

# **South Worcestershire Development Plan**

## **Proposed Modifications to Housing Allocations in South Worcestershire**

### **Site Assessment Forms (Additional New Sites and Amended Sites Only)**

#### **Malvern Hills District Council**

#### **Site Assessment Forms**

Ref. and Hyperlink	Location	Category	Approx. No. of dwellings	Size of site (ha)	New site / amended allocation
<a href="#">SWDP52d</a>	Land at Mill Lane, Poolbrook	Malvern	62	3.94	N
<a href="#">SWDP52f</a>	Pickersleigh Grove (part of Hayslan Fields)	Malvern	44	3.30	N
<a href="#">SWDP52i</a>	Land at Lower Howsell Road (former allotments)	Malvern	81	5.21	N
<a href="#">SWDP52m</a>	Former Railway Sidings, Peachfield Road	Malvern	20	0.67	N
<a href="#">SWDP52s</a>	Victoria Road Car Park	Malvern	21	0.28	N
<a href="#">SWDP52w</a>	Land off Brook Farm Drive, Poolbrook	Malvern	77	4.25	N
<a href="#">SWDP52y</a>	Broadlands Drive, Malvern	Malvern	33	1.82	N
<a href="#">SWDP52*</a>	Barracks Store, Court Road, Malvern	Malvern	28	0.8	N
<a href="#">SWDP52/6</a>	Land to the Rear of 12 Priory Road	Malvern			(deleted)
<a href="#">SWDP57a</a>	Land at Mistletoe Row, Oldwood Road	Tenbury Wells	44	3.74	N
<a href="#">SWDP57c</a>	Land south of the Oaklands, Tenbury	Tenbury Wells	35	1.92	N
<a href="#">SWDP58c</a>	Upton Marina (previously Upton-upon-Severn, Holly Green / Ryall and Tunnel Hill Area)	Upton	70	n/a	N
<a href="#">SWDP58d</a>	Land at Welland Road	Upton	43	2.12	N
<a href="#">SWDP59/7</a>	Land at Yew Tree Farm, Hanley Swan	1			(deleted)
<a href="#">SWDP59/11</a>	Strand Cottages, Peachley Lane, Lower Broadheath (combined / extended sites)	1	6	<del>0.26</del> <b>0.60</b>	A
<a href="#">SWDP59/8</a>	Land adjacent to the Lawns including Bight Farm (combined / extended sites), Kempsey	1	<del>138</del> <b>170</b>	<del>4.70</del> <b>6.40</b>	A
<a href="#">SWDP59a</a>	Walshes Farm, Clows Top Road, Abberley Common	1	15	1.44	N
<a href="#">SWDP59b</a>	Church House Farm, Clifton upon Teme	1	17	4.8	N
<a href="#">SWDP59d</a>	Braithwaite's Yard, Hallow	1	9	0.68	N
<a href="#">SWDP59e</a>	123a Main Road, Kempsey	1	10	0.39	N
<a href="#">SWDP59f</a>	Land north of Brookend Lane (adj to The Limes), Kempsey	1	120	6.87	N
<a href="#">SWDP59*</a>	Land adjacent to Henwick Mill House, Martley Road, Lower Broadheath	1	42	1.55	N
<a href="#">SWDP59k</a>	Land adj. Primary School, Martley	1	14	0.77	N
<a href="#">SWDP59l</a>	Lawn Farm, Drake Street, Welland	1	50	9.15	N
<a href="#">SWDP59zk</a>	The Royal Oak Public House, Hallow	1	8	0.19	N
<a href="#">SWDP59zl</a>	Land between Old Post Office and Church Farm, Drake Street, Welland	1	30	1.66	N

<a href="#"><u>SWDP59zzi</u></a>	Land south of Greenhill Lane, Hallow	1	30	1.67	N
<a href="#"><u>SWDP60/5</u></a>	Former Allotments, Winsmore, Powick and Collet's Green (combined / extended sites)	2	<del>30</del> 35	1.57	A
<a href="#"><u>SWDP60a</u></a>	Land at Stoney Lea, Broadwas	2	8	0.50	N
<a href="#"><u>SWDP60b</u></a>	Land adjacent to the Crown Public House, Powick and Collett's Green	2	45	2.72	N
<a href="#"><u>SWDP60c</u></a>	Land south of Sparrowhall Lane, Powick and Collett's Green	2	39	2.23	N
<a href="#"><u>SWDP60d</u></a>	Land at Kiln Lane, Leigh Sinton	2	53	2.01	N
<a href="#"><u>SWDP60t</u></a>	Land off Bransford Road, Rushwick	2	50	2.16	N
<a href="#"><u>SWDP61/*</u></a>	Land off Pearl Lane, Astley Cross (relates to Stourport)	3	62	2.16	N

<b>Malvern</b>		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMT011 SWDP Ref: SWDP 52 d - Land at Mill Lane Poolbrook
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes. It is an omission site put forward in Proposed Submission Document. Site is 3.94ha. Site was for promoted by landowner for 156 dwellings on larger site area, which has not been demonstrated to be deliverable. This analysis relates to the 62 dwellings. 13/01095/OUT is outline planning permission for up to 63 dwellings (subject to S106).
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Very small amount of Flood Zone 3a and 2 affecting extreme south of site.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Yes. The planning applications for 62 dwellings demonstrated suitable vehicular and pedestrian access via 2 alternatives, off Mill Lane or via the Charlock Road cul de sac.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Discussed as part of planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, residential to north and west. Sewage works to east, but odour study submitted with application and approved with separation distance from proposed housing.
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Yes, southern part of site is in area designated as protected open space in adopted Local Plan (CN13). Northern access off Mill Lane is "Quality Landscape".
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Yes, southern part of site is in area designated as protected open space in adopted Local Plan (CN13). Northern access off Mill Lane is "Quality Landscape" (QL2).
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No, but large trees on north west boundary and some along Mill Lane.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	No
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Yes, large part of south of site and on northern boundary, subject to surface water flooding. Planning application was accompanied by detailed FRA and mitigation.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	No
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Not showing on GIS database, but some anecdotal evidence that some of the area may have been tipped.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Possibly depending on access routes through the site.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	1km to secondary school; approx. 1km to Poolbrook Road local shops. Note the primary school adjacent to site (west) was closed a few years ago.
	Greenfield /Brownfield?	Greenfield
<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	Access from Mill Lane, subject to improvement, junction analysis and potential improvements.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Site is largely FZ1 (floodplain to at southern point of site appears to be derived from modelling of Pool Brook as EA maps show all FZ1 in this area). The surface water maps look more significant (including 30 yr. extent) in north of site and this could restrict development somewhat and may have access impacts, but generally form a fluvial flood risk perspective site looks ok. However, site is adjacent to Barnards Green Sewage Treatment Works, Severn Trent Water have addressed the cordonne sanitaire/development exclusion zone for odour nuisance reasons through planning application.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	Site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component. It will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site has outline planning permission (subject to S106) for 62 dwellings. Two alternative accesses approved off Mill Lane or Charlock Road, hence uncertainty regarding distance to local services (by road/ walking routes). Fits with strategy regarding being adjacent to Malvern settlement boundary and previous issues on flood risk and access now overcome, for this smaller site area (as opposed to larger omission site). See assessment, which includes the play area to the south, SHLAA Ref MHMT104.

