High Level Assessment

| Sustainability theme/ Objectives | | | 10. Plum Pudding Field 10.72 ha 268-321 dwellings | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Availability | Is the site available/has it been put forward by the landowner or a developer? | | Yes | |
| 1/Env To preserve and enhance the natural beauty of Thurston in terms of its geology, landform, soils, water systems and climate | Is the site at high risk from fluvial flooding? | Sites where at least 75% of the area is in flood zone 3 should be eliminated | No | |
| | Is the site at high risk from surface water flooding? | Sites where at least 75% of the area is at high risk of surface water flooding should be eliminated | No | |
| 3/Env To protect the landscape setting of Thurston village through use of land with a low landscape impact and by focusing development on previously developed land | - Is the site in open countryside/will it encroach unacceptably on open countryside? - Will the site have a detrimental impact on the landscape? | Sites that clearly sit in open countryside and are likely to have a detrimental impact on the landscape should be eliminated | Site sits clearly in open countryside, away from the settlement and any other built development. It is likely to have a significant detrimental impact on the landscape when viewed from the east, west and south. | |
| 6/Env To protect the identity and local distinctiveness of Thurston as a rural settlement and to enhance the village streetscape. | - What is the relationship of the site to the settlement? | Sites that are clearly separate from the settlement boundary will be eliminated | Site is clearly separate from the existing settlement boundary | |

| 9/Soc To improve safe movement around the parish and to key service centres outside the parish by a range of modes 10/Soc | - Does a site, by virtue of its location and scale, have a severe impact on the existing highway network? | Sites that are likely to have a severe detrimental impact on the highway network should be eliminated | Whilst there is likely to be an impact, this is unlikely to be severe |
|--|---|--|---|
| To ensure that the community has adequate access to the key services it needs, including health facilities, convenience shops, and schools | - Is the site within a desirable or acceptable walking distance of the main shops and services in the village? | Sites that are more than 50% further than the preferred maximum walking distance from shops and services in the village should be eliminated | Yes |
| Overall assessment | | | The site is very open and visible and would encroach significantly into the countryside. It is also separate from the settlement boundary. It is not considered to be a sustainable location for development. |

Assessment

Should the Overall Assessment state that there is a fundamental issue preventing sustainable development, the site will not be submitted for detailed assessment and the site will not be considered further.

Notes

* This is based on the following guidance provided by the Institute of Highways and Transportation:

| | Facilities, e.g shops, | Commuting / school | Other |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------|-------|
| | bus stop. | | |
| Desirable | 200m | 500m | 400m |
| | | | |

| Acceptable | 400m | 1000m | 800m |
|-------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Preferred maximum | 800m | 2000m | 1200m |

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