



Debenham Neighbourhood Plan

Site Assessment

December 2017
Final Report

This page is intentionally blank.

Quality information

Project Role	Name	Position	Actions Summary	Signature	Date
Project Manager	Jesse Honey	Associate Planner	Undertook site assessment and updated draft report	Jesse Honey	03/10/17
QA	Una McGaughrin	Associate Planner	QA of final draft	Una McGaughrin	02/10/17
Qualifying Body	Steve Palframan	Debenham Parish Council	Co-ordinated group inputs and comments	Confirmed via e-mail	18/10/17
Project Coordinator	Mary Kurcharska	Senior Consultant	Reviewed final draft	Mary Kurcharska	02/11/17

Disclaimer

This document forms an evidence base report, rather than neighbourhood plan policy. It is a snapshot in time and thus over time it may gradually become superseded by more recent data. The Parish Council is not bound to accept all or indeed any of its conclusions. If landowners or any other party can demonstrate that any of the evidence presented herein is incorrect or has become outdated, such evidence can be presented to the Parish Council at the consultation stage; it is then for the Parish Council to decide what policy line to take based on the evidence presented by this report or any other source. Where this evidence conflicts, a policy judgement will need to be made in the plan by the Parish Council and that judgement defended and justified at Examination.

Prepared for:

Debenham Parish Council

Prepared by:

AECOM

Aldgate Tower

2 Leman Street, London

E1 8FA, UK

aecom.com

AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited ("AECOM") has prepared this Report for the sole use of **Debenham Parish Council** ("Client") in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by AECOM.

Where the conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others it is upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate. Information obtained by AECOM has not been independently verified by AECOM, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

The methodology adopted and the sources of information used by AECOM in providing its services are outlined in this Report. The work described in this Report was undertaken in the period August 2017 to October 2017 and is based on the conditions encountered and the information available during the said period of time. The scope of this Report and the services are accordingly factually limited by these circumstances.

Where assessments of works or costs identified in this Report are made, such assessments are based upon the information available at the time and where appropriate are subject to further investigations or information which may become available.

AECOM disclaim any undertaking or obligation to advise any person of any change in any matter affecting the Report, which may come or be brought to AECOM's attention after the date of the Report.

Certain statements made in the Report that are not historical facts may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the Report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. AECOM specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimate or projections contained in this Report.

Where field investigations are carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to meet the stated objectives of the services. The results of any measurements taken may vary spatially or with time and further confirmatory measurements should be made after any significant delay in issuing this Report.

Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	6
1. Introduction	10
1.1 Background.....	10
1.2 Documents reviewed	14
2. Methodology for the site appraisal.....	15
2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 Task 1: Development of site appraisal pro-forma	15
2.3 Task 2: Initial desk study.....	15
2.4 Task 3: Site visit	16
2.5 Task 4: Consolidation of results.....	16
3. Summary of site appraisals	17
3.1.1 Viability	17
3.1.2 Next steps.....	20
Appendix A Completed site appraisal pro-formas	21

Abbreviations used in the report

Abbreviation

AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government
DEFRA	Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DPC	Debenham Parish Council
DPD	Development Plan Document
Dph	Dwellings per Hectare
Ha	Hectare
JLP	Joint Local Plan
MSDC	Mid Suffolk District Council
MSLP	Mid Suffolk Local Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PDL	Previously Developed Land
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance (DCLG)
PSS	Public Site Submissions
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Executive Summary

Seven sites in Debenham were assessed by AECOM for Debenham Parish Council to determine their suitability and availability, or otherwise, for allocation in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Some of the sites had already been assessed by Mid-Suffolk District Council (MSDC) through technical work to support the emerging Local Plan, specifically the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (May 2016)¹ and the Public Site Submissions (PSS, April 2017).² The MSDC assessments have been reviewed alongside data from other sources, including desktop assessment, site visit, and information from the Parish Council.

The seven sites listed in the PSS that were subsequently reviewed by AECOM are summarised below.

Sites identified at Debenham in the PSS, April 2017

PSS site Ref.	Location/description	Site area (ha) ³	Status in the SHLAA	Current land use
SS0031	Land north of Ipswich Road	4	Accepted- reference DEB01	Agricultural
SS0267	Land north of Gracechurch Street	11.6	Partially accepted- reference DEB(NS)02	Agricultural
SS0268	Land east of Aspoll Road (opposite primary school)	2.5	Accepted- reference DEB(NS)03	Agricultural
SS0364	Land west of Priory Lane	0.74	Not assessed	Woodland
SS0588	Land north of Gull Farm	5.53	Not assessed	Agricultural
SS0642	Land north of Low Road	13.5	Not assessed	Agricultural
SS0902	Land south of Low Road	1.0	Not assessed	Agricultural

Site selection and allocations is one of the most contentious aspects of planning, raising strong feelings amongst local people, landowners, builders and businesses. It is therefore important that any selection process carried out is independent, transparent, fair, robust and defensible and that the same criteria and thought process is applied to each potential site. Equally important is the way in which the work is recorded and communicated to interested parties.

The approach of this site appraisal is based primarily on the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance (Assessment of Land Availability) published in 2014⁴ with ongoing updates, which contains guidance on the assessment of land availability and the production of a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as part of a local authority's evidence base for a Local Plan.

Some sites assessed as not suitable or available for the purposes of this assessment may still have the potential to become suitable or available in the next plan period.

From a review of all existing information and AECOM's own assessment of sites that had not yet been reviewed, a judgement has been made as to whether each site is suitable for residential development.

A 'traffic light' rating of all sites has been given based on whether the site is an appropriate candidate to be considered for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The criteria are consistent across all sites and consistent with the government's Planning Policy Guidance. The traffic light rating indicates 'green' for sites that show no constraints and are appropriate as site allocations, 'amber' for sites which are potentially suitable if issues can be resolved and 'red' for sites which are not currently suitable. The judgement on each site is based on whether

¹ Available at <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Current-Evidence-Base/Draft-Joint-SHLAA-Report-MAY-2016-FINAL-LowRes.pdf>

² Available at <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning-Policy/SHELAA-Evidence/BMSDC-Public-Site-Submissions-April-2017.pdf>

³ AECOM measurement

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#key-stages-in-neighbourhood-planning> and <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment>

or not each site is **suitable** and **achievable**. In terms of the separate criterion of achievability, Section 3.1.2 explains the concept of viability.

With more information from landowners/developers, it is possible that more of the sites could be moved into the green category to give greater certainty on the shortlist of sites.

The results of AECOM's assessment are summarised in the table below, which includes all known potential development sites that have been considered within the Debenham Neighbourhood Plan area. The conclusions are based on our professional experience and judgement of the appropriateness of each site as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

This summary should be read alongside the full set of site appraisal pro-formas in **Appendix 1** which provide the detailed rationale behind the assessment summarised here.

Summary of assessment of all sites in Debenham

PSS site Ref.	Location/description	Site area (ha) ⁵	Status in the SHLAA	Current land use	Assessed dwelling yield ⁶	Assessment of suitability for allocation	Summary of assessment rationale	For further details
SS0031	Land north of Ipswich Road	4	Accepted- reference DEB01	Agricultural	60-140	Site suitable with minor constraints	Avoids car bottlenecks, within walking distance of village centre, constraints minor	See pages 22-26
SS0267	Land north of Gracechurch Street	11.6	Partially accepted- reference DEB(NS)02	Agricultural	80-188 (eastern half of site only)	Site in its entirety: not suitable. Eastern half: suitable with medium constraints	Development of entire site would have negative impacts in terms of car bottleneck and visual impact; development of the eastern half only would mitigate both issues to some extent	See pages 27-31
SS0268	Land east of Aspoll Road (opposite primary school)	2.5	Accepted- reference DEB(NS)03	Agricultural	37-87	Site suitable with medium constraints	Site itself has minor or no constraints, but there would be some impact on a car bottleneck	See pages 32-36
SS0364	Land west of Priory Lane	0.74	Not assessed	Woodland	n/a	Site not suitable	No car access and significant negative amenity and visual impact	See pages 37-41
SS0588	Land north of Gull Farm	5.53	Not assessed	Agricultural	n/a	Site not suitable	Site detached from village, distant from services and facilities, significant visual impact, some impact on car bottleneck	See pages 42-46

⁵ AECOM measurement

⁶ Where the site was assessed as not suitable for development within either the SHLAA or the AECOM assessment, the dwelling yield is given as 'n/a', though it is provided in full for all sites within Appendix One. Where the dwelling yield is given as a range, this represents the lowest (15 dph) and highest (35 dph) potential densities.

