								No		1 phase	1		
172	yes		Access included as part of site not good enough and too narrow. Major access issues.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track				Potential for overlooking			Small reduction	Site access	1 phase		1	
173	yes		More appropriate for employment. But no particular problem. Access would need to be off busy main road.	Yes	Inadequate - dangerous junction			Yes				NA	Alternative use	NA			1
174	yes		Lots of existing companies on site that would need to be relocated. But no other problems.	Yes					Existing uses (employment)			No		1 phase			1

RTPID	Site Visted?	If no, why not?	Assessment of Achievability (Site Assessment Panel)										Years				
			Notes of assessment	Constraint	Access	Topography	More appropriate for employment	Other constraint	Undeliverable	Impact on yield	Reason	Timescale for delivery	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+	
175	yes		Significant access problems - access off old A30. RTP note - disagree, access not a major issue	No							No		1 phase	1			
176	yes		Landlocked unless the access point is available - owner would need to be willing.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required						No		1 phase		1		
177	yes		Totally divorced from existing settlements, Put forward for traveller site (not appropriate for market housing).	Yes					Alternative use (gypsy, traveller, travelling show people)		NA	Alternative use	NA				
178	yes		Allotments in use. But no problem. 5 year lease for allotments.	Yes					Existing use (5yr lease)		No		1 phase		1		
179	yes		Big substation adjacent to site. Access difficult but okay. Has planning permission for 80 dwellings.	No							Consent for 80 dwellings		1 phase	1			
180	yes		No problems.	No							No		1 phase	1			
182	yes		Existing youth centre. Access would be off dangerous steep bend.	Yes	Topography (onto site) and inadequate - dangerous junction (bend)						No		1 phase		1		
183	yes		Protected under Local Plan for railway uses. But no problem.	No							No		1 phase	1			
184	yes		Divorced from existing settlement. Not suitable	Yes					Adjacent to M5, not near any settlement	Yes	NA	Undeliverable	NA				
185	yes		Divorced from existing settlement. Not suitable	Yes					Adjacent to M5, not near any settlement	Yes	NA	Undeliverable	NA				
186	yes		Adjacent to Hunts Grove Land, so could come forward after that. (post 15 years). Not suitable for housing at the moment	Yes					Requires Hunts Grove completion		No		1 phase				1
187	yes		Possible bad neighbour issues. Access via swing bridge - possible weight issues. Waterways have 125 year lease for use of others as a docks. Limited potential in market terms.	Yes					Dock area has 125 yr lease for dock use, bad neighbour	Yes	NA	Undeliverable	NA				
188	yes		Possible bad neighbour issues. Access via swing bridge - possible weight issues. Waterways have 125 year lease for use of others as a docks. Limited potential in market terms.	Yes					Dock area has 125 yr lease for dock use, bad neighbour	Yes	NA	Undeliverable	NA				
189	yes		Possible bad neighbour issues. Access via swing bridge - possible weight issues. Waterways have 125 year lease for use of others as a docks. Limited potential in market terms.	Yes					Dock area has 125 yr lease for dock use, bad neighbour	Yes	NA	Undeliverable	NA				
190	yes		Possible bad neighbour issues. Access via swing bridge - possible weight issues. Waterways have 125 year lease for use of others as a docks. Limited potential in market terms.	Yes					Dock area has 125 yr lease for dock use, bad neighbour	Yes	NA	Undeliverable	NA				
191	yes	Developed	Most has been developed already.														
193	yes		All part of previous AAP. Some existing residential within existing industrial area. Contamination. Mixed use potential long time frame (mid-long term opportunity).	Yes					Contamination, flooding and ownership		No		2 phase			1	1
194	yes		Successful company on site, so unlikely to move. Listed building.	Yes	Inadequate			Yes	Existing uses (employment) & Listed Buildings		NA	Alternative use	NA				
195	no	Developed															
196	yes		Access down narrow lane and heavily wooded which will reduce yield but developable. RTP note - alternative access of main road through village - not an issue	No							No		1 phase	1			
197	yes		No problems - short term	No							No		1 phase	1			
198	yes		Access at very north of site. No problem.	No							No		1 phase	1			
199	yes		No problem	No							No		1 phase	1			
200	yes		Conservation area. Access difficult but otherwise okay.	No							No		1 phase	1			
201	yes		Only eastern part of the site available and this is contaminated. But otherwise okay.	Yes					Contamination		No		1 phase		1		
202	yes		Four different owners of 202. If developed with RTPID 202, then access would require relocation of existing members club.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required should be developed in conjunction with neighbouring site (RTP142)				Ownership (3 landowners)		No		1 phase		1		
203	yes		Access a real problem. Multiple owners.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track				Ownership - multiple		Small reduction	Site access	1 phase		1		
204	yes		No problem, but possible access issue	Yes	Inadequate - dangerous junction						No		1 phase		1		
205	no	Developed															
206	yes		No problem - deliverable immediately	No							No		1 phase	1			

