

Appendix B

Clayland Objective review of site suitability assessment based on assessment criteria

Purpose of the review to assess the objectivity and soundness of the original assessment and whether the conclusions reached were based on proportionate evidence and considering all reasonable alternatives
Hingham

Outcome Analysis
Colour coding

No Constraint/Impact
Constraint/Impact capable of mitigation
Constraint/Impact not capable of mitigation

Site Factors against which criteria is judged GNL0298/0335 Watton Road GNL0503 Dereham Road GNL0520 Norwich Road Comments

Criteria

Constraint Analysis

Criteria	Factors against which criteria is judged	GNL0298/0335 Watton Road	GNL0503 Dereham Road	GNL0520 Norwich Road	Comments
Access	Access by all means is possible.	Suitable standard road access can be achieved. Footpath access requires 1 pedestrian refuge crossing to opposite side of B1108 from where there is safe pedestrian path. Bus stop close by on Watton Road	Suitable standard of Access achievable. No existing footpath on either side of road. New footpath provision required. Suggested continuous footpath not achievable - requires crossing of Dereham Road at suitable point to reach centre. No regular bus service from close to site - requires walk to centre.	Potential access constraints identified and potential access conflict with Ironside Way junction particularly if an active frontage is sought. TPO trees prevent the draft policy required footways across the whole site frontage. Pedestrian route requires additional crossing to north side path prejudiced by bus stop at likely location or longer route along shared surfaces through The Hops and additional crossing further west to access centre on safe pathway. Requires greatest level of mitigation.	All sites require mitigation and road crossings. None have feasible pedestrian route on same side of road to centre. 0298/0335 Watton Road crossing via pedestrian refuge, 0503 Dereham Road via new footpath and crossing point, 0520 Norwich Road via new pedestrian refuge and requiring at least one additional crossing to access village centre. See Appendix C of Clayland evidence
Accessibility to Services	4 or more core services within specified walking distance	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	No distinction between sites in Hingham
Utilities Capacity	Sufficient utilities capacity is available	Utilities capacity requires mitigation for all sites in the village by enhancement to Water Recycling and sewerage systems	Utilities capacity requires mitigation for all sites in the village by enhancement to Water Recycling and sewerage systems	Utilities capacity requires mitigation for all sites in the village by enhancement to Water Recycling and sewerage systems	No distinction between sites in Hingham
Utilities Infrastructure	No constraint from utilities infrastructure	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	No distinction between sites in Hingham
Contamination and Ground Stability	No known contamination or stability issues	Satisfied	Satisfied	Satisfied	No distinction between sites in Hingham
Flood Risk	Site is at low risk of flooding Zone 1 and no risk of surface water flooding	Flood zone 1 No surface water flood risk to areas proposed for housing	Flood Zone 1. Small area in north east of allocation at low risk of surface water flooding capable of mitigation by layout design	Policy identifies that further investigation of surface water flood risk susceptibility and mitigation. Identified flood history on adjoining development by same developer. Site partly low/medium surface water flood risk	0520 has significant areas at low and medium risk of surface water flooding and evidence of risk of significant harm from surface water requiring further investigation given flooding from adjoining site. At greater risk than reasonable alternative sites. See Appendix A of Clayland evidence
Market attractiveness	Site location attractive to the market	Attractive well screened site	Attractive to market	Attractive to market	No distinction between sites in Hingham