Malvern			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMT16 (part) SWDP Ref: SWDP 52 f - Land at Pickersleigh Grove	
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Windfall site has planning permission, granted 16th June 2014 (including S106) for 92 dwellings, although only 44 net, as involves demolition of dated RSL housing (13/00900/OUT). Within Malvern urban area.	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Currently Flood Zones have not been produced for the unnamed watercourse which flows along the southern boundary, due to the broad scale modelling approach not being suitable in this particular area. The flood risk from this watercourse should be assessed as part of a detailed flood risk assessment and the exception test may need to be applied based on this detailed assessment.	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Site has planning permission granted 16th June 2014 (including S106) for 92 dwellings, although only 44 net as involves demolition of dated RSL housing (13/00900/OUT).	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Severn Trent to advise.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, residential and open space.	
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Yes, MUGS site (QL2) important landscape area.	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No loss of Public Open Space, but important open space a with footpath routes.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Listed milestones adjacent.	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Yes, MUGS site QL2, important landscape area.	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Yes, some TPO's on southern, eastern boundaries and many trees on site, especially on boundaries.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Yes, some surface water flooding across northern part of site.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	No	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.	No, but within approx. 500m. On Pickersleigh Road.	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes	
	Greenfield/ Brownfield	Mixed.	
	EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
		County Highways Access Comments	Access from Hayslan Road. Link adjacent to 2 Hayslan Avenue approx. 4.6m wide, limiting potential unless additional land available.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		No flood risk identified, but water course at southern edge of boundary not tested.	
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		The sites have unknown potential for unrecorded heritage assets and insufficient information to determine its historic landscape significance. Most of the sites below will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.	
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	Site has planning permission granted 16th June 2014 (including S106) for 92 dwellings, although only 44 net, as involves demolition of dated RSL housing (13/00900/OUT).	

Malvern	
SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMT012 SWDP Ref: SWDP 52 I - Land at Lower Howsell Road Allotments
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	<p>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).</p> <p>Yes, omission site, promoted through SWDP Proposed Submission Document. Site is 5.4ha (though 5.22ha if SWDP 52/7 is discounted). If 40% is allowed for GI could give approx. 97 dwellings (@ 30dph) and at 40dph 130 dwellings. But as former open space (allotments) and with important PROW more than 40% GI would be desirable. Suggest 50% GI more appropriate, that could deliver 81 dwellings. Adjoins large urban extension allocation (to north, SWDP 56). Proposed submission SWDP does not allocate the former allotments site, but it is suggested as a possibility (reasoned justification) in relation to the development of the urban extension. Note, site is within the current Malvern settlement boundary.</p>
	<p>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</p> <p>PROW run along the north east boundary and through the middle of the site, north west to south east. County Highways Officer considers access for site from Lower Howsell Road not appropriate for 100+ dwellings due to restricted nature of junction of Lower Howsell Road, where it meets the junction with Worcester Road. May be scope for access from north east Malvern allocation to north, although this may require additional land for vehicular access adjacent to northern boundary.</p>
	<p>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</p> <p>Provided surface water is dealt with sustainably and foul only flows are connected into the network, the foul flows from this development site is not anticipated to cause any impact on the system. However, there appears to be another, much larger development right next to this site. Modelling should be undertaken if these sites are developed together.</p>
	<p>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</p> <p>Yes, residential development surrounds most of the site.</p>
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	<p>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</p> <p>Yes, site is covered by QL2 designation in current Local Plan (protection and enhancement of Green Space MUGS2), as making an important landscape contribution to Malvern town. Important for footpath links and area was also formerly allotments. GI classed as "good, protect and support" and is part of the local green network.</p>
	<p>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</p> <p>Site is not public open space and no longer used as allotments. Its openness is however valued in landscape terms.</p>
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</p> <p>Listed buildings to NE and SW.</p>
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</p> <p>Designated as quality landscape QL2 - Malvern Urban Greenspace.</p>
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</p> <p>Group TPO in north eastern corner.</p>
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</p> <p>Not known.</p>
	<p>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</p> <p>No, Grade 3 ALC, urban/industrial BMV.</p>
	<p>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</p> <p>Probably, depends where access permitted. Bus stops on Lower Howsell Road and presumably to serve the north east Malvern allocation, and Worcester Road.</p>
	<p>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</p> <p>Approximately: 1km from a superstore; 800m primary school; 2km secondary school; 850m Malvern Link District Centre; and 1.4km from a railway station.</p>
	<p>Greenfield/ Brownfield</p> <p>Greenfield.</p>
<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	<p>Valuation Office Comments</p> <p>No comments - site not sent.</p>
	<p>County Highways Access Comments</p> <p>Main access possibly from Worcester Road, potential second access from Lower Howsell Road.</p>
	<p>EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments</p> <p>Not part of June 2014 update.</p>
	<p>Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments</p> <p>No comments.</p>
	<p>WCC Archaeology Comments</p> <p>The site has unknown potential for unrecorded heritage assets and insufficient information to determine its historic landscape significance. The site may will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.</p>
<b>SUMMARY</b>	<p>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</p> <p>In</p>
	<p>Summary</p> <p>Site is adjacent to Malvern urban area, within the settlement boundary and adjacent to the proposed North East Malvern urban extension. If access issues can be resolved (with main access from Worcester Road) and appropriate levels of public open space delivered, with an open aspect retained in part, the site may be able to deliver up to 81 dwellings, allowing for 50% for green infrastructure. The site has not been in allotment use for many years and this site could deliver a public gain in designated open space in this area of Malvern.</p>

Malvern			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMT112 SWDP Ref: SWDP 52 m - Former Railway Sidings, Peachfield Road	
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Previous MHDC Local Plan site (1996-2011) brought forward to SWDP allocations. Has also had p.p. in past for 20 dwellings, now lapsed. Site is previously developed land.	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Site not within flood zone 3a or 3b.	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No pipelines within 450m.	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Use existing access, possible improvements to adoptable standard achievable.	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Yes, in relation to lapsed planning permission.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes	
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Close to but does not impact as site is within an established residential area.	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Some TPOs at bottom end of the site.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	No	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Beyond site to west some surface water flooding occurs.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Classified as 'Urban'	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Beyond site to east, on opposite side of railway tracks, area of potential contamination (railways).	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Barnards Green District Centre approx. 1km away.	
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	See below.
		County Highways Access Comments	Use existing access, possible improvements to adoptable standard achievable.
		EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Not part of June 2014 update.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		The site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component and will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.	
<b>VALUATION OFFICE</b>	Economic viability of existing use Category Good/Poor/Unviable	Poor	
	Economic viability of existing use VOA Comment	Brownfield land.	
	Market demand for housing in area Category High/Medium/Low	Medium, although proximity to railway line may impact on prospective purchasers of any residential units.	
	Market Demand VOA Comment	Reasonable demand.	
	Financial viability of site for housing Category High/Medium/Low/Unviable	Medium	
Financial Viability VOA Comment	Abnormal costs to be considered.		
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	Previous MHDC Local Plan site (1996-2011) brought forward to SWDP allocations. Approx. 20 dwellings considered achievable on site following planning permission that expired in 2012. Site is one of the few allocated brownfield sites.	

