**Detailed Assessment**REVISED NOVEMBER 2016

Detailed Assessment			INEVISED INOVERSIDEN 2010	
Sustainability theme/ Objectives	Assessment criteria	Commentary on criteria	16. East of Thurston - south of Stoney Lane, north of railway line 1.90 ha 25 - 35 dwellings	
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 risk from fluvial flooding?	- Sites in flood zone 1 should be prioritised over sites in flood zone 2 and those over sites in flood zone 3	Site is not at risk of fluvial flooding. Site is in flood zone 1.	
	Is the site at risk from surface water flooding?	Is there a high, medium or low risk of surface water flooding on the site?	No	
To protect and enhance the biodiversity of the parish, its wildlife habitats and species.	Will the site impact on priority habitats within the NP area?	This includes deciduous woodland, wood pasture and parkland	No	
	- Does development result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land?	Is the site in agricultural land classification (ALC) Grade 1, 2 or 3? Sites in Grades 1 and 2 will have a lower score	Indicatively the site is likely to be Grade 3 agricultural and land therefore may result in the loss of versatile agricultural land, albeit the lowest quality land of this type.	
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?	- If in open countryside, can the settlement edge be integrated with surrounding rural countryside to minimise impact on the character of the wider countryside (as recommended in 11 Guidance Note Plateau Estate Farmlands Suffolk County Council)? - Does the site fall within a Visually Important Open Space as defined in Saved Policy SB3 of the Local Plan?	Site is well surrounded by mature tree cover on the east and west sides and housing on the north side so any development would be well screened. The railway line runs along the southern boundary. Any development would not encroach significantly on the countryside.	
	- Is the site greenfield or previously developed land?	Development of brownfield sites is preferable to use of greenfield land.	Greenfield	

<b>4/Soc</b> To ensure that housing addresses the needs of the existing community of Thurston before addressing wider needs	for affordable housing needs (i.e. the site is capable of delivering 10 or more dwellings)?	Is the site capable of meeting the needs set out in the Thurston Housing Needs Survey, i.e. strong need for 1-2 bed houses, both market and affordable? Sites should be considered favourably if they are capable (by virtue of size) to accommodate needs of all identified groups.	Thurston's housing needs, both for market
<b>5/Econ</b> To maximise the potential of existing employment/employers and support the need for new employment	- Will development of the site result in the loss of commercial business premises? If so, will there be significant job losses?	Would Thurston's home working/small business community be supported or undermined through the proposal?	No
opportunities.	- Will the development provide new employment to serve local needs?		The site promotor has not offered any land for employment uses. The site is poorly located to provide a sustainable location for employment units as most traffic would travel through the village.
<b>6/Env</b> To protect the identity and local distinctiveness of Thurston as a rural settlement and to enhance the village streetscape.		<ul> <li>Is the site within or on the edge of the settlement?</li> <li>Does the site border the settlement on 1, 2 or 3 sides? Sites that are surrounded by existing development will be considered more favourably.</li> </ul>	The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary on its northern and eastern boundaries. Theses boundaries are not significantly built up. The southern boundary is provided by the railway line.
	- Will the proposal be in keeping or otherwise complement the built environment in the immediate vicinity in terms of layout, scale and density?	The community has expressed a preference for small developments of less than 10 units.	It is adjacent to a lower density area of residential development so this would have to be reflected in the design of development. This may therefore represent an inefficient use of land.
	- Does the site impact on the setting of any listed buildings?		No

	- Does the site have any trees with TPOs that could have to be removed?		No
<ul> <li>7/Soc</li> <li>To ensure that the community has a high quality and healthy lifestyle.</li> <li>8/Soc</li> <li>To ensure the provision of a range of community facilities that provide for the needs of the community</li> </ul>	- Does the site create the opportunity to provide new community infrastructure and/or green open space in an accessible location for the wider community?  '- Is the site capable of providing safe and improved linkages to community facilities?	- Will the site provide for allotments? - Will the site provide for greater opportunities for children and adult learning provision? - Will the site provide for improved outdoor recreational facilities - gym trail, gym and football goals/better football goals?	The site is currently allocated for allotment provision for the residents of the village. the site promotor has indicated that any redevelopment of the site would include the retention of an area of allotments to ensure continuity of a community benefit. The site is of a size to accommodate a limited amount of community facilities.  However, the site is very poorly located for the community to access any new community facilities.
	- Would the amenity of residents of the new development be affected by the neighbouring uses?	Would development be next to a 'bad neighbourhood use', e.g. noisy, smelly industrial activities?	The site is adjacent to the railway line so there could be an issue with noise. However, this could be mitigated through careful design.
<b>9/Soc</b> To improve safe movement around the parish and to key service centres	- Will the site impact on any existing footpaths or other public rights of way (PROWs)?		No
outside the parish by a range of modes  10/Soc To ensure that the community has adequate access to the key services it needs, including health facilities, convenience shops, and schools	Would Thurston's shops and services be undermined or supported through development of this site? e.g. would new residents be able to access shops and services easily by foot/bicycle/car? Does the location itself encourage the use of local shops and services?		The site is located in the far east of the village, well away from where the main shops and services are. Access on foot would require walking along stretches of Stoney Lane in the roadway as there is no footway. This does not generally encourage the use of local shops and services.

- Is the site on a safe cycling route to the main shops and services in the village or does it create the opportunity to deliver a new cycle route?	A key service location is the railway station	The route into the village along Barrells Road, Stoney Lane and School Road is reasonably safe, these being small roads with relatively low levels of traffic. There is no opportunity to create a new cycle route or a pedestrian routeway.
- Does a site, by virtue of its location and scale, have a severe impact on the existing highway network?		Barrells Road is a very small country lane that would significantly restrict the level of housing that could be accommodated by an access onto it. The same applies to Stoney Lane which would be the main access road from the site into the village.
- Is the site within a desirable or acceptable walking distance of the main shops and services in the village?	A key service location is the Community College and Primary School	Within acceptable distance of the Primary School and the preferred maximum distance of the Community College.
- Are there safe crossing points and walkways between the site and the Community College and Primary School?		Access on foot to Community College requires crossing of Norton Road and Ixworth Road, neither of which have safe crossing points.  Access to Primary School on foot requires crossing of Church Road which does not have a safe crossing point.  A significant stretch of the route along Stoney Lane does not have a footway so pedestrians would have to walk in the road.
- Is the site within a desirable or acceptable walking distance from the railway station?		Well outside preferred maximum distance

	- Is the site within a desirable or acceptable walking distance from nearest bus stop?	Within preferred maximum distance
Overall assessment		The site's relationship with the settlement boundary is relatively weak, being on the very eastern edge of the village. It is large enough to provide a range of housing and some community infrastructure but access is poor for pedestrians. Its location will ensure a reliance on the motorised vehicle. The site was not originally submitted as part of the Neighbourhood Plan Process but is known to have been submitted as part of Babergh and Mid Suffolk Call for Sites 2016. A request was made in September 2016 for the site to be formally assessed.

## **Assessment**

Strongly positive
Slightly positive
Neutral
Slightly negative
Strongly negative

## Notes

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

	Facilities, e.g shops, bus stop.	Commuting / school	Other
Desirable	200m	500m	400m
Acceptable	400m	1000m	800m
Preferred maximum	800m Providing for Journeys on	2000m	1200m