



1.4 Gross site area (hectares)	Approx 0.6 hectare
1.5 Greater Cambridge Site Submission (if applicable)	No.
1.6 Existing land use	Residential garden
1.7 Land use being considered (housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential garden
1.8 Development capacity	Land promoter states 3 dwelling
1.9 Site identification methods (NP level call for sites/Greater Cambridge call for sites)	Neighbourhood plan level call for sites
1.10 Planning history	Historic planning consents at site adjacent to the north at garages. 1991 and 2004 for dwelling and garage.
1.11 Neighbouring uses	Open countryside (green belt) to the east. Residential north, west and south.

## Assessment of suitability

2. Environmental constraints		Assessment: red/amber/green rating
2.1 Is the site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest?	Three SSSIs (1. Whittlesford/Thriplow Hummocky Fields 2. Thriplow Meadows and 3. Thriplow Peat Holes)	<b>Green. No</b>
2.2 Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?	Three SSSI impact zones in the parish.	<b>Amber. Yes site falls just within the SSSI impact risk zone for Thriplow Meadows SSSI Natural England to be consulted.</b>
2.3 Is the site predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to public open space?	Thriplow: Village Green, play ground, allotment,	<b>No. (green)</b>

<p>2.4 Flooding. Is the site predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</p>	<p>Some areas in fluvial Flood zone 3. Follows Hoffer Brook North South down to Crows Parlour (north of Heathfield). Also follows drain from Brook Road to School Lane.</p>	<p><b>Green. No</b></p>
<p>2.5 Flooding. Is the site is at risk of surface water flooding?</p>	<p>Some areas at risk of surface water flooding in the parish.</p>	<p><b>Green. Low</b></p>
<p>2.6 Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)</p>	<p>Referring to the East Region Agricultural Land Classification Map, it looks as though the parish is largely in very good agricultural land (pale blue) (Grade 2). Map may be too high level to be reliable for site specific assessment? Magic Mapping indicates Grade 3a alongside the A505</p>	<p>NA. residential use.</p>
<p>2.7 Does site contain habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity); wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or</li> <li>• An area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?</li> </ul>	<p>The parish includes areas of deciduous woodland three SSSIs. According to magic.gov.uk the parish includes the following additional habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purple moor grass and rush pasture</li> <li>• Floodplain grazing marsh</li> </ul> <p>In addition, there are two areas of land surrounding and in between the Whittlesford/Thriplow Hummocky Fields, Thriplow Meadows and Thriplow Peat Holes SSSI. These have been identified by Natural England in 2020 as network enhancement zones (2). These are defined by Natural England as <i>Land within close proximity to the existing habitat component that are unlikely to be suitable for habitat re-creation but where other types of habitat may be created or land management may be enhanced including delivery of suitable Green Infrastructure. See</i></p> <p><a href="https://data.gov.uk/dataset/0ef2ed26-2f04-4e0f-9493-ffbdbfaeb159/habitat-networks-england">https://data.gov.uk/dataset/0ef2ed26-2f04-4e0f-9493-ffbdbfaeb159/habitat-networks-england</a></p>	<p><b>Amber. Not identified as such using magic mapping tool. However, mature tree and vegetation coverage will be of value to biodiversity</b></p>

<b>3. Physical Constraints</b>	<b>Assessment: red/amber/green rating</b>
3.1 Is the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat or relatively flat</li> <li>• Gently sloping or uneven</li> <li>• Steeply sloping</li> </ul>	<b>Green. Flat or relatively flat</b>
3.2 Is there existing vehicle access, or potential to create vehicle access to the site?	<b>Green. Yes</b>
3.3 Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access, or potential to create pedestrian/cycle access to the site? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian?</li> <li>• Cycle?</li> </ul>	<b>Green. Yes</b>
3.4 Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?	<b>Green. No</b>
3.5 Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant trees?</li> <li>• Potentially veteran or ancient trees present?</li> </ul>	<b>Amber. Yes. Aerial views using google earth show several established trees. All trees are protected due to the location in the Thriplow conservation area.</b>
3.6 Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?	<b>Amber. There is a public footpath (234/2)<sup>1</sup> running east west to the north of the site and public footpath (234/3) running east west to the north of the site.</b>
Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?	Unknown
Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?	None identified
Would development of the site result in a loss in land use of social, amenity or community value?	<b>Green. No</b>

<b>4. Accessibility</b>			<b>Assessment: red/amber/green rating</b>
<b>4.1 What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)</b>	<b>Comments on parish wide facilities</b>	<b>Distance</b>	
4.1 Thriplow Village Primary School	Located on School Lane		<b>Amber. 400 m – 1200 m to the primary school</b>
4.2 Shop	Thriplow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located on Middle Street near junction with School Lane</li> </ul>		<b>Green. Less than 400 m – to shop</b>

<sup>1</sup> These are the numbers as per the definitive public rights of way map recorded by Cambridgeshire County Council

4. Accessibility			Assessment: red/amber/green rating
4.1 What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Comments on parish wide facilities	Distance	
4.3 Community meeting spaces:	Thriplow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village Hall located on Middle Street near junction with School Lane</li> </ul>		Green. Less than 400 m – to village hall
4.4 Open space/recreation facilities	Thriplow <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Green Informal Open space (also designated as LGS in Local Plan).</li> <li>Cricket ground (also designated as LGS in the Local Plan)</li> <li>Children’s formal play space (also designated as LGS in the Local Plan)</li> <li>Allotment Gardens along western edge of village in green belt.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green. Less than 400 m to the Green</li> <li>Amber. 400 m – 1200 m to Cricket ground</li> <li>Amber. 400 m – 1200 m to play space</li> <li>Amber 400 m – 1200 m to allotments</li> </ul>
4.5 Cycle Route	Cycle path from Heathfield to Thriplow	None in parish?	Green. Access to cycle route into Heathfield
4.6 Bus stop	Thriplow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No 31 Bus Service to Cambridge (from Barley)</li> </ul>		Green. On the route of the No 31 bus. Bus stop on the green on Fowlmere Road