**Malvern**

Malvern		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMT111 SWDP Ref: SWDP 52 s - Victoria Road Car Park Malvern
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes. Approx. 0.2765ha @ 40dph = 11 dwellings or 21 at 75dph. Could take flatted development. Previously developed site (existing car park) owned by District Council.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	No
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Yes, assume from Victoria Road.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Severn Trent to advise.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, mainly residential and offices to the west.
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Within Conservation Area. Principle of some development accepted and guidance produced (Statement of Development principles) by District Council.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Library nearby to west, but nothing within immediate vicinity.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No, although several large trees in middle of site and on western boundary.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	No
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	No
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes. Bus stops to Worcester, Barnards Green etc. within walking distance.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes, within 300m of Great Malvern Town Centre.
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments
County Highways Access Comments		Frontage development use existing access points.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Not part of June 2014 update.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.
WCC Archaeology Comments		This site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component. The site may require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.
<b>VALUATION OFFICE</b>	Economic viability of existing use Category Good/Poor/Unviable	Good
	Economic viability of existing use VOA Comment	Existing car park.
	Market demand for housing in area Category High/Medium/Low	High
	Market Demand VOA Comment	Strong market demand reflects town centre location and access to surrounding services.
	Financial viability of site for housing Category High/Medium/Low/Unviable	High
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Financial Viability VOA Comment	Abnormal costs to be considered.
	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site is in a sustainable location close to Great Malvern Town Centre, within walking distance of all services and bus stops in a predominantly residential area, with some commercial land uses. It is within the Conservation Area, so design will be very important. Approx. 0.27ha that could deliver up to 8 -10 dwellings at 30-40 dph. If suitable for flats, it could deliver more units (approx. 21 at 75dph).



Malvern		
MAJOR CRITERIA	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMT102 SWDP Ref: SWDP 52 w - Land at Brook Farm Drive, Poolbrook, Malvern
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes, put forward in call for sites (SHLAA ref MHMT102). Site is adjacent to Malvern settlement boundary. Site is 4.25ha which, allowing for 40% GI, could deliver 77 dwellings.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	No. Flood Zones 3 and 2 beyond site to north east and Flood Zone 2 beyond to south.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	PROW's on western boundary, north east boundary and east west across southern part of site. Also map show informal route marked from north to south through centre of site.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Although there is a known flooding incident just upstream from this development site, the site is directly next to the treatment works. Provided only the foul flows are connected into the network, this development is not anticipated to cause any impact.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	Poolbrook SWS to north east is close by, so there may be implications that need closer examination.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, residential to west, agricultural land to east and south.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No areas designated, but open space (play area) to north.
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Possibly. Group TPO adjacent to south east boundary (along stream course). Site well treed on eastern boundaries and in places within the site itself.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Surface water flooding events across the site west to east in the northern section of the site and along north, north east boundary and beyond and on southern corner of site and beyond.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	No, Grade 3 ALC.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No. Any planning applications would need to test odour influence from sewage works to the north east.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no state distance.	Probably on Brook Farm Drive.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Within 200m of community centre.
	Greenfield/ Brownfield	Greenfield
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	See below.
	County Highways Access Comments	Multiple access opportunities (Mill Lane subject to improvement, Clover Way and Brook Farm Drive). All subject to junction assessments and possible improvements.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	There appears to be a potential anomaly and unusual flood outlines when you look at the adjacent site/field – a 'glass-walling' effect? Or is the site raised here? JBA to check.  Provided the above is checked and flood outlines are correct, then our advice would be:  Site is predominantly FZ1 (site is FZ1 on EA maps). Modelled extents in SFRA appear to have picked up potential flooding of the ordinary watercourse that runs in culvert adjacent to the south eastern edge of the site and this floodplain does not appear to affect the site. There are however, south west extents shown, which may indicate a flow route and this would need to be managed in any development. Suggest reducing site's capacity a little to accommodate this.  However, the site is adjacent to Barnards Green Sewage Treatment Works. LPA should consult Severn Trent Water on whether there is a cordonne sanitaire/development exclusion zone for odour nuisance reasons.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component. It will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.
VALUATION OFFICE	Economic viability of existing use Category Good/Poor/Unviable	Good
	Economic viability of existing use VOA Comment	Agricultural land.
	Market demand for housing in area Category High/Medium/Low	Medium
	Market Demand VOA Comment	Reasonable demand.
	Financial viability of site for housing Category High/Medium/Low/Unviable	Medium
	Financial Viability VOA Comment	Infrastructure costs to be considered.
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site could deliver a small urban extension to Malvern. Loss of well used green space / PROW character may be an issue, as would impact on trees and nearby Poolbrook, but scope probably for some development here. Capacity allows for 40% GI, so circa 77 dwellings. Capacity may need to be reduced if further work on surface water flooding suggests this is required.

Malvern		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMT003 (Part Duplicate of MHMT114). SWDP Ref: SWDP 52 y - Land at Broadlands Drive
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Landowner says site available within two years. 1.784ha - 40% = 1.070ha @ 30dph = 32 dwellings. Agents suggests it could deliver 60 dwellings, but this would require a high density not in accord with surroundings (open countryside close to AONB) and low to medium density dwellings adjacent.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not in flood zones according to constraints map. Buffer would be required along stream in the north of the site for flood/ ecological reasons.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No record of pipelines on constraints map.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Highway comments: possible access via Sayers Avenue. Junction with Leigh Sinton Road may require alteration subject to assessment. MHDC Officer comment: unrestricted connection to Broadlands Drive according to agent; PROW crosses site. May be access issues for no. of dwellings sought as Broadlands Drive is a cul de sac and north eastern part is unmade and looks as if it is unadopted, so may not be in highway ownership/ control.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Flows from this site will travel through the heart of Malvern and pass multiple known hydraulic flooding incidents. Hydraulic modelling is recommended in order to ascertain the impact of flows from this site.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
OTHER CRITERIA	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Residential development to north-east , east, south and west boundaries. Land to north west and south west generally open in character. Land to immediate south west was formerly part of SHLAA site and contains a listed building and allotments.
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No, but note requirement to retain footpath link.
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site immediately adjacent to allotments covered by policy CN13 (Open Space Protection).
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	There is scope for some development, but with reduced numbers as needs to be kept away from listed farmhouse to the north to preserve its setting. Note pre-app is for 41 dwellings which is a bit high.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No records of SWS / LNR on constraints map. Site lies to east of AONB, although within 120m approx. May be some ecological value along stream in north, and from ponds just outside the site to the North west, so a buffer along here would be required.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No, but site well treed on northern boundary.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Hedgerows around site boundaries.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	No records on constraints map of surface water issues but pond to immediate western corner of site.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Part of site Grade 3 ALC (generally north west section of site); south east section of site classed as urban.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No major concerns, although a Phase I survey will be required to be submitted with any application on the site due to the potential for contamination due to the former Belmont tip within 250m of the site.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No if no state distance.	Approx. 700m to the Leigh Sinton Road which is a bus route.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Approx. 700m to local shop on Belmont Road. Approx. 600m to Northleigh Primary School. Approx. 900m to Dyson Perrins Secondary School.
	EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Greenfield/ Brownfield
Valuation Office Comments		See below.
County Highways Access Comments		Possible access via Sayers Avenue. Junction with Leigh Sinton Road may require alteration subject to assessment.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Not part of June 2014 update.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No major concerns, although a Phase I survey will be required to be submitted with any application on the site due to the potential for contamination due to the former Belmont tip within 250m of the site.
VALUATION OFFICE	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site contains known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) AND is located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation would be required before any consent can be granted.
	Economic viability of existing use Category Good/Poor/Unviable	Good
	Economic viability of existing use VOA Comment	Agricultural land.
	Market demand for housing in area Category High/Medium/Low	High
	Market Demand VOA Comment	Reasonable demand.
	Financial viability of site for housing Category High/Medium/Low/Unviable	High
SUMMARY	Financial Viability VOA Comment	Infrastructure costs to be considered.
	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site lies adjacent to edge of built-up area of Malvern. Reduced in size from previous SHLAA submission, presumably to reduce likelihood of issues arising over listed building. Conservation officer considers some development could be accommodated if drawn away from the listed building to preserve its setting. Boundary to the north is along the stream and woodland. Given the important GI constraints such as open countryside and pond adjacent to site, and PROW would not deliver 60 dwellings as suggested by agent. Access issues may need to be resolved as Broadlands Drive is a cul de sac and part of it is unadopted, although County Highways suggest access via Sayers Avenue. Indicative number: 33 dwellings.

