Employment Assessment

| Sustainability theme/ Objectives | Assessment criteria | Commentary on criteria | 7. Industrial buildings off Norton Road |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | | 0.43 ha Office and light industrial |
| 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 | Yes. Site almost wholly in flood zone 3. Such employment uses are classified as less vulnerable uses therefore are permitted in flood zone 3a but not flood zone 3b. It will need to be confirmed which flood zone the site is in. |
| | 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 | 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? | 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? | The site has existing agricultural barns and buildings on it so low level redevelopment would not significantly worsen any impact that built development currently has on the landscape. |
| | - Is the site greenfield or previously developed land? | Development of brownfield sites is preferable to use of greenfield land. | Brownfield |

| 4/Soc To ensure that housing addresses the needs of the existing community of Thurston before addressing wider needs | - Is the site large enough to provide 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. | N/a |
|--|---|---|--|
| 5/Econ To maximise the potential of existing employment/employers and support the need for new employment opportunities. | 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? | Yes |
| | - Will the development provide new employment to serve local needs? | | Yes |
| 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? | 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. | The site is is clearly separate from the existing settlement boundary. |
| | - 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. | N/a |
| | - 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 |

| 7/Soc To ensure that the community has a high quality and healthy lifestyle. 8/Soc To ensure the provision of a range of community facilities that provide for the needs of the community | wider community? | 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? | N/a |
|--|---|--|---|
| | - 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? | N/a. Nor would the site impact on any existing residential areas. |
| 9/Soc 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? | | No |
| | - 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 | No |
| | Does a site, by virtue of its location and scale, have a severe impact on the existing highway network? | | The scale of growth that would be accommodated would be unlikely to have a severe impact on the highway network. |
| | 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 | N/a |

| | Are there safe crossing points and walkways between the site and the Community College and Primary School? Is the site within a desirable or acceptable walking distance from the railway station? | N/a Within 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 does not have any significant sustainability issues other than the fact that it is remote from the settlement. However, the former agricultural uses on the site established commercial activity so a small development would be acceptable. A significant issue to establish is whether the site is in flood zone 3b (the functional floodplain) in which case development should not occur. |

Assessment

| Strongly positive | |
|-------------------|--|
| Slightly positive | |
| Neutral | |
| Slightly negative | |
| Chronaly possible | |

Strongly negative

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 |
| Courses Outidalized for Descrition for Loursey, or Foot (ULT 0000) | | | |

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