PSS site Ref.	Location/description	Site area (ha) ⁵	Status in the SHLAA	Current land use	Assessed dwelling yield ⁶	Assessment of suitability for allocation	Summary of assessment rationale	For further details
SS0642	Land north of Low Road	13.5	Not assessed	Agricultural	n/a	Site not suitable	Site would have unacceptable impact on most severe car bottleneck (Low Road); little apparent potential for alternative access arrangements from north (scale of site would have significant impact on Gracechurch Street bottleneck) or east (residential estate with impermeable layout of cul-de-sacs)	See pages 47-51
SS0902	Land south of Low Road	1.0	Not assessed	Agricultural	15-35	Site suitable subject to certain conditions	Suitable if no car access to Low Road and SS031 developed; site well-located and suitable in terms of visual impact	See pages 52-56

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This report is an independent site appraisal for Debenham Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of Debenham Parish Council (DPC) carried out by AECOM planning consultants. The work to be undertaken was agreed with the Parish Council and the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in August 2017.

The Neighbourhood Plan, which will cover Debenham parish in Mid Suffolk District (Figure 1), is being prepared in the context of the emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk joint Local Plan (MSLP, August 2017)¹ The Parish Council intends the Neighbourhood Plan, when adopted, to include allocations for housing.




Figure 1: Debenham Parish boundary, comprising the Debenham Neighbourhood Plan Area

The Parish Council has undertaken the initial stages of preparation for the Neighbourhood Plan, and it is now looking to ensure that key aspects of its proposals will be robust and defensible. In this context, the Parish Council has asked AECOM to undertake an independent and objective assessment of the sites that are available for housing for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The purpose of the site appraisal is therefore to produce a clear assessment as to whether the identified sites are deliverable, i.e. that they are suitable and available for housing development. The site appraisal is intended to guide decision making and provide evidence for the eventual site selection to help ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan can meet the Basic Conditions⁷ as determined by the Independent Examiner, as well as any potential legal challenges by developers and other interested parties.

⁷ Available online at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning-2#basic-conditions-for-neighbourhood-plan-to-referendum>

At the time of the site appraisal, the MSLP consultation document (August 2017) stated that a total of 9,951 new homes would be needed across the district between 2014 and 2036. The options for distribution of that growth were for the core villages (of which Debenham is one) to receive between 15% and 30% of planned growth. Without a preferred option being chosen at this time, it is not possible to identify a specific amount of growth allocated for Debenham based on the Local Plan options. However, DPC advises that a proportional distribution of this growth to the core villages, based on current population, would result in a requirement of between 84 and 167 new homes between 2014 and 2036, meaning the Parish Council is currently proposing to set the housing target in the Neighbourhood Plan as a minimum of 84 houses.

Should more detailed evidence of housing need be required, including what type of housing is needed, AECOM offers a Housing Needs Assessment package through the Locality programme of supporting communities in neighbourhood planning.

Debenham's local authority is Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC). The 1998 Local Plan for Mid Suffolk⁸ has mostly been superseded by policies from the Core Strategy⁹ and then the Focussed Review of that Core Strategy¹⁰ (adopted 2008 and 2012 respectively). A full list of adopted policies from all three sources is available on the MSDC website¹¹, and it is considered that this list collectively represents the policies that form the adopted plan.

These policies are being replaced in their entirety by a new Joint Local Plan (JLP) document for Babergh and Mid-Suffolk. As such, the JLP comprises the emerging local plan. The draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) from May 2016¹² is part of the JLP evidence base and has been used to inform this study, as have the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Public Site Submissions (PSS) (April 2017)¹³.

All of this means that some elements of the adopted Local Plan pre-date the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹⁴, which means that for the purposes of planning policy, the adopted Local Plan is considered 'out of date'. In particular, there is no up-to-date Site Allocations document that would identify any sites within Debenham parish that MSDC has allocated for development; the part of the MSDC website covering allocated sites¹⁵, at the time of writing, contains a number of sites allocated at the time or since the Local Plan was adopted, but none of these are within Debenham parish.

Mid Suffolk and Babergh's joint Annual Monitoring Report 2016-2017 (AMR, published June 2017)¹⁶ states that Mid Suffolk can demonstrate 3.9 years of housing land supply. As such, MSDC are not able to demonstrate a five-year supply of developable land, meaning that the NPPF's 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' (paragraph 49) applies to the whole of the District, including Debenham. This means that developers have a freer hand than they otherwise would have to make speculative development applications at present.

Neighbourhood Plans will form part of the development plan for Mid Suffolk, alongside, but not as a replacement for, the adopted and emerging Local Plans. Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in conformity with the Local Plan and can develop policies and proposals to address local place-based issues. In this way it is intended for the Local Plan to provide a clear overall strategic direction for development in Mid Suffolk, whilst enabling finer detail to be determined through the neighbourhood planning process where appropriate.

Therefore, the policies of the adopted Local Plan (including the original 1998 policies, and the subsequent revisions in 2008 and 2012) that currently apply to Debenham and are relevant for the purposes of this exercise are as follows:

⁸ Available at <http://apps.midsuffolk.gov.uk/localplan/>

⁹ Available at <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Mid-Suffolk-Core-Strategy/Core-Strategy-with-CSFR-label-and-insert-sheet-07-01-13.pdf>

¹⁰ Available at <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Mid-Suffolk-Core-Strategy/CSFR-adopted-December-2012.pdf>

¹¹ Available at <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Mid-Suffolk-Core-Strategy/MSDC-current-policies-June-2016.pdf>

¹² See <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Current-Evidence-Base/Draft-Joint-SHLAA-Report-MAY-2016-FINAL-LowRes.pdf>

¹³ Available at <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning-Policy/SHELAA-Evidence/BMSDC-Public-Site-Submissions-April-2017.pdf>

¹⁴ Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework-2>

¹⁵ See <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/adopted-documents/mid-suffolk-district-council/supplementary-planning-documents-and-planning-briefs/>

¹⁶ Available at <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/AMR/FINAL-BMSDC-AMR-2016-17.pdf>

- FC1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development, which reflects the NPPF approach outlined above, and which supports development proposals at Debenham that are in line with the provisions of the NPPF and the adopted Local Plan;
- FC1.1: Supports and amplifies FC1, stating that development proposals will need to conserve and enhance local character.

MSDC have assessed a total of eight sites in Debenham¹⁷ through the technical work to support the Local Plan through the SHLAA and the PSS, both referenced above. The sites assessed in this report all originate from these two documents, meaning that Mid Suffolk have already carried out a technical appraisal of their own on all sites being assessed. However, the Council has subsequently made clear to DPC that they are comfortable with the Neighbourhood Plan allocating any or all of the sites (subject, of course, to the Basic Conditions of neighbourhood planning), whether or not they were accepted or rejected in the Council's own assessment.

As such, this assessment effectively comprises a re-assessment of all sites, on an independent, technical basis. It may come to exactly the same conclusions as the MSDC assessment, or it may not- either way, it will start with no prior assumptions so as to ensure an entirely impartial, neutral viewpoint across all sites.

The 2016 SHLAA considered a total of five sites within the parish, three of which were accepted for development in principle and two of which were provisionally rejected for development.