Malvern		
MAJOR CRITERIA	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMTX SWDP ref: SWDP 52* - Barracks Store, Court Road, Malvern
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes. Site has had planning permission (05/00383/OUT and 10/01581/EOX) for 28 dwellings previously, now lapsed. Site was also a Local Plan housing site within malvern's adopted Plan 2006. Land adjacent to the east permission granted for a new sports facility. It is considered that the site could be developable within plan period. Site is 0.73ha x 30dph = 22 dwellings.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Site not within defined Flood Zone.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Site not within specified distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access is likely to be achieved via Thirlstone Road. Highway Officer Comments would be recommended, in particular on the in combination effect with the larger proposed allocation site to the south, at Qinetiq. Main concerns raised by Highways on this site were "...there should not be any resulting increase in traffic along Geraldine Road, due to the existing community uses found in this area. Therefore, the other access points should take the brunt of the development traffic, however this could have a detrimental affect on the surrounding highway network and the developer will have to mitigate against this. Improvement works to all points of access and off site improvements have been preliminary discussed, which have identified third party issues involving land owned by Malvern Hills Conservators. The developer will be required to resolve these by negotiations or reduce aspirations on the scale of development. The landowner has been in extensive discussions and modelling with the WCC Transportation Team to test these issues." There is a PROW to the south of the site.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Comments received for Qinetiq site likely to be the same for this site. "Comparison of current measured dry weather flow against the consented dry weather flow indicates there is reasonable spare capacity at this treatment works. There are no known physical constraints that would prevent additional capacity being provided at this treatment works."
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, site is located within the settlement boundary of Malvern, site is adjacent to residential development, employment development (research and development) and education facilities, incorporating open space (Malvern Urban Green Space), a area which contributes to the townscape of Malvern.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No, but adjacent to a Local Green Network.
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No, but adjacent to an area of open space, playing fields with new permission for a sports facility.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Site adjoins a Conservation Area to the west. Development design will need to take account of this.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No, unlikely. 125 Court Road in close proximity, however other residential development between that and the development site.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Yes, TPO on site (490) and around northern and eastern boundaries, tree/hedgerow.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known. However, tree/hedgerow around northern and eastern boundaries.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Some surface water flooding to the north of the site.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Urban ALC and Urban/Industrial BMV land.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Contaminated land potential is medium.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.	Unclear, from site to south (Qinetiq) - Yes, St Andrews Road.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Unclear, from site to south (Qinetiq) - Yes.
	Greenfield/Brownfield	Brownfield.
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments on this site, as site not sent. However comments received on higher potential contaminated site to the south (Qinetiq) response were: "No major concerns, although a Phase I Survey will be required to be submitted with any application on the site, due to the potential for contamination from the former industrial use of the site".
	WCC Archaeology Comments	No comments on this site, as site not sent. However, comments received on site to south (Qinetiq) response were: "The site contains either known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR is located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation are more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions".
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Brownfield site in sustainable location near local schools, shops, employment opportunity and services. Site could deliver approx. 22 dwellings at 30dph. Rearrangements of potential access may make for a more rational use of land, while still permitting a mixed use for employment land. TPOs and boundary TPO features will need to be taken account of. Surface water flooding to north of site will need to be considered and remediated as necessary.

## Tenbury Wells

	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHTW08 (part) SWDP Ref: SWDP 57 a - Land at Mistletoe Row, Oldwood Road
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes. 3.73 hectares. Assuming a 40% green space and density of 30 dwellings per hectare, indicative density potential for 67 dwellings, although landscape and topographical issues (site slopes to west). Allowed on appeal for 44 dwellings 13/08/2013.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within flood zone 3 or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access permitted off Oldwood Road / Mistletoe Row. Site does not affect PROW.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Discussed through planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Site outside settlement boundary, but adjacent to residential development and rural exception site to east.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13. However, playing fields (policy CN13) opposite site.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No Historic Environment implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No Historic Environment implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No Historic Environment implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. Local Green Network opposite site.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site does not appear to be in fluvial flood zone. West of site susceptible to surface water flooding (1 in 30 years, shallow).
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Mostly Grade 2, BMV land value, >60% likelihood.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No evidence of contaminated land.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	N/A permission granted.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Site not part of June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site has unknown potential for unrecorded heritage assets and insufficient information to determine its historic landscape significance. The site below will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site allowed on appeal for 44 dwellings 13/08/2013.

<b>Tenbury Wells</b>			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHTW03 and MHTW08 SWDP Ref: SWDP 57 c - Land south of the Oaklands, Oaklands Road, Tenbury	
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Site proposed in Call for Sites by Tenbury Town Council and by landowner. Single ownership, timescale for delivery not stated. Site area approx. 1.91 hectares. Minus 40% site area for GI at 30 dph = approx. 35 dwellings.	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. Flood zone 1.	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Yes	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access proposed via the Oaklands. A PROW also runs through the site.	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Provided surface water is dealt with sustainably and foul only flows are connected into the network, the foul flows from 35 properties is not anticipated to cause any impact on the downstream network.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, residential to north, west and east with open land to the south.	
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No loss of protected space in policy terms.	
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No HE implications.	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No HE implications.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No HE implications.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	There is a TPO on the eastern boundary of the site.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	No	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Some minor surface water flooding on the site.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Northern portion of site Grade 3, southern portion (smaller) Grade 2. BMV land, most of site urban/industrial, with small western portion of the site >60% likelihood BMV.	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No, but site falls under 'Ground Water Vulnerability' GIS Layer.	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Tenbury Town Centre possibly walkable (approx. 1km) or a short drive.	
	Greenfield/Brownfield	Greenfield	
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
		County Highways Access Comments	Multiple potential access points, full appraisal required to assess potential.
		EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Not part of June 2014 update.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		The site has unknown potential for unrecorded heritage assets and insufficient information to determine its historic landscape significance. The site may require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.	
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	SHLAA 2012 stated that access arrangements are sub-standard. County Council now say multiple potential access to the site. Site may be suitable if landowner can demonstrate that access issues can be resolved. Site area 1.91 hectares. Assuming 40% GI and 30dph, potential for 35 dwellings. Site is prominent, but the lower no. of dwellings, with 40% GI should allow for a sensitive scheme, with appropriate landscaping/ buffers.	

