

# Neighbourhood Planning

brought to you by

locality

A toolkit for neighbourhood  
planners

# Site Details

This assessment was undertaken on Friday 13 March 2020 by members of the Orcop NDP Steering Group in lieu of site details being missed from original AECOM instruction and using only information which would have been available to AECOM.


Detail	Assessment										
<p>Site Reference / Name</p>	<p>Roadside field in front of “Hamara”, (formerly “The Cave”) Orcop Hill HR2 8SF</p>										
<p>These drawings are for use in the planting process only. All measurements should be checked on site. These plans should not be used for structural calculations or any other engineering purpose.</p> <p>Existing Track/tractorway and gate made good (Gravel track) providing access to cottage.</p> <p>Area to form cottage garden boundary, landscape detail by condition if required. (Timber and wire fence to match adjoining dwelling garden boundaries)</p> <p>New Gate (standard galv. metal gate)</p> <p>The two existing trees within the cottage garden boundary have not been formally assessed in detail, however they are to be retained and protected to British standard BS37:2005 "Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations", during works, regardless, ensuring their future protection within the garden boundary.</p> <p>1 Block plan 1: 500</p> <p>2 Fence Panel 1: 50</p>											
<p>Peter Pendleton &amp; Associates 97 Lower Marsh London SE1 7AB <a href="http://www.pendleton-assoc.com">www.pendleton-assoc.com</a></p>	<p>REVISION:</p>										
<p>The Cave' Orcop Hill, HR2</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Block plan</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Project number</td> <td>ORC-ep1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Date</td> <td>21-09-2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Drawn by</td> <td>Author</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Checked by</td> <td>Checker</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>ORC-PR-4</p> <p>Scale: A3 As indicated</p>		Block plan		Project number	ORC-ep1	Date	21-09-2015	Drawn by	Author	Checked by	Checker
Block plan											
Project number	ORC-ep1										
Date	21-09-2015										
Drawn by	Author										
Checked by	Checker										



View from Burnett lane towards south-east (Hamara).



View from Little Hill towards north.

Detail	Assessment
	<p>Access Road and roadside ditch to north of field.</p>
Site Address / Location	Field in front of Hamara, Orcop Hill, HR2 8SF
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.8Ha
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agriculture land currently pasture for Sheep
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Housing
Landowner estimate of development capacity (if known)	4-6 Bungalows x 3bed or 10 first-time buyer Houses x 2bed
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHELAA, Call for Sites consultation, identified by neighbourhood planning group)	Call for Sites
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	None
Neighbouring uses	Housing, pastoral field, single track road, village lane to houses

## Assessment of Suitability

### Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</p> <p>Ancient Woodland            Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)            Biosphere Reserve            Local Nature Reserve (LNR)            National Nature Reserve (NNR)            National Park            Ramsar Site            Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)            Special Area of Conservation (SAC)            Special Protection Area (SPA)</p> <p>Yes/ No/ Unknown</p> <p>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</p> <p>Yes/ No/ Unknown</p>	<p>Yes – River Wye SAC</p> <p>No</p> <p>Natural England to be consulted regarding site being within R Wye SAC</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Corridor            Local Wildlife Site (LWS)            Public Open Space            Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)            Nature Improvement Area            Regionally Important Geological Site            Other</p> <p>Yes/ No/ Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</p> <p>See guidance notes:  Flood Zone 1: <b>Low Risk</b>  Flood Zone 2: <b>Medium Risk</b>  Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): <b>Medium Risk</b>  Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): <b>High Risk</b></p>	<p><b>Low Risk</b></p>
<p>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</p> <p>See guidance notes:  Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <b>Low Risk</b>  &gt;15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – <b>Medium Risk</b></p>	<p><b>Medium Risk</b> Roadside ditch by north side hedge is deep to accommodate field run off. There is a ditch in field north to south to take surface water away from roadside ditch. Field was wet/boggy underfoot in places when inspected, but ditch and sloping ground help to take water away. [note recent exceptionally heavy rainfall].</p>
<p>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)  <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Site contains 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:  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  An area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?  <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p><b>No</b> – there are no environmental designations on the site</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?  <b>Yes / No / Unknown</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>

## Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Is the site: Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping	Gently sloping from north to south
Is there existing vehicle access to the site? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes via set-back gateway from road
Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access to the site?  Pedestrian? Yes / No / Unknown  Cycle? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes  Yes
Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?  Significant trees? Yes, within / Yes, adjacent / No / Unknown  Potentially veteran or ancient trees present? Yes, within / Yes, adjacent / No / Unknown  Owned by third parties? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes, adjacent. Four significant Oak Trees adjacent to field perimeter.  No  Yes two trees above owned by third parties (neighbouring land).
Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination? Yes / No / Unknown	No

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes Power lines cross field east to west
Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes Landscape view from road would be obstructed

## Accessibility

Factor	Guidance
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using <a href="#">Google Maps</a> :	
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)
Town / local centre / shop	<p>&lt;400m</p> <p>400-1200m</p> <p>&gt;1200m</p>
Bus /Tram Stop	<p>400-1200m</p> <p>400-800m</p> <p>&gt;800m</p>
Train station	<p>400-800m</p> <p>&gt;800m</p> <p>Catch Corner</p>
Primary School	<p>&lt;400m</p> <p>400-1200m</p> <p>&gt;1200m</p>
Secondary School	<p>&gt;1200m</p> <p>Hereford 14km</p>
Open Space / recreation facilities	<p>&lt;400m</p> <p>400-800m</p> <p>&gt;800m</p>
Cycle Route	<p>&lt;400m</p> <p>400-800m</p> <p>&gt;800m</p>
	<p>1600-3900m</p> <p>Steiner Academy (age 3-16) 3.5km. Hereford Academy (16-18) 14km</p>
	<p>&gt;800m</p> <p>Nearest recreational facilities are in Ross/Hereford</p>
	N/A



## Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site <b>low</b>, <b>medium</b> or <b>high</b> sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</p> <p><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</p>	<p><b>Low sensitivity</b></p>
<p>Is the site <b>low</b>, <b>medium</b> or <b>high</b> sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p><b>Low sensitivity:</b> the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><b>Medium sensitivity:</b> the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p><b>High sensitivity:</b> the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</p>	<p><b>Medium sensitivity</b> Site is visible from various places in Orcop parish. Panoramic view of land towards Orcop basin/Garway Hill would be obstructed (less effect if Bungalows built). There are hedges on north (road) and west (lane) side. Small cottage to the south. Taller hedge and house on east side.</p>

## Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</p> <p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</p> <p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</p> <p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</p> <p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	<p>No</p>

## Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Is the site in the Green Belt? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?	In planning application 160489 [decision 24 May 2016] for The Cave the Planning Officer's Report stated... <i>The application site is not within or adjacent to the main built up part of such a settlement being separated from Orcop Hill by intervening fields. It is, therefore, in open countryside where the principle of providing new residential development is ordinarily resisted. However, permission was given under Exception No.4 ...sustainable re-use of a redundant or disused building...(RA3)</i>
Is the site:  <b>Greenfield</b> A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land?	Greenfield
Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?  Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?	Outside and not connected to the existing built up area See above ref to planning report.
Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?  Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?	No existing settlement boundary designated.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another? Yes / No / Unknown	No
Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes

## Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
Is the site available for development? Yes / No / Unknown.	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? Yes / No / Unknown.	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.	0-5 years

## Viability

Indicators of Viability	Assessment
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? Yes / No / Unknown.  What evidence is available to support this judgement?	Sewerage provision could be very expensive if public sewer option is pursued as suggested by Prof Kumar's agent Jay Patel. Investigation with Welsh Water to be done by owner/agent.  General concern of residents regarding sewage disposal heightened by recent experience of new developments and planning applications in Orcop Hill.

## Conclusions

Conclusions	Assessment
Summary of key development constraints affecting the site	
What is the estimated development capacity of the site?	30 per_ hectare net housing density. 0.4 Ha development. 10 houses.
What is the likely timeframe for development? (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years.
Other key information	
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)  The site is suitable, available and achievable The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable	Amber The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	The site would not be overlooked or overlook. Good access. Some loss of landscape view. The site borders Orcop Hill settlement, but not in main built area. The Cave planning report (referenced on page 12) notes that the site is in open countryside, where development would normally be resisted. This would produce a Red classification, but “The Cave” (now “Hamara”) was converted under Exception no.4 (RA3). The advantages of the site have been weighed against its open countryside location, leading to the Amber rating.

End Page