The 2017 PSS retained all three of the accepted sites, extending the boundaries of one of them, and reintroduced the two rejected sites and a further two sites not previously considered. For simplicity, and because it covers all sites, this report uses the site designations employed for seven sites within the 2017 PSS, which are set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of all Debenham sites from the 2017 PSS


PSS site Ref.	Location/description	Site area (ha) ¹⁸	Status in the SHLAA	Current land use
SS0031	Land north of Ipswich Road	4	Accepted- reference DEB01	Agricultural
SS0267	Land north of Gracechurch Street	11.6	Partially accepted- reference DEB(NS)02	Agricultural
SS0268	Land east of Aspall Road (opposite primary school)	2.5	Accepted- reference DEB(NS)03	Agricultural
SS0364	Land west of Priory Lane	0.74	Not assessed	Woodland
SS0588	Land north of Gull Farm	5.53	Not assessed	Agricultural
SS0642	Land north of Low Road	13.5	Not assessed	Agricultural
SS0902	Land south of Low Road	1.0	Not assessed	Agricultural

All sites were assessed using a desk top appraisal followed by a site visit.

¹⁷ Two of the sites overlap, meaning in practice that there are seven sites to be assessed by this report.

¹⁸ AECOM measurement

Figure 2: Map of all sites from the Mid Suffolk PSS document



Source: Mid Suffolk District Council

1.2 Documents reviewed

A number of local and national sources have thus been reviewed in order to understand the history and the context for the Neighbourhood Plan site allocations. These comprise:

- Adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy DPD, September 2008¹⁹;
- Core Strategy Focused Review Incorporating Proposed Modifications, December 2012²⁰;
- Debenham Conservation Area Appraisal, November 2009²¹;
- DEFRA Magic Map²²;
- Draft Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), May 2016²³;
- Emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan, July 2017²⁴;
- Google Earth, Google Maps and Google Street View²⁵;
- Information provided verbally and via e-mail by Debenham Parish Council;
- Joint Babergh and Mid-Suffolk District Council Landscape Guidance²⁶;
- Mid Suffolk District Council Interactive Map²⁷; and
- Natural England's Agricultural Land Quality Mapping for the East of England²⁸.

¹⁹ Available at <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/adopted-documents/mid-suffolk-district-council/core-strategy/>

²⁰ Available at <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy-Focused-Review-incorporating-modifications-December-2012.pdf>

²¹ Available at <http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Conservation-Area-Appraisals/Debenham2009CAA.pdf>

²² Available at <http://www.magic.gov.uk>

²³ Available at <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/Current-Evidence-Base/Draft-Joint-SHLAA-Report-MAY-2016-FINAL-LowRes.pdf>

²⁴ Available at <http://baberghmidsuffolk.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=1013>

²⁵ Available at https://www.google.co.uk/intl/en_uk/earth/ and <https://www.google.co.uk/maps>

²⁶ Available at <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/DM-Planning-Uploads/Joint-Landscape-Guidance-Aug-2015.pdf>

²⁷ Available at <http://maps.midsuffolk.gov.uk/>

²⁸ Available at <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/127056?category=5954148537204736>

2. Methodology for the site appraisal

2.1 Introduction

Site selection and allocations is one of the most contentious aspects of planning, raising strong feelings amongst local people, landowners, builders and businesses. It is therefore important that any selection process carried out is independent, transparent, fair, robust and defensible and that the same criteria and thought process is applied to each potential site. Equally important is the way in which the work is recorded and communicated to interested parties.

The approach undertaken to this site appraisal is based primarily on the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance (Assessment of Land Availability) published in 2014 with ongoing updates, which contains guidance on the assessment of land availability and the production of a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as part of a local authority's evidence base for a Local Plan.

Although a Neighbourhood Plan is at a smaller scale than a Local Plan, the criteria for assessing the suitability of sites for housing are still appropriate.

In this context, the methodology for carrying out the site appraisal is presented below.

2.2 Task 1: Development of site appraisal pro-forma

Prior to carrying out the appraisal, site appraisal pro-formas were developed. The purpose of the pro-forma is to enable a consistent evaluation of each site through the consideration of an established set of parameters against which each site can be then appraised.

The pro-forma utilised for the assessment enables a range of information to be recorded, including the following:

- Background information:
 - Site location and use;
 - Site context and planning history;
- Suitability:
 - Site characteristics;
 - Environmental considerations;
 - Heritage considerations;
 - Community facilities and services;
 - Other key considerations (e.g. flood risk, agricultural land, tree preservation orders); and
- Availability.

2.3 Task 2: Initial desk study

The next task was to conduct an initial desk study for each of the sites. This involved a review of all existing information in order to judge whether the sites were suitable, available and achievable for the use proposed.

One of the many criteria used for assessing the performance of each individual site was its distance from what we have called Debenham's 'centre of gravity' for services and facilities. We define the village's 'centre of gravity' as being the location closest on average to the full range of village conveniences, including shops, pubs, employment sites, emergency services, schools and so on. In the case of Debenham, it is considered that this approximate point is the junction of Gracechurch Street, Aspall Road and High Street, which also has the advantage of being the historic centre of the settlement in any case.

The distance was measured, in metres, along existing and proposed routes, between the middle point of each site and this 'centre of gravity'. It is important to measure along existing and proposed routes rather than as the crow flies, as the latter obviously does not give an accurate picture of travel time.

2.4 Task 3: Site visit

After the completion of the initial desk study, a site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan area was undertaken by a member of the AECOM Neighbourhood Planning team. The purpose of the site visit was to evaluate the sites 'on the ground' to support the site appraisal. It was also an opportunity to better understand the context and nature of the Neighbourhood Plan area and each individual site.

2.5 Task 4: Consolidation of results

Following the site visit, further desk-based work was carried out. This was to validate and augment the findings of the site visit and to enable the results of the site appraisal to be consolidated.

Indicative housing capacities; that is, the optimal number of new homes that could be provided on each site, for each site considered suitable and available have been calculated on the basis of a range of three densities: 15 dph, 25 dph and 35 dph²⁹. These densities were selected with respect to the local evidence base, namely:

- Desktop assessment by AECOM shows that residential development in a Suffolk village context is normally around 15 to 25 dwellings per hectare; and
- MSDC's existing viability appraisal³⁰, which uses a figure of 35 dwellings per hectare to assess viability of development.³¹

Section 3 presents a summary of the findings of the site appraisal.

The completed pro-formas for all sites assessed are provided in Appendix 1.

²⁹ Dwellings per hectare

³⁰ Available online at <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/CIL-and-S106-Documents/Pre-Adoption-Documents-Mid-Suffolk/Previous-CIL-Consultation-documents/Preliminary-Draft-Charging-Schedule/CILViabilityStudy-BaberghMidSuffolk.pdf>

³¹ The difference between Debenham's existing densities of 15-25 dph and the viability appraisal's blanket assumption of 35 dph strongly suggests that Debenham Neighbourhood Plan will benefit from a more neighbourhood-specific assessment of viability, a service that can also be provided by AECOM via its Locality contract supporting local communities in neighbourhood planning.

3. Summary of site appraisals

This section provides a summary of the findings linked the evaluation of all sites considered through the site appraisal for Debenham Neighbourhood Plan³². There is the potential for some sites assessed as not suitable or available for the purposes of this assessment to become suitable or available in the next plan period.

The sites have been assessed using the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) relating to Neighbourhood Planning and the assessment of land for development³³. From a review of all existing information, a judgement has been made as to whether each site is suitable for residential development and appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan to meet identified development needs.

A 'traffic light' rating of all sites has been given based on whether the site is an appropriate candidate to be considered for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The criteria are consistent across all sites and consistent with the government's Planning Practice Guidance. The traffic light rating indicates 'green' for sites that show no constraints and are appropriate as site allocations, 'amber' for sites which are potentially suitable if issues can be resolved and 'red' for sites which are not currently suitable. The judgement on each site is based on whether or not each site is **suitable** and **available**. In terms of the separate criterion of achievability, Section 3.1.1 explains the concept of viability.

With more information from landowners/developers, it is possible that more of the sites could be moved into the green category to give greater certainty on the shortlist of sites.