Upton upon Severn		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: N/A SWDP Ref: SWDP 58 c - Land at OS 8576 4086 North East of Upton Marina
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes. 2.85 hectares. Assuming a 40% GI discount and a density of 30 dwellings per hectare, there is potential for 51 dwellings. Planning application allowed on appeal (6th June 2104) for up to 70 dwellings (13/00431/OUT).
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Site not affected by a Flood Zone 3 or 2. However, proposed access to west is. Beyond western boundary of site Flood Zone 3 and 2 is extensive.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Potential access off A4104, although proposal appears to suggest access from track to the west of the site, which is in Flood Zone 2. Access a significant issue. Site not affected by PROW.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	To be advised by Severn Trent, as per planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	Site 200m from SSSI.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, adjacent to existing residential development. Site outside, but adjacent to settlement boundary.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Green Infrastructure classed as "good, protect and support".
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No regional or local wildlife sites of importance near to site.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Site does not include any TPO's.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	Not in Significant Gap.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Surface water flooding affects an area of land beyond the site to the west.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC, part urban/industrial, part 20.1 - 60% likelihood of BMV land.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No major concerns, although a Phase I Survey will be required to be submitted with any application on the site, due to the potential for contamination from the former industrial use of the site.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.	Yes, bus stop on the A4104 to the east of the site.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Upton town centre is approx. 1 km away.
	Valuation Office Comments	See comments below.
	EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	County Highways Access Comments
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Site itself is predominantly FZ1, but access arrangements were considered to be problematic. But addressed through planning application and appeal recently allowed.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No major concerns, although a Phase I Survey will be required to be submitted with any application on the site, due to the potential for contamination from the former industrial use of the site.
WCC Archaeology Comments		The site contains either known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR is located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation with more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions.
VALUATION OFFICE	Economic viability of existing use Category Good/Poor/Unviable	Good
	Economic viability of existing use VOA Comment	Agricultural land.
	Market demand for housing in area Category High/Medium/Low	High
	Market Demand VOA Comment	Good demand reflecting proximity to town centre.
	Financial viability of site for housing Category High/Medium/Low/Unviable	High
Financial Viability VOA Comment	Flooding to be considered, as well as infrastructure costs.	
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Planning application allowed on appeal (6th June 2104) for up to 70 dwellings (13/00431/OUT). Access issues related to flooding and evidence of contaminated land (landfill) around proposed access, therefore considered to be resolved.

Upton / Tunnel Hill		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: N/A SWDP Ref: SWDP 58 d - Land at Welland Road, Upton
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes. 2.126 hectares. Assuming a 40% green space and density of 30 dwellings per hectare, potential for 38 dwellings. Site has planning permission (13/00009/FUL) for 43 dwellings 19/03/2014 subject to S106.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within flood zone 3 or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access off A4104 (Welland Road). PROW runs through centre of site.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Dealt with through planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, residential development on land opposite the site.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. Site is opposite (50m) from Local Green Network.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site does not appear to be in fluvial flood zone or susceptible to surface water flooding.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 2 ALC, two thirds of the site has >60% likelihood of BMV land, the remainder 1/3.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No evidence of contaminated land.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Possibly.
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No Comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	Direct access from A4104, possible second access from Monsel Lane.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Site not part of June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component. It will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site would open up development to the south of A4104. Site has planning permission for 43 dwellings (13/00009/FUL) approved on 19/03/2014, subject to S106.

Lower Broadheath			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHLB10 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59/11 - Strand Cottages, Peachley Lane	
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	<b>These comments (except the 'External Assessments' section) have been taken from the 'Non-strategic site selection background paper' December 2012. Part brownfield ( derelict cottages on site).</b>  Site submitted as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period. Site Area 0.26 ha (plus additional site area of extension).	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Site not within defined Flood Zone.	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Site not within specified distance for either facility.	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	No objection to frontage development with individual access points onto Peachley Lane.	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, agricultural fields to north and residential development to east, south and west.	
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	GI classed as "average, protect and invest".	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No. But there is a pond to the SW corner and its biodiversity value should be determined.	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17.	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known. Need to check status of hedgerows & any bio-diversity issues.	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	None identified.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC.	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No evidence of contamination provided. Not according to GIS.	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Services 308 / 309 / 310 / 311- Martley to Worcester (Bell Inn).	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes, within access to village hall, school.	
	EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
		County Highways Access Comments	No further comments.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Not part of June 2014 Update.	
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		This site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component. Site may require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.	
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	Overgrown site within long gap in frontage development, adjacent to settlement boundary. Contains derelict cottages in northern part. Pond on S.W boundary. Track along western boundary. Access acceptable for frontage development. Development here would fill this gap along Peachley Lane. Mixed type of dwellings to west, east and south. Site would require footpath along frontage. Site can deliver approximately 6 dwellings. Increase in site area, but no change in numbers, in order to deliver frontage development only.	



## Kempsey

Kempsey		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHKY04 & MHKY33 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59/8 & 59/8a - Land adjacent to the Lawns including Bight Farm
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Both sites proposed in SWDP 59/8 for 138 dwellings. Both sites have planning permission, May 2014 (14/00021/OUT and 13/01130/OUT), subject to S106. Planning application for land adjacent to Lawns for up to 110 dwellings and Bight Farm for up to 80 dwellings. Total 190 units, but on an increased site area.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within Flood Zone 3 or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access off A38 (Main Road). PROW runs along south west boundary of site and across to meadow Close in north west.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Considered as part of planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes. Residential, including care home to north, residential on opposite side of main Road. The Lawns has a nursing home and 9 TPO's. Bight Farm adjacent to settlement boundary. Farmland to south.	
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under Local Plan Policy CN13.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Site is not within or immediately adjacent to a Conservation Area. However, Conservation Area 50m from site.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. 2 Local Green Networks within 200m of site (Policy CN13) and site of regional or local wildlife importance 530m from site.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	The Lawns site includes 9 TPO's.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known. However, site appears to be contained by hedges around boundary.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Some surface water events on eastern and western boundaries.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Mostly Grade 1 with exception of area around Bight Farm, which is Grade 3. KY04 - Approx. half site Urban BMV land, half 20.1 - 60% BMV and a small area has >60% likelihood of BMV land. KY33 mostly >60% likelihood of BMV land, rest 20.1 - 60% likelihood of BMV land.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Probably yes.
Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes	
<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	See below.
	County Highways Access Comments	Frontage to A38, direct access possible.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Not part of June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site contains either known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR are located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation with more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required, before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions.
<b>VALUATION OFFICE</b>	Economic viability of existing use Category Good/Poor/Unviable	Good
	Economic viability of existing use VOA Comment	Agricultural land.
	Market demand for housing in area Category High/Medium/Low	Medium
	Market Demand VOA Comment	Reasonable demand, reflecting location on the edge of Kempsey fronting the A38, close to Worcester.
	Financial viability of site for housing Category High/Medium/Low/Unviable	Medium
	Financial Viability VOA Comment	Site is to be developed in conjunction with adjoining land, already identified in Local Plan.
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Both sites proposed in SWDP59/8. Both sites subject to planning permissions in May 2014 (14/00021/OUT and 13/01130/OUT) with approval subject to S106. Planning application for land adjacent to Lawns for up to 110 dwellings and Bight Farm for up to 80 dwellings. Conservation Area 50m from site. The Lawns has a nursing home and 9 TPO's. Bight Farm adjacent to settlement boundary.