RTPID	Site Visted?	If no, why not?	Assessment of Achievability (Site Assessment Panel)										Years				
			Notes of assessment	Constraint	Access	Topography	More appropriate for employment	Other constraint	Undeliverable	Impact on yield	Reason	Timescale for delivery	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+	
241	yes		Flooding. Access narrow	Yes	Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP242)				Flooding		No		1 phase		1		
242	yes		Flooding.	Yes					Flooding		No		1 phase	1			
243	no	Developed															
244	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
245	yes		Car parks, both in use, unlikely to be available - site more suitable for commercial uses	Yes				Yes	Existing uses (car parks)		NA	Alternative use	NA				
247	yes		Access would have to come through RTPID 81	Yes	Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring site (RTP81)								1 phase			1	
248	yes		Back garden land. Very narrow access. Significant problem.	Yes	Inadequate - narrow/single track				Multiple ownerships		Small reduction	Access	1 phase				1
249	yes		Part (south) has planning permission for 8 dwellings. Access is the issue to unlock remainder of site - cant be done.	Yes					Current permission will limit potential on rest of site		Consent for 8 dwellings						
250	no	Developed															
251	no	Has now got planning permission															
252	yes		Access a problem because of a roundabout. Otherwise okay. Ownership is the big issue.	Yes					Ownership		No		1 phase		1		
253	yes		Vacant building, but not great for conversions. But as a site, no problem.	No							No		1 phase	1			
256	yes		No access - would have to knock down Orchard House. Large trees take up 50% of site.	Yes	Inadequate - demolition required				Trees may limit developable area		50% reduction	Trees	1 phase		1		
258	no	Relatively modern office block - would not be considered for housing															
264	no	Has now got planning permission															
267	yes		Ownership - owned by private company who are unlikely to move out (part of expansion plans). Access an issue - would need to be across playing fields. Multiple ownership.	Yes	Inadequate - access required through other land				Ownership and existing uses (employment)		NA	Alternative use	NA				
268	no	Has now got planning permission															
269	yes		No problem.	No							No		1 phase	1			
270	yes		Commercial site unlikely to be available for housing, pp recently granted for commercial uses	Yes				Yes	Existing uses (commercial)		NA	Alternative use	NA				
272	no	Developed															
277	yes		Possible bad neighbour issues. Access via swing bridge - possible weight issues. Waterways have 125 year lease for use of others as a docks. Limited potential in market terms.	Yes					Dock area has 125 yr lease for dock use, bad neighbour	Yes	NA	Undeliverable	NA				
279	no	Has now got planning permission															
280	no	Has now got planning permission															
281	no	Has now got planning permission															
282	yes		25% occupied industrial site. If you relocate occupiers, then would be a good site. Available and parts could be delivered quickly. In 2 ownerships. May be contamination / flooding though.	Yes					Ownership, potential contamination and flooding		No		1 phase		1		
283	yes		Existing employment site in occupation by Millican (successful company). But no other problem.	Yes					Existing uses (employment)		No		1 phase		1		

RTPID	Site Visted?	If no, why not?	Assessment of Achievability (Site Assessment Panel)										Years				
			Notes of assessment	Constraint	Access	Topography	More appropriate for employment	Other constraint	Undeliverable	Impact on yield	Reason	Timescale for delivery	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	15+	
284	yes		A few empty employment buildings. Some listed buildings. Good site for conversion. Multiple occupation.	Yes					Existing uses - employment		No		1 phase		1		
285	yes		All part of previous AAP. Some existing residential within existing industrial area. Contamination. Mixed use potential long time frame (mid-long term opportunity).	Yes					Contamination, flooding and ownership		No		2 phase			1	1
286	yes		Employment buildings in good condition. No problem to deliver. Occupation long term.	Yes					Existing uses - emploment		No		1 phase		1		
287	yes		No problems	No							No		1 phase	1			
288	yes		Vacant hotel. Not possible to renovate. Views make it marketable. No problems.	No							No		1 phase	1			
289	yes		Power lines adjacent to site, flooding underneath them. Sloping, so part of site has potential.	Yes					Powerlines and flooding		Small reduction	Powerlines/flooding	1 phase	1			
290	yes		Redevelopment for affordable housing. No problem, apart from relocation.	Yes					Existing uses - housing		No		1 phase				1
291	yes		Same as RTPID 290. Relocation of existing occupiers an issue. But no other problems. Net yield would be limited.	Yes					Existing uses - housing		No		1 phase				1
292	yes		Deliverable but requires agreement from homeowners to vacate the site	Yes					Existing uses - housing		No		1 phase				1
293	yes		Would need to relocate existing occupiers. Very narrow road would need improving. Redevelopment unlikely.	Yes					Existing uses - housing		No		1 phase				1
294	yes		No problem. Planning permission for 10 dwellings.	No							No		1 phase	1			
295	yes		Full planning permission for misc of uses, including 9 storey block of flats. Potential for houses in East. Possible issue of shared access with Network Rail.	No							Reduce	Mixed uses anticipated	2 phase	1	1		
296	yes		Access poor. Long term strategic prospects. Potential for bypass (using RTPID 16). No problem	Yes		Inadequate - requires development of neighbouring sites (RTP 150 or RTP151)					Consent for 10 dwellings		1 phase				1