

Kings Somborne Neighbourhood Development Plan

“Draft” Final Site Appraisal



Analysis

The following table shows the short listed sites and their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats against the key criteria in relation to site location.

It should be noted that all sites are deemed suitable for development. The table is constructed to facilitate the preference of the final four sites to be included in the Neighbourhood Development Plan

	Site	KS1	KS3	SHELAA 55	SHELAA 80	SHELAA 148b	SHELAA 168
Topic	Criteria						
Site Size/ Location	Strength	None	Site can accommodate up to 12 houses Fills in a natural gap in the settlement boundary	Site can accommodate the maximum number of houses	Site can accommodate the minimum of 7 houses	Site can accommodate the maximum number of houses	Site can accommodate the maximum number of houses
	Weakness	Site is too small to accommodate the minimum of 7 houses	Due to highways restrictions the maximum number or 14 houses cannot be accommodated	None	The site is too small to accommodate 10 houses which is the minimum to generate	None	None

					Affordable Housing		
	Opportunity	None	To utilise derelict land rather than utilise land currently used for agriculture	None	Allows development to be diversified through the whole Village. Extends settlement boundary to natural break line of New Lane		None
	Threat	Required housing numbers will not be fulfilled	None	Continued expansion of the village into the countryside	Continued expansion of the village into the countryside	Continued expansion of the village into the countryside	Continued expansion of the village into the countryside. Site was refused permission for 60 houses see 16/02378/OUTS
Flooding	Strength	Site located well above flood zone	None	Site is located well away from flood zone	None	None	Site is located well away from flood zone
	Weakness	Run off will feed directly into the Bourne	Site located in proximity to flood zone 2/3	Site drainage will rely on good percolation properties	Site located in proximity to flood zone 2/3	None	Site drainage will rely on good percolation properties

	Opportunity	None		None	None	None	None
	Threat	None	None	None	None	None	None
Vehicle Access	Strength	No material or severe detrimental impact upon highway safety and efficiency.	None	The site would be considered a prime location to support such a residential use with little in the way of constraint.	The LHA would not likely raise an objection in regard to traffic impact	None	LHA would be unlikely to raise any significant highway safety concerns for a development of this size and in this location.
	Weakness	None	Short section of single lane carriageway. A maximum number of 12 houses is appropriate which should include the numbers from KS1	None		it is unlikely the LHA would have much appetite or support for vehicular access off of Muss Lane	None
	Opportunity	None	None			To move the 30 mph speed limit to a respectable distance past New Lane	None

	Threat	None	None			The length of the necessary access road from the A3057 to the site could make it cost prohibitive	None
Pedestrian Access	Strength	None	Benefits from the ability to provide segregated pedestrian access.	Benefits from a number of potential options for segregated and nonsegregated pedestrian access for linkage to the surrounding residential area and village centre.	None	Benefits in being able to provide a dedicated and segregated pedestrian route to the village centre via Muss Lane.	A short extension to the current pavement would achieve a clear and continuous pedestrian linkage to the village facilities.
	Weakness	Pedestrians could utilise Cow Drove Hill to gain access	Pedestrians could also utilise Cow Drove Hill to gain access	None	Site sits to the edge of the village boundaries, and as such, pedestrian access is limited,	Footfall along Muss Lane which has no pavement will increase	None

	Opportunity	None	To provide a high-quality access for pedestrians via Frog Hole Lane	None	To upgrade the current footpath leading to Muss Lane	None	None
	Threat	None	None	None	During periods of wet weather pedestrians will utilise Winchester Road	None	None
Distance to the village centre	Strength	Good 400m	Good less than 400m	Good less than 400m	None	None	None
	Weakness	None	None	None	Poor on edge of Village in excess of 400m	Average in excess of 400m	Average in excess of 400m
	Opportunity	None	None	None	None	None	None
	Threat	None	None	None	None	None	None
Environment Impact	Strength	None	None	None	None	None	None
	Weakness	None	Loss of some hedgerow would be inevitable.	Loss of some hedgerow would be inevitable.	Access would require moderate to substantial removal of vegetation to effect necessary sightlines,	Access would require moderate to substantial removal of vegetation to effect necessary sightlines,	Loss of some hedgerow would be inevitable.