Abberley		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHAB05 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 a - Land at Walshes Farm
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Within 5 years. 1.44 hectares. Assuming 40% GI and density of 30 dwellings per hectare, potential for 25 dwellings. Site submitted to DC as part of the SHLAA and developable within plan period. <b>Site has outline planning permission for 15 dwellings</b> , see details in summary.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within Flood Zone 3 or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Subject to junction design complying with design standards a single point of access, from B4202 Clows Top Road, to serve this development site, would be acceptable. Gradient of the site may restrict development potential to less than 30 units. Individual vehicular accesses onto Clows Top Road will be resisted on grounds of highway safety. Development of this site will require an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit and also a continuous footway between the site and Abberley Primary School. Further site survey work will need to be carried out to check road user speeds and the suitability of a new access. Site not affected by PROW.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	To be advised by Severn Trent, as per planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Northern boundary appears to be adjacent to sewerage works. Southern boundary of site adjacent to settlement boundary. Power cable appears to be running through the site. Has been assessed through planning application.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Green Infrastructure classed as "average - protect and invest". Has been assessed through planning application.
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No Historic Environment implications. Site has Planning Permission.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No Historic Environment implications. Site has Planning Permission.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No Historic Environment implications. Site has Planning Permission.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Site does not include any TPO's, but 3 TPO's within 100m of site that would need to be considered.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	Not in Significant Gap.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known, but site contained by hedges around boundary.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site not appear to be in fluvial Flood Zone or susceptible to surface water flooding. 1 in 200 shallow, only affects lower part of site.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No evidence of contamination provided. Site has planning permission. On GIS, site to north within 200m is potentially contaminated, but nature of contamination is unknown.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Service 758 - Worcester - Tenbury. Long walk to bus stop at village shop.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Good access to a range of village facilities.
	EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments
County Highways Access Comments		Direct access, consider footpath links.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Not part of June 2014 update.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.
WCC Archaeology Comments		Unlikely to contain heritage assets or important historic landscapes.
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Outline Planning Permission for 15 dwellings approved 27th June 2014 (including S106 agreement). [ principle of development here accepted on appeal].

Clifton upon Teme			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: N/A SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 b - Church House Farm, Clifton upon Teme	
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Within 5 years. 2.3 hectares. As purely an indicative amount, assuming a 40% green space and density of 30 dwellings per hectare, potential for 41 dwellings. 13/01327/FUL - 17 dwellings approved 4th February 2014 (subject to S106), much lower because of conservation issues (listed buildings).	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within flood zone 3 or 2.	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Highway comment: 2 sites fit this description. One has frontage access, the other limited access options. Both need footpath linkage consideration. MHDC Officer comment: Access off "The Village" (B4204). PROW runs through middle of site. PROW also along western boundary and across north-east corner of site.	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Ground topography suggests this site will drain South East to the nearby pumping station. Flows will then be pumped North West into Clifton upon Teme before draining through the village to Clifton upon Teme STW. Provided surface water is dealt with sustainably and foul only flows are connected into the system, subject to the capacity of the pumping stations, the flows from 16 properties are not expected to cause any adverse impact on the downstream network.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	Would not compromise International or Nationally designated site.	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Site includes a number of existing buildings (agricultural), site is outside (but slightly adjacent to) settlement boundary but would extend development to the east of the village and likely to add pressure for development to the west of the site.	
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Outside, but close (100m) from Conservation Area.	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Harmful to setting of farmhouse (Grade II) and curtilage buildings - but granted planning permission and listed building consent.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No apparent detrimental impact.	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No detrimental impact on TPO's.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	Probably no detrimental impact on ancient woodland. Possible impact on ancient woodland 330m away would need to be considered.	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known - site appears to be contained by hedges around boundary.	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site not appear to be in fluvial flood zone or susceptible to surface water flooding.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 2 ALC.	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Not affected by contaminated land.	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes	
	EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
		County Highways Access Comments	Two sites fit this description. One has frontage access, the other limited access options. Both need footpath linkage consideration.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Not part of June 2014 update.	
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		Contains known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) AND is located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation would be required before any consent can be granted.	
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	Site has planning permission, 13/01327/FUL - 17 dwellings (gross) approved 4th February 2014 (subject to S106). Site is outside development boundary and would extend development significantly to the south east of the village. Significant impact on public rights of way. Development would necessitate demolition of existing buildings and impact on listed building, and open countryside location.	

Hallow			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHHA10 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 d - Braithwaites Yard	
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Planning permission dismissed at on appeal for the development of this site, in conjunction with delivery of affordable housing on another site in Hallow at the former Royal Oak PH (Ref SWDP 59 zk). However, dismissal on a technicality, and the principle of development for housing accepted by the Inspector. Site is a brownfield site, available now. 0.68 hectares. Assuming density of 30 dwellings per hectare, could deliver 20 dwellings, but lower density more appropriate as site in open countryside. Planning permission 14/00170/OUT for 9 dwellings-not yet determined.	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within flood zone 3 or 2.	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	MHDC Officer comment: Access off Hallow Road. Site not affected by PROW.	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	As per planning applications.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site.	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Site more than 150m outside settlement boundary. However, residential dwellings in Park Lane. Any industrial activities at Braithwaites yard would need investigation or cease if developed.	
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Significant view in CAA. See map- B2B2 marks views to the Malvern Hills; "A" view of rural approach from south in to CA. Sites adjacent to western boundary of CA ( 59 zh). However, bear in mind site.	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Site is also opposite church, a listed building, which is dominant in CA - development here would have to respect these issues.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	Not adjacent or within vicinity of a SAM.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. Impact on site of regional or local wildlife importance 175m from site would need to be considered.	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Site does not include any TPO's. However, impact on TPO's 75m away would need to be considered.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	Site is in Significant Gap, but previously developed land.	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site does not appear to be in fluvial flood zone. However, part of site appears to have been affected by surface water flooding.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Not applicable.	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	WRS advised as part of planning application/ conditions, as contamination likely, remedial reports and mitigation works may be required.	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Service 758 - Worcester-Hallow, Tenbury Wells from Royal Oak (Hallow) Service 294 /295 - Kidderminster, Stourport and Worcester from Royal Oak (Hallow) - check distance, more than 400m.	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Approx. 900m to school. Approx. 550m to village hall/ pre-school.	
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
		County Highways Access Comments	Highway comment: Direct access from Main road, subject to junction design.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Detailed planning application so site not sent.	
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		WRS advised as part of planning application/ conditions, as contamination likely, remedial reports and mitigation works may be required.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		The site is unlikely to contain heritage assets or important historic landscapes, due to past land use removing deposits or that the site has been previously evaluated and found not to contain remains warranting preservation or recording. No archaeological assessment or mitigation will be required on this site (unless new information is provided).	
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	Underused/ part vacant brownfield land (PDL). Site within Significant Gap and adjacent to Conservation Area but scope for development in principle accepted at appeal, including acceptance of loss of employment site. Current planning proposals in line with appeal.	

## Kempsey

Kempsey		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: N/A SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 e - 123a Main Road, Kempsey
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Site has planning permission for 10 dwellings approved 28/04/2014 13/01041/FUL.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. <b>State Flood zone.</b>	Not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No pipeline or underground cables within 450m.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Limited access available, private drive.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	As per planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes - surrounded by residential and community centre.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No - enclosed urban area.
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No - enclosed urban area.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Not in conservation area.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No, however, TPO beyond site to north-western corner.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	No
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	No, unlikely from GIS check.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	25% of site grade 1 (north west corner), 75% grade 3.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No (from GIS layer check)
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	Limited access available, private drive.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	No part of June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site is unlikely to contain heritage assets or important historic landscapes, due to past land use removing deposits or that the site has been previously evaluated and found not to contain remains warranting preservation or recording. No archaeological assessment or mitigation will be required for this site (unless new information is provided).
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site has planning permission for 10 dwellings approved 28/04/2014 13/01041/FUL.