3.1.1 Viability

This assessment has not considered the viability of sites for the development proposed. The Neighbourhood Plan should be able to demonstrate that the sites are financially viable to develop.

A recent viability report for Mid Suffolk District Council³⁴ indicates that housing in Debenham would be viable for development, but flats would not be. Also, the accepted SHLAA sites can be assumed to be considered viable by MSDC, having passed their tests of availability and achievability.

However, for more evidence, the site promoters/developers could be approached to request viability evidence such as financial viability appraisals for the sites they are promoting.

However, valuations produced by a third party are not necessarily definitive or sufficiently independent. For this reason, AECOM are able to provide separate viability advice to the Parish Council if their application for support in this regard is successful.

As noted previously, viability considerations underpin the rationale for assessing all site capacities at a density of 35 dwellings per hectare as well as 15 and 25 dwellings per hectare, (the latter two of which would be more in line with existing densities across the village).

Table 2 below includes all known potential development sites that have been considered within the Debenham Neighbourhood Plan area, including sites that have been considered by MSDC through the SHLAA. The conclusions are based on our professional experience and judgement of the appropriateness of each site as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

This summary should be read alongside the full set of site appraisal pro-formas in **Appendix 1**.

³² The emerging evidence base for the neighbourhood plan is available online at <http://debenhamnp.onesuffolk.net/>

³³ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#key-stages-in-neighbourhood-planning> and <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment>

³⁴ Babergh and Mid Suffolk CIL Viability Study, PBA, 2014

Table 2: Summary of assessment of all sites in Debenham

PSS site Ref.	Location/description	Site area (ha) ³⁵	Status in the SHLAA	Current land use	Assessed dwelling yield ³⁶	Assessment of suitability for allocation	Summary of assessment rationale	For further details
SS0031	Land north of Ipswich Road	4	Accepted- reference DEB01	Agricultural	60-140	Site suitable with minor constraints	Avoids car bottlenecks, within walking distance of village centre, constraints minor	See pages 22-26
SS0267	Land north of Gracechurch Street	11.6	Partially accepted- reference DEB(NS)02	Agricultural	80-188 (eastern half of site only)	Site in its entirety: not suitable. Eastern half: suitable with medium constraints	Development of entire site would have negative impacts in terms of car bottleneck and visual impact; development of the eastern half only would mitigate both issues to some extent	See pages 27-31
SS0268	Land east of Aspoll Road (opposite primary school)	2.5	Accepted- reference DEB(NS)03	Agricultural	37-87	Site suitable with medium constraints	Site itself has minor or no constraints, but there would be some impact on a car bottleneck	See pages 32-36
SS0364	Land west of Priory Lane	0.74	Not assessed	Woodland	n/a	Site not suitable	No car access and significant negative amenity and visual impact	See pages 37-41
SS0588	Land north of Gull Farm	5.53	Not assessed	Agricultural	n/a	Site not suitable	Site detached from village, distant from services and facilities, significant visual impact, some impact on car bottleneck	See pages 42-46

³⁵ AECOM measurement

³⁶ Where the site was assessed as not suitable for development within either the SHLAA or the AECOM assessment, the dwelling yield is given as 'n/a', though it is provided in full for all sites within Appendix One. Where the dwelling yield is given as a range, this represents the lowest (15 dph) and highest (35 dph) potential densities.

PSS site Ref.	Location/description	Site area (ha) ³⁵	Status in the SHLAA	Current land use	Assessed dwelling yield ³⁶	Assessment of suitability for allocation	Summary of assessment rationale	For further details
SS0642	Land north of Low Road	13.5	Not assessed	Agricultural	n/a	Site not suitable	Site would have unacceptable impact on most severe car bottleneck (Low Road); little apparent potential for alternative access arrangements from north (scale of site would have significant impact on Gracechurch Street bottleneck) or east (residential estate with impermeable layout of cul-de-sacs)	See pages 47-51
SS0902	Land south of Low Road	1.0	Not assessed	Agricultural	15-35	Site suitable subject to certain conditions	Suitable if no car access to Low Road and SS031 developed; site well-located and suitable in terms of visual impact	See pages 52-56

3.1.2 Next steps

This report has shown the sites which are suitable and available to allocate in the Neighbourhood Plan (subject to considerations of viability and masterplanning constraints), alongside those sites which are potentially appropriate but have issues that need to be resolved.

Some of the sites in the amber category may need further advice or assessment not possible to address through this high level assessment. Such advice could be commissioned through specialist consultants or in conjunction with relevant officers at MSDC (e.g. heritage) and Suffolk County Council (e.g. highways, education, waste, infrastructure) to allow them to be moved into either the green or red categories.

Once the pool of sites in the green category has been finalised, this provides a shortlist from which the proposed allocations can be selected. These should be the sites that best meet the aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. The criteria that are used to select the sites should be clearly recorded and made available as evidence to support the plan.

Choosing between the amber sites

AECOM's professional opinion, based on the evidence presented in this report, is that of the three sites assessed as being within the amber category (SS0267, SS0268 and SS0902), it is SS0902 that has the greatest potential to be moved to the green category, subject to no car access being provided onto Low Road and site SS0031 being developed. Development of the adjacent sites SS0031 and SS0902 could provide between them up to 175 homes.

This would still leave a shortfall of 75 homes, which would need to be provided on either of the remaining amber sites- namely the eastern half of site SS0267 (maximum capacity 188 dwellings) or site SS0268 (maximum capacity 87 dwellings). There is very little to choose between them in terms of the technical assessment; they are finely balanced.

However, given the need to develop 75 homes, and the importance (as attested by Neighbourhood Plan Examinations in the past) of ensuring contingency (or 'back-up') in terms of allocation capacity, the larger size of site SS0267 could render it more appropriate as an allocation than site SS0268.

Whichever of sites SS0267 or SS0268 are selected for allocation, each will have a degree of impact on an existing traffic bottleneck (Gracechurch Street and High Street respectively). It is recommended that the Parish Council have more detailed discussions with MSDC and/or the County Council to discuss any potential for mitigation of these impacts.

Appendix A Completed site appraisal pro-formas

Site Assessment Proforma

General information

Site Reference / name	SS0031
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Land north of Ipswich Road
Current use	Agricultural
Proposed use	Residential ³⁷
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	4
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	DEB01
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner through SHLAA process

Context

Is the site: Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed) Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixture	Unknown
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site planning history Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	No known planning applications on the site according to MSDC interactive mapping and Debenham Parish Council			

Suitability

Suitability

Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?	No access at present but easy potential for car access from Ipswich Road, and potential for pedestrian and cycle access via Low Road if the site is developed alongside site SS0902.
Is the site accessible? Provide details of site's connectivity	Site close to village centre, but car access would be less direct if provided only to Ipswich Road to south. However, no potential for car access via Low Road to north due to significant bottleneck along its length (narrow width of road accessing village centre and very limited potential for widening due to number of existing properties).

³⁷ Though not explicitly stated in the information provided to AECOM by DPC, it has been assumed that all sites are being assessed for their potential for residential and no other use.

Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Ancient Woodland • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • National Park • European nature site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area) • SSSI Impact Risk Zone • Site of Importance for Nature Conservation • Site of Geological Importance • Flood Zones 2 or 3 	<p>Site lies within Impact Risk Zone of two SSSIs</p>	<p>The site lies within the far outer impact risk zone of two SSSIs- Mickfield Meadow and Fox Fritillary Meadow Framdsen. However, in both cases, the SSSIs are considered distant enough for this to be only a minor constraint; Natural England should nevertheless be consulted.</p>
<p>Ecological value? Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p>Unknown</p>	<p>There could be potential for protected species; ecological survey would be required ahead of any planning application.</p>
<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape and visual impact?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible from surrounding locations, existing landscape or townscape character is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: development of the site would lead to a moderate impact on landscape or townscape character due to visibility from surrounding locations and/or impacts on the character of the location. (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would be within an area of high quality landscape or townscape character, and/or would significantly detract from local character. Development would lead to the loss of important features of local distinctiveness- without the possibility of mitigation.</p>	<p>Medium sensitivity to development Medium visual impact</p>	<p>Within Landscape Character Area (17) Rolling Valley Claylands of the Joint Babergh & Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (2015).</p> <p>In terms of visual impact, the site is flat, but it is elevated, making it more visible; additionally adjoins existing development on only one side- hence an amber rather than a green assessment.</p> <p>No defensible boundary (e.g. hedgerow) on western edge of site, as it passes directly across a field; potential for new boundary (e.g. hedge) to be created as part of any new development</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p>Some loss</p>	<p>Site on Grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate)</p>

Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation area • Scheduled monument • Registered Park and Garden • Registered Battlefield • Listed building • Known archaeology • Locally listed building 	<p>Close to two listed buildings; minor impact on setting of a third</p>	<p>Development would have to minimise impact on setting of Grade II listed Malting Farmhouse and Grade II listed Cherry Tree Farmhouse. Development has potential to impact in a minor way on the setting of Grade I listed St Mary's Church (because at the moment it can be glimpsed briefly cars travelling eastbound on Ipswich Road) but the glimpse is fleeting and so harm would be less than substantial</p>

Community facilities and services

Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):		Observations and comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre/local centre/shop • Employment location • Public transport • School(s) • Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities • Health facilities • Cycle route(s) <p>Where a site is poorly located if > 800m, moderately located if 400m to 800m, and favourably located if < 400m from services.</p>	<p>Poorly located</p>	<p>Centre of site 810m from 'centre of gravity' of services and facilities in Debenham; however, potential for mitigation of distance through direct pedestrian and cycle access to Low Road via development of site SS0902.</p>

Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
Would development lead to the loss of habitats with the potential to support protected species, for example mature trees, woodland, hedgerows and waterbodies?	Some	A detailed ecological assessment should be carried out before the submission of any planning application. Access to Ipswich Road would likely necessitate the removal of one or more mature trees, which could be re-provided elsewhere on site.	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Limited social and community value due to lack of public access; will have some visual amenity as open rural land	
Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?	Yes	No	Comments
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or close to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Though not significant, small power line crosses the site on poles; this would need to be mitigated in any new development.

Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ gentle slope/ steep gradient	Flat
Coalescence Development would result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another.	No
Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of settlement	No
Any other comments?	

3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As confirmed via e-mail by Debenham Parish Council
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, covenants, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Parish Council has confirmed to AECOM that it is not aware of significant constraints on any site in terms of multiple ownership, ransom strips, tenancies or covenants.
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site is available immediately

4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions

Please tick a box

The site is appropriate for allocation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
This site has minor constraints		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The site has significant constraints		<input type="checkbox"/>
The site is not appropriate for allocation		<input type="checkbox"/>
Potential housing development capacity (15, 25,35 dph):	60	100
Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northern half of site within walking distance of village centre facilities via Low Road if SS0902 developed Potential for car access via Ipswich Road without exacerbating Low Road or any other bottleneck Performs well in terms of landscape and visual impact Minor constraints (trees, telegraph wires) easy to mitigate As such, the site has been given an assessment of green 	

Site Assessment Proforma

General information

Site Reference / name	SS0267
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Land north of Gracechurch Street
Current use	Agricultural
Proposed use	Residential
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	11.6
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	Southern 2/3 overlaps with SHLAA site DEB(NS)02
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner through PSS process

Context

Is the site: Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed) Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixture	Unknown
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site planning history Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	No known planning applications on the site according to MSDC interactive mapping and Debenham Parish Council			

Suitability

Suitability

Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?	Potential for car access to Gracechurch Street and pedestrian/cycle access to The Butts. Gracechurch Street offers more direct access to most village services and facilities, but is narrow without opportunity for widening as it approaches High Street, thus forming a bottleneck (albeit not as severe as the previously-mentioned Low Road bottleneck).
Is the site accessible? Provide details of site's connectivity	The further east access is along Gracechurch Street, the closer to village centre services and facilities. For this reason, new car access could be created immediately west of the houses on the north side of Gracechurch Street. There is an existing narrow access between houses on Gracechurch Street with the potential to provide cycle and pedestrian access only to any new development.

Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Ancient Woodland • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • National Park • European nature site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area) • SSSI Impact Risk Zone • Site of Importance for Nature Conservation • Site of Geological Importance • Flood Zones 2 or 3 	<p style="text-align: center;">Site lies within Impact Risk Zone of two SSSIs; access affected by flood zones 2 and 3</p>	<p>The site lies within the far outer impact risk zone of two SSSIs- Mickfield Meadow and Fox Fritillary Meadow Framsdan. However, in both cases, the SSSIs are considered distant enough for this to be only a minor constraint; Natural England should nevertheless be consulted.</p> <p>Access to north (The Butts) is Flood Zones 2 and 3; would require mitigation/drainage</p>
<p>Ecological value? Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Unknown</p>	<p>There could be potential for protected species; ecological survey would be required ahead of any planning application</p>
<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape and visual impact?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible from surrounding locations, existing landscape or townscape character is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: development of the site would lead to a moderate impact on landscape or townscape character due to visibility from surrounding locations and/or impacts on the character of the location. (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would be within an area of high quality landscape or townscape character, and/or would significantly detract from local character. Development would lead to the loss of important features of local distinctiveness- without the possibility of mitigation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Western half of site: medium landscape sensitivity to development, high visual impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Eastern half of site: low sensitivity to development, low visual impact</p>	<p>Within Landscape Character Area (17) Rolling Valley Claylands of the Joint Babergh & Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (2015)</p> <p>In terms of visual impact, the eastern half of the site performs much better as it is only visible from a relatively contained area and adjoins existing development on two sides.</p> <p>Development on the more open, visible western half would have more of an impact, as it adjoins existing development on only one side and is relatively elevated and exposed</p> <p>No defensible boundary (e.g. hedgerow) on western edge of site, as it passes directly across a field; potential for new boundary (e.g. hedge) to be created as part of any new development.</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Some loss</p>	<p>Site on Grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate)</p>

Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation area • Scheduled monument • Registered Park and Garden • Registered Battlefield • Listed building • Known archaeology • Locally listed building • 	<p>No constraints identified</p>	<p>No heritage constraints in immediate vicinity</p>

Community facilities and services

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre/local centre/shop • Employment location • Public transport • School(s) • Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities • Health facilities • Cycle route(s) <p>Where a site is poorly located if > 800m, moderately located if 400m to 800m, and favourably located if < 400m from services.</p>	<p>Moderately located</p>	<p>Centre of site 660m from 'centre of gravity' of services and facilities in Debenham; if only part of the site were to be developed, the east and centre of the site are preferable to the west in terms of proximity to community facilities and services</p>

Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
Would development lead to the loss of habitats with the potential to support protected species, for example mature trees, woodland, hedgerows and waterbodies?	Unknown	A detailed ecological assessment should be carried out before the submission of any planning application	
Public Right of Way	Yes	Public right of way across centre of site	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Significant	Social and community value due to footpath providing access across site, and visual amenity as undeveloped rural land	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ gentle slope/ steep gradient	Gentle slope down to north
Coalescence Development would result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another.	No
Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of settlement	No

3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	.As confirmed via e-mail by Debenham Parish Council
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, covenants, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Parish Council has confirmed to AECOM that it is not aware of significant constraints on any site in terms of multiple ownership, ransom strips, tenancies or covenants.
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site is available immediately

4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions

Please tick a box

The site is appropriate for allocation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
This site has minor constraints³⁸		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The site has significant constraints³⁹		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The site is not appropriate for allocation		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Potential housing development capacity (15, 25,35 dph):	174	290	406
Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of the site is such that if all of it were developed, there could be significant traffic impacts along a bottleneck on Gracechurch Street towards its junction with High Street; the development of the entire site is not recommended, mainly for this reason • However, such impacts could be mitigated by developing only the eastern half of the site (i.e. east of a new car access off Gracechurch Street adjacent to westernmost house on north side)- this would generate less traffic and also promote pedestrian and cycle access to proximate village services and facilities via Gracechurch Street and The Butts⁴⁰ • Developing eastern half of site only would also significantly reduce visual impact of development. • As such, development of the western half of the site has been given a red and the eastern half an amber (recognising that the bottleneck remains a constraint even if eastern half only is developed) 		

³⁸ If half of site developed

³⁹ If entire site developed

⁴⁰ Eastern half of site only is 5.39 hectares, providing 80 homes at 15 dwellings per hectare, 134 homes at 25 dph and 188 homes at 35 dph.

