

King's Somborne Neighbourhood Development Plan

~~Final~~ **Draft** Site Appraisal

The following table shows the short listed sites and their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats against the key criteria in relation to site location. *The analysis should be completed with close reference to the following reports – the AECOM “Site Options and Assessment Report”, the Waterco “Drainage Note”, the Nick Culhane Highway Consultant “Potential Sites Access Study”, the “Sequential Test Report” and the Hampshire County Council “Highways Assistance” letter.*

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	Site can accommodate the maximum number of houses	Site can accommodate the minimum of 7 houses	Site can accommodate the maximum number of	Site can accommodate the maximum number of houses

			settlement boundary			houses	
	Weakness	<p>Site is too small to accommodate the minimum of 7 houses</p> <p><i>The site can accommodate 7 houses [AECOM p. 19], and it would be illogical not to develop this site if site 3 is to be developed. Site 3 can only be accessed via site 1</i></p>	<p>Due to highways restrictions the maximum number of 14 houses cannot be accommodated</p>	None	<p>The site is too small to accommodate 10 houses which is the minimum to generate Affordable Housing</p> <p><i>AECOM identifies a capacity of 9-19 homes and the SHELAA estimate is 11. [AECOM p. 35]</i></p>	None	None

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Opportunity	None	To utilise derelict land rather than utilise land currently used for agriculture <i>This is an opinion and not part of the Evidence Base. The owner has chosen not to use this field for agriculture.</i>	None <i>This site has the potential to take many more than the assumed 15 dwelling limit. The AECOM report identifies a capacity of 29-59. [AECOM p. 30]</i>	Allows development to be diversified through the whole Village. Extends settlement boundary to natural break line of New Lane	<i>This site has the potential to take many more than the assumed 15 dwelling limit. The AECOM report identifies a capacity of 9-19. [AECOM p. 38]</i>	None <i>This site has the potential to take many more than the assumed 15 dwelling limit. The AECOM report identifies a capacity of c. 38. [AECOM p. 39]</i>
	Threat	Required housing numbers will not be fulfilled <i>See comment above re. site capacity [AECOM p. 19]</i>	None <i>The site is <1,000m from an SSSI Impact Risk Zone and may require consultation with Natural England [AECOM p.21]</i>	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	None	Site is located well away from flood	None	None	Site is located well away from flood

		above flood zone		zone <i>Site passes the Sequential Test [p. 9]</i>		<i>Site passes the Sequential Test [p. 9]</i>	zone <i>Site passes the Sequential Test [p. 9]</i>
	Weakness	Run off will feed directly into the Bourne <i>via Site 3</i>	<p>Site located in proximity to flood zone 2/3</p> <p><i>Site does not pass the Sequential Test [p. 9]</i></p> <p><i>Land level raising required to accommodate attenuation storage. [Waterco Drainage Note p. 7]</i></p>	<p>Site drainage will rely on good percolation properties</p>	<p>Site located in proximity to flood zone 2/3</p> <p><i>Site does not pass the Sequential Test [p. 9]</i></p> <p><i>Land level raising required to accommodate attenuation storage. [Waterco Drainage Note p.7]</i></p>	None	<p>Site drainage will rely on good percolation properties</p>

	Opportunity	None	<i>None</i>	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. <i>Incorrect, see Weakness below</i>	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 <i>Incorrect</i> <i>Visibility splays of 2.4m by 43.0m required at the junction with Cow Drove Hill. Such a splay cannot be</i>	Short section of single lane carriageway. A maximum number of 12 houses is appropriate which should include the	None	<i>See threat identified below, could also be considered a weakness</i>	it is unlikely the LHA would have much appetite or support for vehicular access off of Muss Lane	None

		<p><i>achieved in the northerly direction.</i></p> <p><i>[Nick Culhane Highway Consultant p.4]</i></p>	<p>numbers from KS1</p> <p><i>See adjacent comment for site 1</i></p> <p><i>[Nick Culhane Highway Consultant p.4]</i></p> <p><i>Note: Cyclists frequently freewheel fast from this northerly direction. An unsighted cyclist hitting a car emerging from Highfield could result in serious injury. The likelihood of this risk is increased by development.</i></p>				
	Opportunity	None	None	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	To move the 30	None

						mph speed limit to a respectable distance past New Lane	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

3

	Threat	None	None	None	<i>Vehicular access requires visibility consideration. [Hampshire County Council Highways Assistance p. 7]</i>	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	None	Benefits in being able to provide a dedicated and segregated pedestrian route to the village centre	A short extension to the current pavement would achieve a clear and continuous pedestrian linkage to the village facilities.