Impact Analysis

Significant Landscapes	Not detrimental to sensitive landscapes or their setting	Not adjoining or within line of sight of sensitive landscape, SSSI on opposite side of the village and site well screened. Proposed woodland will enhance the landscape	Not adjoining or within line of sight of sensitive landscape, SSSI on opposite side of the village. Open view from north but existing housing backs visible on village approach so opportunity to improve the landscape rather than harm.	Within Tiffey tributary farmland and will enclose adjacent PROW with loss of landscape views to walkers. No existing screening of site from eastern approach and visible on the higher part of the slope so likely to adversely affect the landscape and existing long views of the church. Significant impact that it is difficult to mitigate. Effect on TPO trees on the site frontage will require mitigation / protection zones in conflict with the desired active frontage in proposed policy.	0520 is potentially detrimental in several regards to the landscape and identified features within it in the sustainability assessment, and not all can be mitigated. See Appendix D of Clayland evidence
Townscapes	Not detrimental to Townscape including Conservation areas, listed buildings or important townscapes	Not adjoining conservation area (as stated). Screened from centre and church and from views from the western approach by existing development and trees so no negative impact.	Not adjoining Conservation area. Existing development screens the site from the centre and church so no negative impact	Significant and important long views of the church approaching along the B1108, remaining after The Hops was developed because this was on the lower part of the slope, with be significantly harmed by development at the top of the slope in a way that can not be mitigated by screening - the view will be lost. In close proximity to 2 listed buildings the setting of which will be affected	0520 effect on heritage assets unlikely to be possible to entirely mitigate, particularly the log view of the church on the approach to the town. The Hops was considered acceptable in 2014 because it was low enough on the slope not to significantly block this important view. The proposed 0520 can not avoid blocking it. See Appendix D of Clayland evidence.
Biodiversity & Geodiversity	No detrimental impact on designated site, protected species or ecological network eg SSSI	No protected species issues (ecology report from previous planning application) 2km from SSSI on opposite side of Hingham so no mitigation required. Proposed community woodland would give significant biodiversity enhancement	Assessed as amber in suitability assessment but no highlighted significant constraint.	900m from and in line of sight with SSSI. TPO trees on the site. Mitigation likely to be required	0520 is closest to SSSI and the only site of the 3 with line of site visibility but is the only one of the three originally assessed without constraint. No objective assessment of Biodiversity net gain undertaken as part of the assessment process. See Appendix F of Clayland evidence.
Historic Environment	Not detrimental to any designated or non designated heritage assets	Not adjoining Conservation area and screened by existing development and trees	Not adjoining Conservation area and no significant heritage constraints	In close proximity to 2 listed buildings on Seamere Road to the south. Whilst it may be possible to mitigate the effect on these it will not be possible to enhance this as required by the draft policy. Effect on long views of the Grade 1 listed church	0520 has significant potential detriment to heritage assets that it will be difficult to mitigate. See Appendix D of Clayland evidence.
Open Space and GI	No resulting loss of open space	Significant enhancement of Public Open Space and GI from proposed community woodland	No loss of open space or GI	No loss of open space.	No detrimental effects from any site but assessment fails to recognise the potential enhancement of 0298/0335
Transport and Roads	No detrimental impact to trunk or local roads	Highways report assesses traffic numbers and demonstrates highway capacity for likely scale of development	Proposed allocation suggests some carriageway widening may be required	Increased highway use and potential conflict with commercial traffic using Ironside Way considered capable of mitigation	Mitigation required for highway for both proposed allocations but not 0298/0335. See Appendix C of Clayland evidence

Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses	Development would be compatible with existing or adjoining uses	Compatible with adjoining residential uses	Compatible with adjoining residential uses	Incompatibility between residential and B2 industrial uses identified, including from volumes of traffic generated and emerging from Ironside Way opposite part of the site, requiring layout and other mitigation.	0520 is only site of the three with potential compatibility issues between conflicting residential and B2 industrial uses, posing a threat to the environment of residents and the ongoing and future business uses in the main industrial location within the settlement. Assessed in HELAA as amber. See Appendix E of Clayland Evidence
--------------------------------------	---	--	--	---	--

Outcome score on the basis of objective review of the evidence.

Green	12	10	5
Amber	2	4	8
Red	0	0	1

An objective assessment would consider 0298/0335 as the preferred site for further consultation, and that there are significant issues to seek further information on or mitigate for 0520

Sources HELAA site assessment , GNLG Sustainability appraisal draft GNLG Policy and site research and observation
See also evidence within Clayland Appendices