Site Assessment Proforma

General information

Site Reference / name	SS0268
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Land east of Aspall Road (opposite primary school)
Current use	Agricultural
Proposed use	Residential
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	2.5
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	DEB(NS)03
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner through SHLAA process

Context

Is the site: Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)	Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixture	Unknown
Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site planning history Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	No known planning applications on the site according to MSDC interactive mapping and Debenham Parish Council.			

Suitability

Suitability

Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?	Currently no access onto site, but straightforward to provide it from Aspall Road. No potential for access from Priory Lane to the east.
Is the site accessible? Provide details of site's connectivity	Site has generally good potential for access to village centre services and facilities, but Aspall Road narrow where it meets High Street, meaning there is a traffic bottleneck (same level of severity as Gracechurch Street bottleneck but less severe than Low Road bottleneck)

Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Ancient Woodland • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • National Park • European nature site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area) • SSSI Impact Risk Zone • Site of Importance for Nature Conservation • Site of Geological Importance • Flood Zones 2 or 3 	<p>Site lies partially within Impact Risk Zone of an SSSI; access affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3</p>	<p>The site lies within the far outer impact risk zone of Mickfield Meadow SSSI. However, the SSSI is considered distant enough for this to be only a minor constraint; Natural England should nevertheless be consulted.</p> <p>Access to west (Aspall Road) is Flood Zones 2 and 3; this would require mitigation/drainage</p>
<p>Ecological value? Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p>Unknown</p>	<p>There could be potential for protected species; ecological survey would be required ahead of any planning application</p>
<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape and visual impact?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible from surrounding locations, existing landscape or townscape character is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: development of the site would lead to a moderate impact on landscape or townscape character due to visibility from surrounding locations and/or impacts on the character of the location. (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would be within an area of high quality landscape or townscape character, and/or would significantly detract from local character. Development would lead to the loss of important features of local distinctiveness- without the possibility of mitigation.</p>	<p>Medium landscape sensitivity; low sensitivity in terms of visual impact</p>	<p>Within Landscape Character Area (17) Rolling Valley Claylands of the Joint Babergh & Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (2015).</p> <p>Eastern half of site is less visible and flat, but western half slopes down to Aspall Road. However, Aspall Road is on floor of small valley, minimising site's wider visibility.</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p>Some loss</p>	<p>Site on Grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate)</p>

Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation area • Scheduled monument • Registered Park and Garden • Registered Battlefield • Listed building • Known archaeology • Locally listed building 	<p>Some potential for impact on conservation area and listed buildings</p>	<p>Site abuts north-eastern corner of Debenham Conservation area; site close to Grade II listed Debenham House and Grade II listed 50 Aspoll Road</p>

Community facilities and services

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre/local centre/shop • Employment location • Public transport • School(s) • Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities • Health facilities • Cycle route(s) <p>Where a site is poorly located if > 800m, moderately located if 400m to 800m, and favourably located if < 400m from services.</p>	<p>Moderately located</p>	<p>Centre of site 560m from 'centre of gravity' of services and facilities in Debenham.</p>

Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
Would development lead to the loss of habitats with the potential to support protected species, for example mature trees, woodland, hedgerows and waterbodies?	Unknown	A detailed ecological assessment should be carried out before the submission of any planning application	
Public Right of Way	No	None across site but right of way along Priory Lane to east of site	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Limited social and community value due to lack of public access; will have some visual amenity value as open rural land from footpath along eastern side and from Aspal Road	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ gentle slope/ steep gradient	Gentle slope
Coalescence Development would result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another.	No
Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of settlement	No
Any other comments?	

3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As confirmed via e-mail by Debenham Parish Council
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, covenants, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Parish Council has confirmed to AECOM that it is not aware of significant constraints on any site in terms of multiple ownership, ransom strips, tenancies or covenants.
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site is available immediately

4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions

Please tick a box

The site is appropriate for allocation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
This site has minor constraints		<input type="checkbox"/>
The site has significant constraints		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The site is not appropriate for allocation		<input type="checkbox"/>
Potential housing development capacity (15, 25,35 dph):	37	62
Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are few constraints on the site itself • However, its development would exacerbate the existing traffic bottleneck at Aspoll Road/High Street/primary school • Though this bottleneck is less severe than the Low Road bottleneck, there seem few options for mitigation/widening • As such, the site has been given an assessment of amber (but amber shading into red rather than amber shading into green) 	

Site Assessment Proforma

General information

Site Reference / name	SS0364
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Land west of Priory Lane
Current use	Woodland
Proposed use	Residential
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	0.74
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	None
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner through PSS process

Context

Is the site: Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed) Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixture	Unknown
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site planning history Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	No known planning applications on the site according to MSDC interactive mapping and Debenham Parish Council			

Suitability

Suitability

Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?	Currently no access into site; additionally, as site is dense woodland, access within the site is poor; no car access to site at all by car as Priory Lane is unsuitable for motor vehicles, with little realistic prospect of upgrade
Is the site accessible? Provide details of site's connectivity	Only alternative means of access would be to secure access via Coopersfield to west, but this is unlikely to be possible as could require demolition of existing properties and upgrading of cul-de-sac to through road.

Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Ancient Woodland • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • National Park • European nature site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area) • SSSI Impact Risk Zone • Site of Importance for Nature Conservation • Site of Geological Importance • Flood Zones 2 or 3 	<p>No</p>	<p>None of the environmental constraints identified applies to this site</p>
<p>Ecological value? Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p>Unknown</p>	<p>There could be potential for protected species, particularly given the dense woodland covering the site; ecological survey would be required ahead of any planning application</p>
<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape and visual impact?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible from surrounding locations, existing landscape or townscape character is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: development of the site would lead to a moderate impact on landscape or townscape character due to visibility from surrounding locations and/or impacts on the character of the location. (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would be within an area of high quality landscape or townscape character, and/or would significantly detract from local character. Development would lead to the loss of important features of local distinctiveness- without the possibility of mitigation.</p>	<p>Medium sensitivity in terms of landscape High sensitivity in terms of visual impact</p>	<p>Within Landscape Character Area (17) Rolling Valley Claylands of the Joint Babergh & Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (2015)</p> <p>Existing visual amenity as woodland along footpath used by dog-walkers would be entirely lost through development in this location; a significant impact would result.</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p>Some loss</p>	<p>Site on Grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate)</p>

Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation area • Scheduled monument • Registered Park and Garden • Registered Battlefield • Listed building • Known archaeology • Locally listed building 	<p>No constraints identified</p>	<p>No heritage constraints in immediate vicinity</p>

Community facilities and services

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre/local centre/shop • Employment location • Public transport • School(s) • Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities • Health facilities • Cycle route(s) <p>Where a site is poorly located if > 800m, moderately located if 400m to 800m, and favourably located if < 400m from services.</p>	<p>Moderately located</p>	<p>Centre of site 500m from 'centre of gravity' of services and facilities in Debenham</p>

Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None	
Would development lead to the loss of habitats with the potential to support protected species, for example mature trees, woodland, hedgerows and waterbodies?	Unknown	A detailed ecological assessment should be carried out before the submission of any planning application; as this site is the only one covered in dense woodland, development likely to have more biodiversity impacts
Public Right of Way	No	None across site but right of way along Priory Lane to east of site
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Limited social and community value due to lack of public access; has significant visual amenity value as woodland from footpath along eastern side
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<i>Comments</i>

Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ gentle slope/ steep gradient	Flat
Coalescence Development would result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another.	No
Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of settlement	No

3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As confirmed via e-mail by Debenham Parish Council
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, covenants, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Parish Council has confirmed to AECOM that it is not aware of significant constraints on any site in terms of multiple ownership, ransom strips, tenancies or covenants.
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site is available immediately
Any other comments?			

