

# Long list of site options



**These options were evaluated ahead of the detailed analysis carried out for the four short listed sites.**

Site 1: Not Suitable

- There are a number of land ownerships across the Site which would require multiple negotiations and purchase discussions.
- The disused railway track diagonally across the Site is designated as a Local Wildlife Site.
- Access – pedestrian and cycle access would need significant investment to create sufficiently safe routes to the Site.

Site 2: Not Suitable

- Access – pedestrians and cyclists would have to cross the A134 to access the Site. The Site is not served well by a wider cyclist/ walking infrastructure.

Site 3: Not Suitable

- Access – the Site is considered isolated in terms of sustainable modes of transport access.

Site 4: Not Suitable

- Access – there is a poor road network in order to access the Site as the Site would only be served by Rougham Hill.

Site 5: Not Suitable

- The site is thin and narrow which is likely to lead to difficulties in layout and adjacencies.
- Access – access is likely to be difficult onto Mount Road. Sow Lane would serve as access to the A14 and the section between Mount Road and the ERR is considered problematic. It is also considered that significant traffic would seek to access the site from the Moreton Hall or East Barton Road area which could also create issues.

Site 6: Not Suitable

- The site is thin and narrow which is likely to lead to difficulties in layout and adjacencies. It is also highly likely that any development of the Site would need to include a significant landscape buffer due to its prominence along the road. This will further narrow the site and increase the associated difficulties.
- Access – poor accessibility by foot and cycle and it is likely to be difficult to get vehicular access to the site.

Site 7: Not Suitable

- Access – there is poor existing access to the site

for vehicular traffic and there is no direct link to the A14 (this cannot be through Westley).

- The site is located within close proximity of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and currently forms part of a special landscape area.

Site 8: Not Suitable

- Access – difficulty in access for pedestrians and cyclists from the south. Tut Hill is likely to require upgrades to create an acceptable route to the A14. The existing access to the golf club is considered dangerous. Development at the Site is also unlikely to be acceptable as there are very limited opportunities for access to sustainable modes of transport.
- The site benefits from prominent landscape which will require significant mitigation in terms of building scale and height.

Site 9: Not Suitable

- Access – difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to access the site from the south. Tut Hill is likely to require upgrades to create an acceptable route to the A14. The existing access to the golf club is considered dangerous. Development at the site is also unlikely to be acceptable as there are very limited opportunities for access to sustainable modes of transport.
- The site benefits from prominent landscape which will require significant mitigation in terms of building scale and height.

Site 10: Not Suitable

- The site is very sensitive to landscape impact as it is exposed. It is also Grade 3 agricultural land.
- Access – there are concerns on the accessibility of the site to sustainable transport modes and the impact of any development on existing and surrounding highway networks.

Site 11: Not Suitable

- The site is very sensitive to landscape impact as it is exposed. It is also Grade 3 agricultural land.
- Access – there are concerns on the accessibility of the site to sustainable transport modes and the impact of any development on existing and surrounding highway networks.

#### Site 12: Not Suitable

- The site is very prominent, of much higher topography than its surrounds and therefore development is likely to cause significant impact/harm to the existing landscape.
- The surrounding highway network is very constrained by the Ortewell Road underpass (under the railway line). The underpass would require widening to accommodate two way traffic which would require agreement from Network Rail. This process is likely to cause significant delay to the planning process and subsequent opening of the new hospital. There is also no guarantee of a supportive outcome and a potentially costly process.

#### Site 13: Not Suitable

- The site is not considered acceptable for development. Policy BV25 acknowledges the prominence of the Site from the town centre, the views between which should be protected.
- Access is considered very difficult for vehicles.

#### Site 14: Not Suitable

- The site is not large enough to accommodate the new hospital and is also thin which is likely to cause difficulties in layout and adjacencies.
- The site is allocated for a park under Policy BV19. The site is also considered prominent in the views to be protected of the historic core under Policy BV25.
- The site has been previously been promoted for leisure uses and the Inspector considered that any development on the site would be harmful to the historic core of Bury St. Edmunds.

#### Site 15: Not Suitable

- The site is not large enough to accommodate the new hospital.
- Access – the surrounding highway network is very constrained and the site is also an existing car park, the loss of which would only add to the existing strain.

#### Site 16: Not Suitable

- The site is not large enough to accommodate the new hospital.
- The site is also an existing Development Site allocated for a range of uses, with a live application including 5,000 sqm of new health floorspace.

#### Site 17: Not Suitable

- The site is not available as the land owner is not willing to consider selling.