				surrounding residential area and village centre.		via Muss Lane.	
	Weakness	<p>Pedestrians could utilise Cow Drove Hill to gain access</p> <p><i>See adjacent comment for Site 3</i></p>	<p>Pedestrians could also utilise Cow Drove Hill to gain access</p> <p><i>This safety risk is highly likely given the shorter distance than the Froghole Lane alternative</i></p>	None	<p>Site sits to the edge of the village boundaries, and as such, pedestrian access is limited,</p>	<p>Footfall along Muss Lane which has no pavement will increase</p>	None

4

	Opportunity	None	<p>To provide a high-quality access for pedestrians via Frog Hole Lane</p>	None	<p>To upgrade the current footpath leading to Muss Lane</p>	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 <i>See adjacent comment for site 3.</i>	Good less than 400m <i>Pedestrian access via Froghole Lane is much further than 400m.</i> <i>“The importance of high-quality pedestrian access provision, which is segregated from vehicular traffic, should not be underestimated.”</i> <i>[Hampshire County</i>	Good less than 400m	None	None	None

			<i>Council Highways Assistance p. 4]</i>				
	Weakness	None <i>Safe pedestrian access to the village centre is in excess of 400m – see above</i>	None <i>Safe pedestrian access to the village centre is in excess of 400m – see above</i>	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	Access would require moderate to substantial	Loss of some hedgerow would be inevitable.

			<i>The site has high landscape sensitivity. [AECOM p.21]</i>		vegetation to effect necessary sightlines, <i>The site has high landscape sensitivity. [AECOM p. 35]</i>	removal of vegetation to effect necessary sightlines,	
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

5

	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,	None	None	None	None
--	-------------	------	---	------	------	------	------

			<p>invertebrates, birds, bats and other mammals.</p> <p><i>Not supported by the Evidence Base and not an opportunity that results from proposed development – these benefits already exist, including perfect feeding conditions for the Barbastelle Bats and other species.</i></p>				
	Threat	None	<p>Development within the lower part (flood plain) of the site could damage the</p>	<p>Potential loss of the trees at the Gorrings.</p>	<p>Landscape would be impaired unless screening is provided.</p>	None	None

			ecology. <i>The site is <1,000m from an SSSI Impact Risk Zone and may require consultation with Natural England [AECOM p. 21]</i>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

6

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. *Site selection need no longer be subjective. The Evidence Base facilitates far greater objectivity.*

The Parish Council has identified the preference for 4 sites one of 14 dwellings, two of ten and one of seven. *The Parish Council rejected this proposed statement at the 11 October 2021 Parish Council meeting.* 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. *Site 1 cannot therefore legitimately be excluded for this reason, but The Evidence Base does support the exclusion of site 1 due to visual splays not being achievable in a northerly direction up Cow Drove Hill. This, of course, also applies to site 3.*

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. *It is illogical to develop site 3 and not site 1 as site 3 can only be accessed by development in site 1.* 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. *Site 3 is available for agriculture now and it is the owner's choice not to use it. Both the Hampshire Highways and Nick Culhane reports identify a safety risk of pedestrian access via the vehicular route into site 3, preferring the opportunity to provide pedestrian access via Frogghole Lane. Safe pedestrian access to the village centre is therefore a considerable distance and it is likely pedestrians will frequently choose the shorter less safe route. In addition, the restricted visibility up Cow Drove Hill increases the risk of car/cyclist collisions as cyclists frequently enjoy high speed freewheeling down the hill.* 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. *The whole of site 3 is already a thriving wildlife area providing natural habitat for many species including perfect feeding conditions for the Barbastelle bats. Furthermore the AECOM report identifies that, of all the sites suitable for potential development, only sites 3 and 80 are of "high landscape sensitivity" and sites 1 and 3 are the only ones within 1,000m of the SSSI impact risk zone. Development of the site will not enhance the existing habitat conditions and, worse, could potentially harm them.*

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 *with an opportunity to consider more in the interest of reducing the number of sites developed. AECOM identifies a capacity of 29-59.*

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. *The Evidence Base does not support this assertion (see above and ANNEX 1). Furthermore, expensive land level raising will be required in both sites 3 and 80 in order that effective rainfall attenuation can be provided as identified in the Waterco Drainage Note.*

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. *AECOM identifies a sensible capacity of c.38 dwellings. Why not use some of this additional capacity to limit the number of developed sites?* 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

The following conclusion cannot be drawn for the reasons identified in orange (derived from the publicly funded Evidence Base) throughout this marked up version of the document.

~~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~~