4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions

Please tick a box

The site is appropriate for allocation				<input type="checkbox"/>
This site has minor constraints				<input type="checkbox"/>
The site has significant constraints				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The site is not appropriate for allocation				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential housing development capacity (15, 25,35 dph):	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not suitable for allocation as it cannot be accessed by car • There is no realistic prospect of upgrading Priory Lane for car access, nor of securing access through Coopersfield to the west • Redevelopment from woodland to development would have a significant negative amenity and visual impact • As such, the site has been assessed as red 			

Site Assessment Proforma

General information

Site Reference / name	SS0588
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Land north of Gull Farm
Current use	Agriculture
Proposed use	Residential
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	5.53
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	None
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner through PSS process

Context

Is the site: Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)	Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixture	Unknown
Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site planning history Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	No known planning applications on the site according to MSDC interactive mapping and Debenham Parish Council			

Suitability

Suitability

Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?	No current access onto site; potential for access from Aspall Road, but this would exacerbate effect of bottleneck at Aspall Road/High Street/primary school
Is the site accessible? Provide details of site's connectivity	Site is poorly located in terms of accessibility; it is most distant of all sites from existing village; walking and cycling to village centre services and facilities would be complicated by lack of pavement or cycleway along Aspall Road; would promote car-based development

Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Ancient Woodland • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • National Park • European nature site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area) • SSSI Impact Risk Zone • Site of Importance for Nature Conservation • Site of Geological Importance • Flood Zones 2 or 3 	<p>Site lies partially within Impact Risk Zone of an SSSI; access affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3</p>	<p>The site lies within the far outer impact risk zone of Mickfield Meadow SSSI. However, the SSSI is considered distant enough for this to be only a minor constraint; Natural England should nevertheless be consulted</p> <p>Access to east (Aspall Road) is Flood Zones 2 and 3; this would require mitigation/drainage</p>
<p>Ecological value? Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p>Unknown</p>	<p>There could be potential for protected species; ecological survey would be required ahead of any planning application</p>
<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape and visual impact?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible from surrounding locations, existing landscape or townscape character is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: development of the site would lead to a moderate impact on landscape or townscape character due to visibility from surrounding locations and/or impacts on the character of the location. (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would be within an area of high quality landscape or townscape character, and/or would significantly detract from local character. Development would lead to the loss of important features of local distinctiveness- without the possibility of mitigation.</p>	<p>Medium landscape sensitivity High sensitivity to visual impact</p>	<p>Within Landscape Character Area (17) Rolling Valley Claylands of the Joint Babergh & Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (2015)</p> <p>In terms of landscape, the site slopes gently to the east and is no more or less suitable than many others in this respect.</p> <p>However, in terms of visual impact, the site is detached from the village and surrounded by countryside on all sides, meaning the visual impact of new development would be high</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p>Some loss</p>	<p>Site on Grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate)</p>

Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation area • Scheduled monument • Registered Park and Garden • Registered Battlefield • Listed building • Known archaeology • Locally listed building 	<p>Some potential for impact on listed buildings</p>	<p>Site close to Grade II listed Gull Farmhouse and Grade II listed barn 30 metres to west</p>

Community facilities and services

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre/local centre/shop • Employment location • Public transport • School(s) • Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities • Health facilities • Cycle route(s) <p>Where a site is poorly located if > 800m, moderately located if 400m to 800m, and favourably located if < 400m from services.</p>	<p>Poorly located</p>	<p>Centre of site 940m from 'centre of gravity' of services and facilities in Debenham</p>

Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
Would development lead to the loss of habitats with the potential to support protected species, for example mature trees, woodland, hedgerows and waterbodies?	Unknown	A detailed ecological assessment should be carried out before the submission of any planning application. Access would require removal of large mature trees between site and Aspsall Road, which would have some ecological impact	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Limited social and community value due to lack of public access; will have visual amenity value as open rural land	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ gentle slope/ steep gradient	Gentle slope to east
Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another.	No
Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of settlement	No

3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As confirmed via e-mail by Debenham Parish Council
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, covenants, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Parish Council has confirmed to AECOM that it is not aware of significant constraints on any site in terms of multiple ownership, ransom strips, tenancies or covenants.
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site is available immediately
Any other comments?			

4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions

Please tick a box

The site is appropriate for allocation			<input type="checkbox"/>
This site has minor constraints			<input type="checkbox"/>
The site has significant constraints			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The site is not appropriate for allocation			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential housing development capacity (15, 25,35 dph):	n/a	n/a	n/a
Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is detached from the village and surrounded by countryside on all sites • As such, development would have a high visual impact and is distant from village services and facilities • Access would need to be taken off Aspoll Road, thus exacerbating existing traffic bottleneck at Aspoll Road, High Street and primary school • As such, the site has been given an assessment of red 		

Site Assessment Proforma

General information

Site Reference / name	SS0642
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Land north of Low Road
Current use	Agricultural
Proposed use	Residential
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	13.5
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	None
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner through PSS process

Context

Is the site: Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed) Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixture	Unknown
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site planning history Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	No known planning applications on the site according to MSDC interactive mapping and Debenham Parish Council.			

Suitability

Suitability

Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?	Site itself not currently accessible; potential for access off Low Road, but Low Road forms a narrow bottleneck along almost all of its length between the site and the High Street, with very limited prospect for mitigation- also seemingly very limited prospect of car access to village centre via Wells Way/Bloomfield Way due to impermeable layout of residential cul-de-sacs. Scale of site would generate significant additional traffic. Seemingly remote prospect of access from Gracechurch Street, and scale of site would result in significant exacerbation of existing bottleneck there at junction with High Street.
Is the site accessible? Provide details of site's connectivity	Reasonably distant from village centre services and facilities; no potential for shorter route via north or east due to school, leisure centre and new cul-de-sac based housing development.

Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Ancient Woodland • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • National Park • European nature site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area) • SSSI Impact Risk Zone • Site of Importance for Nature Conservation • Site of Geological Importance • Flood Zones 2 or 3 	<p>Site lies within Impact Risk Zone of two SSSIs; access affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3</p>	<p>The site lies within the far outer impact risk zone of two SSSIs- Mickfield Meadow and Fox Fritillary Meadow Framdsen. However, in both cases, the SSSIs are considered distant enough for this to be only a minor constraint; Natural England should nevertheless be consulted</p> <p>Access to south (Low Road) is Flood Zones 2 and 3; this would require mitigation/drainage.</p>
<p>Ecological value? Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p>Unknown</p>	<p>There could be potential for protected species; ecological survey would be required ahead of any planning application.</p>
<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape and visual impact?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible from surrounding locations, existing landscape or townscape character is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: development of the site would lead to a moderate impact on landscape or townscape character due to visibility from surrounding locations and/or impacts on the character of the location. (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would be within an area of high quality landscape or townscape character, and/or would significantly detract from local character. Development would lead to the loss of important features of local distinctiveness- without the possibility of mitigation.</p>	<p>Landscape impact medium Visual impact medium</p>	<p>Within Landscape Character Area (17) Rolling Valley Claylands of the Joint Babergh & Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (2015)</p> <p>In terms of visual impact, the site is well-contained, sloping gently to the south and adjacent to existing development on two sides, but scale of site makes assessment amber rather than green</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p>Some loss</p>	<p>Site on Grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate)</p>

Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation area • Scheduled monument • Registered Park and Garden • Registered Battlefield • Listed building • Known archaeology • Locally listed building 	<p>Some potential for impact on listed buildings</p>	<p>Site close to Grade II listed Malting Farmhouse</p>

Community facilities and services

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre/local centre/shop • Employment location • Public transport • School(s) • Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities • Health facilities • Cycle route(s) <p>Where a site is poorly located if > 800m, moderately located if 400m to 800m, and favourably located if < 400m from services.</p>	<p>Poorly located</p>	<p>Centre of site 1110m from 'centre of gravity' of services and facilities in Debenham; this is a particular issue given the limited ability of cars to access the site</p>

Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
Would development lead to the loss of habitats with the potential to support protected species, for example mature trees, woodland, hedgerows and waterbodies?	Unknown	A detailed ecological assessment should be carried out before the submission of any planning application	
Public Right of Way	No	None across site but right of way along western boundary of site	
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Limited social and community value due to lack of public access; will have visual amenity value as open rural land from adjoining footpath	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Characteristics	
Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/ gentle slope/ steep gradient	Gentle slope down to south
Coalescence: Development would result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another.	No
Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of settlement	Size of site means there is potential for this to occur unless mitigated through sensitive design

3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability			
	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As confirmed via e-mail by Debenham Parish Council
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, covenants, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Parish Council has confirmed to AECOM that it is not aware of significant constraints on any site in terms of multiple ownership, ransom strips, tenancies or covenants.
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site is available immediately
Any other comments?			

