

Detailed Assessment

REVISED NOVEMBER 2016

Sustainability theme/ Objectives	Assessment criteria	Commentary on criteria	4. 14 Meadow Lane
			0.67 ha 16-20 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
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 2 agricultural land and therefore would result in the loss of versatile agricultural land
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 existing residential development on the east side and mature tree cover on the west side. 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 will provide limited affordable housing which would not address all of Thurston's housing needs. The limited amount of market housing would be able to provide for a limited range of needs.</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>By virtue of the site's size, it would provide no potential for new employment floorspace.</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>Site's western boundary is sufficiently close to the settlement boundary that the site could logically be incorporated but this means that relationship of the site to the existing settlement is weak. Site does have existing residential development on the east side.</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>Whilst slightly larger than the community's preference for small developments, this site would be of a scale that would largely complement existing development in Thurston.</p>
	<p>- Does the site impact on the setting of any listed buildings?</p>		<p>No</p>
	<p>- Does the site have any trees with TPOs that could have to be removed?</p>		<p>No</p>

<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 not of a scale capable of providing any community infrastructure.</p> <p>The site is not capable of providing improved linkages to community facilities.</p>
<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>	<p>- Would the amenity of residents of the new development be affected by the neighbouring uses?</p> <p>- Will the site impact on any existing footpaths or other public rights of way (PROWs)?</p> <p>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?</p> <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>Would development be next to a 'bad neighbourhood use', e.g. noisy, smelly industrial activities?</p>	<p>No</p> <p>There is a PROW along the northern boundary but development would not affect this, nor would it impact on any views from the PROW.</p> <p>The site is reasonably close to some of the shops and services in the village. Access on foot would require walking along stretches of Meadow Lane in the roadway as there is no footway. This does not generally encourage the use of local shops and services.</p> <p>The route into the village along Meadow Lane and Norton Road is reasonably safe, albeit that Norton Road is quite a well used route. There is no opportunity to create a new 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 that would be accommodated would be unlikely to have a severe impact on the highway network.</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 acceptable distance of the Primary School and desirable distance of 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 Norton Road and Ixworth Road, neither of which have safe crossing points. Access to Primary School on foot requires crossing of Norton Road which does not have a safe crossing point. A significant stretch of the route along Meadow Lane does not have a footway so pedestrians would have to walk in the road.</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			The site would result on the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. Its relationship with the settlement boundary is weak and its size limits its ability to provide a range of housing, community infrastructure or employment. Access is poor for pedestrians.
---------------------------	--	--	--

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)