<b>Kempsey</b>		
	<b>SHLAA site reference</b>	<b>SHLAA Ref: MHKY02 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 f - Land north of Brookend Lane</b>
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	<b>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. ( e.g. through SHLAA).</b>	Windfall site that has outline planning permission (13/00417/OUT) for up to 120 dwellings, allowed on appeal 12/12/2013.
	<b>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</b>	Eastern boundary of site Flood Zone 3 and 2, becoming more extensive beyond site to south east.
	<b>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</b>	Not within distance for either facility.
	<b>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</b>	Highways officer suggest that frontage onto Brookend Lane, possible links to A38, consider pedestrian links.
	<b>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</b>	To be advised by Severn Trent.
	<b>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</b>	No designated areas within vicinity of site.
	<b>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</b>	No
	<b>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</b>	Yes, broadly compatible with surrounding land uses and residential amenity. Site is adjacent to settlement boundary.
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	<b>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</b>	Site is within the Significant Gap.
	<b>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</b>	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</b>	No Historic Environment implications.
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</b>	No Historic Environment implications.
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</b>	No Historic Environment implications.
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</b>	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. Site of Regional or Local Wildlife Importance 300m from site.
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</b>	Site does not include any TPO's.
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</b>	Site is within the Significant Gap.
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</b>	No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</b>	Not known, but site appears to be contained by hedges around boundary.
	<b>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</b>	Eastern boundary of site affected by surface water flooding, associated with areas in Flood Zone 3 and 2. Additional area through middle of site, running east to west.
	<b>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</b>	Grade 3 ALC.
	<b>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</b>	No evidence of contaminated land.
	<b>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</b>	Yes
	<b>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</b>	Yes
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	<b>Valuation Office Comments</b>
<b>County Highways Access Comments</b>		Frontage onto Brookend Lane, possible links to A38, consider pedestrian links.
<b>EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments</b>		Site is only marginally affected by the floodplain of the Hatfield Brook along the eastern edge. Almost entirely within FZ1 (98%). There is some surface water flooding shown in middle of site, but relatively small so likely site is suitable for residential development, providing the surface water can be managed in development. Understand site has outline permission and a current Reserved Matters application is on-going – had no objections at outline, but have requested further details on finished floor levels at the RM stage). (MHDC Officer Update: Application 13/00417/OUT allowed on appeal 12/12/2013.)
<b>Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments</b>		No comments.
<b>WCC Archaeology Comments</b>		Contains either known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR are located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation with more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions.
<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</b>	In
	<b>Summary</b>	Site has outline planning permission (13/00417/OUT) for up to 120 dwellings - allowed on appeal 12/12/2013.

Lower Broadheath		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHLB14 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59* - Land adj. Henwick Mill House, Martley Road, Lower Broadheath (Site is considered separate to the Urban Extension at Worcester West, although is located in the north east corner of that allocation).
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Site has outline planning permission for 42 dwellings approved 29/04/2014 (13/00725/OUT). This is a brownfield site.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Flood Zone 3 and 2 passes around the eastern boundary of the site.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No pipelines or underground cables within 450m of the site.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Highways comment: Potential to use existing access, subject to suitable visibility splays being achievable. Alternative new access to the west on B4204, subject to design.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Dealt with through planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
OTHER CRITERIA	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, residential to the east, Worcester West proposed allocation to the south west.
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	GIS/SFRA shows surface water flooding running along eastern boundary of the site.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	ALC classified as "Urban" with half the site having >60% likelihood of BMV land and the other half 20.1 - 60% BMV land.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Contaminated land shown on GIS layer - see comments in external assessments below.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.	Yes
Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes	
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	Potential to use existing access, subject to suitable visibility splays being achievable. Alternative new access to the west on B4204, subject to design. Dealt with through planning application.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	There may be a flood risk associated with this feature too (SFRA does not highlight this) – a site specific FRA may find this has further restrictions. Also Martley Rd looks subject to surface water flood risk. All the above are significant constraints – a development could still be deliverable, but given the presence of existing dwellings, the site's capacity will need to be seriously reduced. We would advise re-drawing the red line of the allocation.  Other than the potential for this to have some flood risk associated with it and surface water affecting Martley Rd, this allocation is predominantly FZ1, so likely to be suitable for development. (We understand an application was approved for this site in April 2014 – EA ref SV/2013/107152). No objection conditioned response regarding treatment of watercourse. Applicant submitted site specific modelling from BWB that we were satisfied with.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No major concerns, although a Phase I Survey will be required to be submitted with any application on the site, due to the potential for contamination from the former industrial use of the site.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site contains either known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR is located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation containing more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required, before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions.
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site has outline planning permission for 42 dwellings approved 29/04/2014 (13/00725/OUT). Site is considered separate to the Urban Extension at Worcester West, although is located near the north east corner of that allocation.

<b>Martley</b>			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHMY14 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 k - Land adj. Primary School, Martley	
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes. 0.548 hectares. Assuming density of 30 dwellings per hectare, potential for 16 dwellings. Site has outline planning permission for 14 dwellings approved 03/04/2014 (13/00981/OUT).	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within flood zone 3 or 2.	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access off B4204. Site not affected by PROW.	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Considered through planning application.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site.	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Next to school. Site 160m outside settlement boundary and 30m outside Conservation Area.	
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Green Infrastructure classed as "average - protect and invest".	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.	
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No, although site 30m from Conservation Area.	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Listed buildings 40m from site. 7 listed buildings within 260m of site.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	Not adjacent or within vicinity of a SAM.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. Special Wildlife Site 200m from site.	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Site does not include any TPO's.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	Not in Significant Gap.	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site. 2 Ancient Woodlands around 320m from site.	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known, but site contained by hedges around boundary.	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site not susceptible to surface water flooding.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC.	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No contaminated land on site according to GIS. However, land to west is potentially contaminated from Church Cemetery/Graveyard use, approx. 50m at its closest point to the site.	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Probably yes.	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes	
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
		County Highways Access Comments	Direct access from B4204.
		EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Not in June 2014 update.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		Site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component. It will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.	
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	Site has outline planning permission for 14 dwellings (13/00981/OUT).	



Welland		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHWD05 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 I - Lawn Farm, Drake Street
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes. 9.15 hectares. Assuming 40% for GI and density of 30 dwellings per hectare, potential for 164 dwellings. 12/01087/OUT - planning permission for 50 dwellings allowed on appeal 20/01/2014. APP/J1860/A/13/219703.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within Flood Zone 3 or 2, but is on the edge (70m).
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access off A4104 (Drake Street). PROW runs through site and along eastern boundary.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	To be advised by Severn Trent.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	Site not within designated area, but AONB in close vicinity, 300m from west boundary and 260m from south of site. SSSI less than 130m from site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Site 340m outside settlement boundary and disconnected from development at Welland.
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Green Infrastructure classed as "good - protect and support".
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Planning permission already granted.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Planning permission already granted.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	Planning permission already granted.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site adjacent to site of regional or local wildlife importance.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Site does not include any TPO's, but TPO's within 100m of east of site.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	Not in Significant Gap.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known, site appears to contain and be contained by hedges around boundary.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site not appear to be in fluvial flood zone. Evidence that central part of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC with 60% likelihood of BMV land.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No evidence of contaminated land.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Some facilities may be reachable within 800m from the site.
<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	Frontage access onto A4104, consider pedestrian links.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Not part of June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site contains either known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR is located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation with more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions.
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site very close (70m) proximity to Flood Zones 2 and 3, 300m from AONB, 130m from SSSI, disconnected from development at Welland, close proximity to listed building (20m) and TPOs (100m), and parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding.Planning permission for 50 dwellings allowed on appeal 20/01/2014.