4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions

				Please tick a box
The site is appropriate for allocation				<input type="checkbox"/>
This site has minor constraints				<input type="checkbox"/>
The site has significant constraints				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The site is not appropriate for allocation				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential housing development capacity (15, 25,35 dph):		n/a	n/a	n/a
Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would have an unacceptable traffic impact given the length of the bottleneck on Low Road, and there is only a low possibility that this can be mitigated • There seems a clear lack of alternative options for car access; even if access north to Gracechurch Street could be secured, there would still be bottleneck issues due to the scale of the site; layout of residential cul-de-sacs to east of site is impermeable and likewise not suited to volume of traffic likely generated • The site is also far from village centre services and facilities which would reduce pedestrian accessibility • The scale of the site has potential to significantly change the size and character of Debenham • The combination of the difficulty of access, the potential for changing the scale/character and the distance from services and facilities give this site a red assessment 		

Site Assessment Proforma

General information

Site Reference / name	SS0902
Site Address (or brief description of broad location)	Land south of Low Road
Current use	Agricultural
Proposed use	Residential
Gross area (Ha) Total area of the site in hectares	1.0
SHLAA site reference (if applicable)	None
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner through PSS process

Context

Is the site: Greenfield: land (farmland, or open space, that has not previously been developed)	Greenfield	Brownfield	Mixture	Unknown
Brownfield: Previously developed land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated infrastructure.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site planning history Have there been any previous applications for development on this land? What was the outcome?	No known planning applications on the site according to MSDC interactive mapping and Debenham Parish Council			

Suitability

Suitability

Is the current access adequate for the proposed development? If not, is there potential for access to be provided?	No access at present; potential for access from Low Road to the north but given extensive traffic bottleneck given narrowness of Low Road, access here should be limited to pedestrians and cyclists; potential for car access via Ipswich Road to south if site SS0031 were also developed
Is the site accessible? Provide details of site's connectivity	Once developed, site would be reasonably accessible to/from village services and facilities on foot and by bike via Low Road, also by car via Ipswich Road

Environmental Considerations

Questions	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to the following policy or environmental designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt • Ancient Woodland • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • National Park • European nature site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area) • SSSI Impact Risk Zone • Site of Importance for Nature Conservation • Site of Geological Importance • Flood Zones 2 or 3 	<p>Site lies within Impact Risk Zone of two SSSIs; access affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3</p>	<p>The site lies within the far outer impact risk zone of two SSSIs- Mickfield Meadow and Fox Fritillary Meadow Framdsen. However, in both cases, the SSSIs are considered distant enough for this to be only a minor constraint; Natural England should nevertheless be consulted</p> <p>Access to north (Low Road) is Flood Zones 2 and 3; this would require mitigation/drainage</p>
<p>Ecological value? Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc.?</p>	<p>Unknown</p>	<p>There could be potential for protected species, especially given overgrown character of the land; ecological survey would be required ahead of any planning application</p>
<p>Landscape</p> <p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: site not visible or less visible from surrounding locations, existing landscape or townscape character is poor quality, existing features could be retained</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: development of the site would lead to a moderate impact on landscape or townscape character due to visibility from surrounding locations and/or impacts on the character of the location. (e.g. in built up area);</p> <p>High sensitivity: Development would be within an area of high quality landscape or townscape character, and/or would significantly detract from local character. Development would lead to the loss of important features of local distinctiveness- without the possibility of mitigation.</p>	<p>Medium sensitivity in landscape terms Low sensitivity in terms of visual impact</p>	<p>Within Landscape Character Area (17) Rolling Valley Claylands of the Joint Babergh & Mid Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (2015)</p> <p>In terms of visual impact, the site is small, is located on the south side/floor of a small valley and is surrounded by existing development on two sides- thus visual impact is considered low.</p>
<p>Agricultural Land Land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)</p>	<p>Some loss</p>	<p>Site on Grade 3 agricultural land (good to moderate)</p>

Heritage considerations

Question	Assessment guidelines	Comments
<p>Is the site within or adjacent to one or more of the following heritage designations or assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation area • Scheduled monument • Registered Park and Garden • Registered Battlefield • Listed building • Known archaeology • Locally listed building 	<p>Some potential for impact on listed buildings</p>	<p>Site close to Grade II listed Cherry Tree Farmhouse</p>

Community facilities and services

Question	Assessment guidelines	Observations and comments
<p>Is the site, in general terms, close/accessible to local amenities such as (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town centre/local centre/shop • Employment location • Public transport • School(s) • Open space/recreation/ leisure facilities • Health facilities • Cycle route(s) <p>Where a site is poorly located if > 800m, moderately located if 400m to 800m, and favourably located if < 400m from services.</p>	<p>Moderately located</p>	<p>Centre of site 640m from 'centre of gravity' of services and facilities in Debenham</p>

Other key considerations

Are there any Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	None		
Would development lead to the loss of habitats with the potential to support protected species, for example mature trees, woodland, hedgerows and waterbodies?	Unknown	A detailed ecological assessment should be carried out before the submission of any planning application	
Public Right of Way	None		
Existing social or community value (provide details)	Some	Limited social and community value due to lack of public access; will have visual amenity value as open rural land	
<i>Is the site likely to be affected by any of the following?</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Ground Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Significant infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/ pipe lines, or in close proximity to hazardous installations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Characteristics

Characteristics which may affect development on the site:	Comments
Topography: Flat/gentle slope/steep gradient	Gentle slope to north
Coalescence Development would result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another.	No
Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of settlement	No

3.0. Availability

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Availability

	Yes	No	Comments
Is the site available for sale or development (if known)? Please provide supporting evidence.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As confirmed via e-mail by Debenham Parish Council
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, covenants, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Parish Council has confirmed to AECOM that it is not aware of significant constraints on any site in terms of multiple ownership, ransom strips, tenancies or covenants.
Is there a known time frame for availability? 0-5 /6-10 / 11-15 years.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site is available immediately
Any other comments?			

4.0. Summary

Assessing the suitability of the site will give an indication of whether the site has any constraints to development. It should consider aspects such as infrastructure, planning policy, local services, heritage and other considerations.

Conclusions

				Please tick a box
The site is appropriate for allocation			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
This site has minor constraints			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The site has significant constraints			<input type="checkbox"/>	
The site is not appropriate for allocation			<input type="checkbox"/>	
Potential housing development capacity (15, 25,35 dph):	15	25	35	
Key evidence (3-4 bullet points) for decision to accept or discount site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is suitable for allocation on condition that pedestrian/cycle access only to Low Road, and site SS0031 is also developed, giving car access to village centre via Ipswich Road • Land itself performs well in terms of landscape and visual impact, but potential for ecological constraints • Moderately located in terms of pedestrian and cycle distance to village services and facilities • As such, this site is given an amber assessment to reflect that it is suitable on certain conditions • The assessment is amber shading into green (rather than into red), particularly if site SS0031 were to be allocated 			

