

Detailed Assessment

REVISED NOVEMBER 2016

Sustainability theme/ Objectives	Assessment criteria	Commentary on criteria	6. Norton Road
			11 ha 175-200 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 from 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
2/Env 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 land and 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?	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

<p>4/Soc To ensure that housing addresses the needs of the existing community of Thurston before addressing wider needs</p>	<p>- Is the site large enough to provide for affordable housing needs (i.e. the site is capable of delivering 10 or more dwellings)?</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Site would be able to provide for all of Thurston's housing needs, both for market and affordable housing.</p>
<p>5/Econ To maximise the potential of existing employment/employers and support the need for new employment opportunities.</p>	<p>- Will development of the site result in the loss of commercial business premises? If so, will there be significant job losses?</p>	<p>Would Thurston's home working/small business community be supported or undermined through the proposal?</p>	<p>No</p>
	<p>- Will the development provide new employment to serve local needs?</p>		<p>The site promoter has not offered any land for employment uses.</p>
<p>6/Env To protect the identity and local distinctiveness of Thurston as a rural settlement and to enhance the village streetscape.</p>	<p>- What is the relationship of the site to the settlement?</p>	<p>- Is the site within or on the edge of the settlement? - Does the site border the settlement on 1, 2 or 3 sides? Sites that are surrounded by existing development will be considered more favourably.</p>	<p>The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary on its western and southern boundary - this covers more than half the perimeter of the site. The site would represent a coherent extension of the settlement area.</p>
	<p>- Will the proposal be in keeping or otherwise complement the built environment in the immediate vicinity in terms of layout, scale and density?</p>	<p>The community has expressed a preference for small developments of less than 10 units.</p>	<p>The site is of a scale that is significantly larger than the community's preference. However, this is adjacent to the main residential area of Thurston so a well-designed development with dwellings separated by areas of open space would be in keeping with the existing development in this area of the village.</p>
	<p>- Does the site impact on the setting of any listed buildings?</p>		<p>No</p>

	- Does the site have any trees with TPOs that could have to be removed?		No
<p>7/Soc To ensure that the community has a high quality and healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>8/Soc To ensure the provision of a range of community facilities that provide for the needs of the community</p>	<p>- Does the site create the opportunity to provide new community infrastructure and/or green open space in an accessible location for the wider community?</p> <p>'- Is the site capable of providing safe and improved linkages to community facilities?</p>	<p>- Will the site provide for allotments?</p> <p>- Will the site provide for greater opportunities for children and adult learning provision?</p> <p>- Will the site provide for improved outdoor recreational facilities - gym trail, gym and football goals/better football goals?</p>	<p>The site is large enough to provide community infrastructure. The developer has offered to provide open space, a 5-a-side grass pitch, gym trail, space for play areas and allotments.</p> <p>Land has also been offered for an extension of The Victoria Public House.</p> <p>The site is well located for the community to access any new community facilities.</p>
	- 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?	No
<p>9/Soc To improve safe movement around the parish and to key service centres outside the parish by a range of modes</p> <p>10/Soc To ensure that the community has adequate access to the key services it needs, including health facilities, convenience shops, and schools</p>	- Will the site impact on any existing footpaths or other public rights of way (PROWs)?		There is a PROW along the north eastern boundary that does then cut through a small section of the site. It is desirable for this route to be retained and for the views looking east from the PROW to be kept.
	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 close to most shops and services which are on existing footway routes. Encouragement of the use of shops and services in the village would need to be through the provision of a footpath and a pedestrian crossing onto the footway on the western side of Sandpit Lane.

<p>- 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?</p>	<p>A key service location is the railway station</p>	<p>The route into the village along Sandpit Lane is reasonably safe provided a safe pedestrian crossing route were to be installed to allow access to footpaths. There is no provision however to install a cycle route.</p>
<p>- Does a site, by virtue of its location and scale, have a severe impact on the existing highway network?</p>		<p>The scale of growth proposed could have a severe impact on the highway network. Liaison with the Highway Authority would need to be made to assess this in more detail. The impact and the capability of Sandpit Lane / Thedwastre Road Priority System and the inevitable increase in traffic volume needs further investigation. Liaison with the Highway Authority on the suitability of such a site having the one entrance/exit is also to be encouraged.</p>
<p>- Is the site within a desirable or acceptable walking distance of the main shops and services in the village?</p>	<p>A key service location is the Community College and Primary School</p>	<p>Within desirable distance of both the Primary School and the Community College.</p>

	<p>- Are there safe crossing points and walkways between the site and the Community College and Primary School?</p>		<p>Access on foot to Community College requires crossing of Ixworth Road, which does not have a direct safe crossing point. Access to Primary School on foot requires crossing of Sandpit Lane which does not have a safe crossing point. However, the scale of growth would mean that a footpath and a pedestrian crossing should be provided. Access to both schools would then be along footways for the entire route.</p>
	<p>- Is the site within a desirable or acceptable walking distance from the railway station?</p>		<p>Within preferred maximum distance</p>
	<p>- Is the site within a desirable or acceptable walking distance from nearest bus stop?</p>		<p>Within desirable distance</p>

Overall assessment			<p>This site is well located and is large enough to provide a range of housing and community infrastructure (a number of which have been offered by the developer). The site is not situated on a pedestrian footway and consideration will need to be given over safe entry and exit points. Safe pedestrian access to primary and secondary schools would require the provision of footpath and pedestrian crossing/safe crossing points. The major issue with the site would be the potential traffic impact which would need more detailed assessment in conjunction with the Highway Authority.</p>
---------------------------	--	--	--

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	2000m	1200m

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