	Opportunity	None	The redundant land and proximity to the Bourne gives opportunity to provide shelter, food and foraging and breeding opportunities for a variety of wildlife species including plants, amphibians, invertebrates, birds, bats and other mammals.	None	None	None	None
	Threat	None	Development within the lower part (flood plain) of the site could damage the ecology.	Potential loss of the trees at the Gorrings.	Landscape would be impaired unless screening is provided.	None	None

Appraisal of Analysis

As highlighted within the AECOM site selection there are no ideal sites for development and therefore selection is subjective with a view to meeting the visions and objectives of the Parish whilst minimising the impact of development.

The Parish Council has identified the preference for 4 sites one of 14 dwellings, two of ten and one of seven. With this in mind it is apparent that site KS1 is unsuitable as it does not provide sufficient housing numbers to meet the criteria and can therefore be excluded.

The removal of KS1 has the knock on effect of increasing the viability of KS3 due the fact Highways have indicated vehicle movements would preclude a development of more than 12 dwellings with access of Cow Drove Hill. With careful design KS3 has some benefits. It is close to the village centre, the land is no longer farmed so no loss of agriculture is foreseen. Further there is an opportunity to create a dedicated wildlife area in the lower half of the site which would be of benefit and interest to all. This site is suitable for up to 10 houses.

SHELAA 55 has sufficient capacity for 14 dwellings, it is close to the village centre and there are no highways issues. Environmental impact is minimal the only drawback would appear that development could spread further into the countryside. This site is a good candidate for 14 houses

SHELAA 80 is located on the edge of the village and access is not ideal. Pedestrian access is via field to Muss Lane making it inevitable residents would use Winchester Road in times of wet weather. There are however no highways issues although significant loss of hedging will occur to achieve necessary sight lines. On balance KS3 appears to be a better prospect for a small scale development.

SHELAA 148b will require a new road taken from the A3057. This road will significantly increase development costs and potentially viability of the site necessitating a reduced ration of private versus affordable homes and thus not meeting the identified housing requirement. Under current planning regulation the local authority will determine this at the detailed planning stage. Screening will be required to ensure landscape is not impacted. The threat of further expansion into the countryside is similar to SHELAA 55. This site on balance is therefore not as suitable as SHELAA55 however the identified cost impact of the new road makes the most viable number of dwellings 14 for this site.

SHELAA 168 The considerations for this site virtually mirrors that of those for SHELAA 55 except that it is at further distance from the village centre. Whilst the site was subject to application for planning permission in 2016 inspection of the planning officers report indicates no serious obstacle to limited development of this site. Whilst mirroring assessment of site SHELAA 55 the increased distance from the village centre leads to it being ranked below SHELAA 55 but still suitable for the maximum requirement of 14 dwelling.

Conclusion

From the analysis above it is apparent there are two distinct options in nominating development sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Firstly the preferred allocation is sites SHELAA 55, SHELAA 148b and SHELAA 168 should be nominated to take one site of 14 and the other two 10 houses. Provided the landowner agrees to the proposed numbers then site SHELAA 148b should be allocated 14 houses. This is because of the consideration of infrastructure costs associated with construction highlighted above. Written confirmation must be obtained to ensure that the location of development within the site and the numbers of affordable houses will be adhered to. Sites SHELAA 55 and SHELAA 168 should be nominated for 10 houses. Finally site KS3 should be nominated for 7 dwellings.

Secondly if for any reason the above scenario fails to materialise in respect to site SHELAA 148b which of the larger sites has the most obstacles to overcome then site SHELAA 55 should take the 14 houses with sites SHELAA 168 and KS3 taking 10 each with the remaining seven being allocated to site 80.

NDPWG – 29th November 2021