5. Landscape and Visual Constraints	Assessment: red/amber/green rating
5.1 Is the site in low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape	<p>Red. Site has high landscape sensitivity with respect to physical and natural landscape factors</p> <p>Red. Site has high landscape sensitivity with respect to historic and cultural landscape factors</p> <p>Refer to separate assessment by Lucy Batchelor-Wylam.</p>

<b>5. Landscape and Visual Constraints</b>	<b>Assessment: red/amber/green rating</b>
5.2 Is the site in low medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual	<p><b>Red. Site has high visual sensitivity in terms of relationship with settlement form and edge</b></p> <p><b>Amber. Site has medium visual sensitivity in terms of views</b></p> <p><b>Amber. Site has medium visual sensitivity in terms of perceptual aspects</b></p> <p>Refer to separate assessment by Lucy Batchelor-Wylam.</p>

<b>6. Heritage Constraints</b>		<b>Assessment: red/amber or green?</b>
6.1 Would development of the site cause harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset or its setting	As per national heritage listing in the parish accessed at <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/</a>	<p><b>Amber. The Manor House (Grade II* listed) is immediately adjacent</b></p> <p><b>Amber. The garden and boundary wall to the Manor house is listed.</b></p> <p><b>Amber. The garden ornaments A, B and C are Grade II listed.</b></p>
6.2 Would development of the site conserve or enhance the significance of the Conservation Area	Most of Thriplow village designated as conservation area.	<b>Amber. The site is in the Thriplow village conservation area</b>

<b>7. Planning Policy constraints</b>	<b>How to assess green, amber or red?</b>
7.1 Is the site in the Green Belt	<b>Amber. No. The site abuts the green belt</b>
7.2 Existing Local Plan designations. Check for: Protected Village Amenity Areas, Local Green Space, Important Countryside Frontages,	<p><b>Red. Most of the site submitted by the land promoter is outside the development framework. Local Plan Policy S/7 allows for development outside development frameworks only where allocated through a completed neighbourhood plan.</b></p> <p><b>Red. Local Plan Policy S/10 Group Villages only allows for schemes of 8 dwellings within the development framework or as an exception 15 dwellings where this makes the best use of a single brownfield site.</b></p> <p><b>Amber. Adjacent to the Green Belt. Policy NH/8 Mitigating the impact of development in and adjoining the green belt states that development</b></p>

7. Planning Policy constraints	How to assess green, amber or red?
	<p>on the edges of the settlement which are surrounded by Green Belt must include careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality.</p> <p>Amber. Local Plan Policy NH/14 Heritage Assets. This states development proposals will be supported where they sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets including their settings.</p>
7.3 Is the site allocated for a particular use in the Local Plan	no
7.4 Is the site within, adjacent or outside the existing the village settlement boundary (the development framework)?	Amber. The site is outside but adjacent to the development framework.
7.5 Is the size of the site large enough to significant change the size and character of the existing settlement	Green. No

8. Assessment of Availability	
8.1 Is the site available for development?	Green. Yes. Parish level call for sites.
8.2 Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners?	no
8.3 Is there a known time frame for availability? Available now? / 0 – 5 years/ 6 – 10 years / 11 – 15 years.	Unknown

9. Viability	
9.1 Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?  Evidence?	Not known

10. Conclusions	
10.1 Summary of key development constraints affecting the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contrary to 2018 Local Plan due to location of the site outside the development framework. To be policy compliant must be allocated as part of the Neighbourhood Plan and no development on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Lies in the Thriplow Conservation area</li> </ul>



10. Conclusions	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is in the setting of the Grade II* listed Manor House</li> <li>• Site is sensitive in landscape terms</li> <li>• Possible presence of priority habitats and species</li> </ul>
10.2 What is the estimated development capacity of the site	?
10.3 What is the likely timeframe for development? (0 - 5 years, 6 - 10, 11 - 15, 15 +)	?
10.4 Other key information	
10.5 Overall rating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green: the site is suitable, available and achievable</li> <li>• Amber: the site is potentially suitable, available and achievable</li> <li>• Red: the site is not currently suitable, available and achievable</li> </ul>	<p><b>Red. This site is in a highly sensitive area in both landscape and heritage terms. The site is outside the current development framework. The site is not considered suitable for the proposed development.</b></p>
10.6 Summary of justification for the rating	<p>The site is conveniently located in relation to the village and village services.</p> <p>However, the site is also highly sensitive due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Grade II* Manor House</li> <li>- Existing mature tree coverage across the site and their value as part of the Thriplow Conservation area</li> <li>- Other important landscape features including moat</li> <li>- Location adjacent to the green belt</li> <li>- Location adjacent to characterful part of open land enjoyed from public footpaths 234/2 and 234/3</li> </ul> <p>In addition the site lies outside the Thriplow development framework.</p> <p>This site is not considered suitable for development other than for very small scale development that would not compromise significance of heritage assets or current important landscape features. Were this scenario to apply, the site would need to secure community support through the Neighbourhood Plan (a site outside the development framework is otherwise not compatible with the Local Plan).</p>





View towards the Manor House Thriplow, across the open green belt land from public footpath number 234/2. The Manor House is hidden from view in amongst the trees. Photo taken 2 November 2020