Hallow		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: N/A (Close to MHHA05) SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 zk - Royal Oak, Hallow
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Planning permission dismissed at on appeal for the development of this site, in conjunction with delivery of market housing on another site in Hallow (Ref ID 168, SHLAA Ref: MHHA10, Braithwaites Yard, Main Road). However, this was on a technicality and the principle of development for housing was accepted by the Inspector. Available now. 0.19 hectares. Assuming density of 30 dwellings per hectare, could deliver 20 dwellings, but lower density more appropriate, as site is in open countryside. Planning application 14/00170/OUT for 8 dwellings, not yet decided, but addresses appeal issues.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within Flood Zone 3 or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Site not affected by PROW.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	To be advised by Severn Trent through planning application.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, compatible with surrounding land uses and residential amenity. Site within settlement boundary. Vacant public house site.	
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Green Infrastructure classed as "average, protect and invest".
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Site is not within or immediately adjacent to a Conservation Area. A Conservation Area is located 90m from the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	Not adjacent or within vicinity of a SAM.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Site does not include any TPO's.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	Yes, site is in Significant Gap.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site does not appear to be in fluvial Flood Zone or susceptible to surface water flooding.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	No
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No evidence of contaminated land on GIS.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes
	Greenfield / Brown field	Brownfield.
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments
County Highways Access Comments		Access from Shoulton Lane.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Detailed planning application, so site not sent.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.
WCC Archaeology Comments		The site is unlikely to contain heritage assets or important historic landscapes due to past land use removing deposits or that the site has been previously evaluated and found not to contain remains warranting preservation or recording. No archaeological assessment or mitigation will be required (unless new information is provided).
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Royal Oak Public House has been vacant for sometime and the principle of its loss has been accepted at appeal hearing (APP /J1860/A/13/2196484). The site is previously developed land, within the Significant Gap.

Welland		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHWD18 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 z1 - Land between Old Post Office and Church Farm, Drake Street
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Windfall site has planning permission for 30 dwellings approved 16th April 2014 subject to S106. 13/01526/OUT. (Site is to the west of the lawn farm site allowed on appeal).
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not in Flood Zones 2, 3a or 3b.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No pipeline within 450m.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	PROW runs through the north west corner of the site.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Severn Trent to advise.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	No
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Land is in the open countryside in policy terms.
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Mutlow's Orchard is to the south west of the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	No
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	No
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes, within walking distance of village centre/ school.
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	See below.
	County Highways Access Comments	Frontage access onto A4104, consider pedestrian links.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Site not part of June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site contains either known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR are located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation with more detailed assessment of the landscape setting required before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions.
VALUATION OFFICE	Economic viability of existing use	Good
	Economic viability of existing use	Agricultural Land.
	Market demand for housing in area Category	Medium
	Market Demand	Reasonable demand reflecting semi rural area. Close to existing farm, and farm buildings.
	Financial viability of site for housing	High
	Financial Viability	Infrastructure costs to be considered.
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site has planning permission for 30 dwellings approved 16th April 2014 subject to S106. 13/01526/OUT.

<b>Hallow</b>			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHHA02 & 14 SWDP Ref: SWDP 59 zzi - Land South of Greenhill Lane	
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).	Promoted through Call For Sites. Available within five years. 1.67ha - 40% for GI = 1.00ha @ 30dph = approx. 30 dwellings. Site is adjacent to settlement boundary, character of settlement at this point is residential and agricultural. The larger proposed site (SHLAA Ref MHHA14) would extend the growth of the settlement to the east into an area currently undeveloped and into open countryside, so it is proposed to just put forward the western field (Now SHLAA Ref: MHHA02).	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not in Flood Zones 2 or 3.	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No record on constraints plan of pipeline.	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access onto Greenhill Lane limited, possible new access onto A443, consider footpath links. PROW close to southern boundary.	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Services available according to promoter.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Residential to north and south of site and to west across road, agricultural to east. Site in agricultural use.	
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No	
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No HE implications.	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No HE implications.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No HE implications.	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No record on constraints plan of SWS / LNR.	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No, however appears to be large individual tree on western (road) boundary (aerial photo 2007).	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known. However, hedgerows around boundaries of site and hedgerow to southern edge appears to contain a number of trees.	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Surface water flooding records along southern boundary.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 2 ALC with urban BMV land.	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.	Yes	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes. Opposite school and within walking distance of parish hall / pre-school, shop and recreation ground.	
	Greenfield/brownfield?	Greenfield.	
	Landscape officer	Clear views of the site from the main road (A443). Clear views of open countryside across the site would be lost from the perspective of the main road (A443). Settlement pattern of the area somewhat degraded by presence of Heath Close and Coppice Close to the north. Wider visual impact likely to be limited by topography of the land (relatively flat) and intervening development and vegetation.	
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	Comments not sent.
		County Highways Access Comments	Access onto Greenhill Lane limited, possible new access onto A443, consider footpath links.
		EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Comments not sent.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		Comments not sent.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		The site has unknown potential for unrecorded heritage assets and insufficient information to determine its historic landscape significance. It will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.	
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	Site is bounded on three sides by development and if kept to the western field, development would not extend further than the existing development into the rural areas east of Hallow. It would appear as a rounding-off of the settlement at this point and be seen in the context of surrounding housing. It would also be very close to existing facilities within the village and served by the bus routes on the main road. Allocate for 30 dwellings.	

**Powick and Colletts Green**

	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHPW09 SWDP Ref: SWDP 60/5 - Former Allotments at Winsmore
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).	Site submitted to District Council as part of the SHLAA and call for sites developable within plan period. Site area 1.36ha (plus extension). Current SWDP 60/5, Winsmore, Powick is for 30 dwellings. This is on slightly larger area and would increase no's to 35 dwellings.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Site not within defined Flood Zone.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Site not within specified distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	This site has no frontage to a public highway. To the west of the site it has a frontage to a track over which a public right of way runs. This track is in terms of its width and alignment unsuitable to serve the developments site, its junction with the A449 to the north west of the development site is also substandard. There is no suitable means of safely accessing this site except through Winsmore to the east, on to the B4424 Upton Road.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	No in principle objection from Severn Trent Water Due to the size of these sites, provided surface water is dealt with sustainably, the foul only flows expected are not expected to cause any impact on the downstream sewer network.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas in vicinity of the site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Site adjacent to residential development (to north and east).
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	GI quality on site is considered "good, protect and support".
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area, although Conservation area close to the north, beyond adjacent housing.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	There are no listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	The site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a SAM.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	The site is not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No TPO's within or adjacent to the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	The site is not within an area defined as a Significant Gap under the terms of LP Policy DS17.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	There is no Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	No surface water drainage issues identified.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 2 ALC.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No observations made.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.	Site located adjacent to A449 Worcester-Malvern Road and a high level of bus route provision. (Service No: 44.). Within 1km of school/ pre-school by road. Closer if footpath links provided to west.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Good access to a range of village services.
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	Extension - access via Winsmore, possible restriction on numbers due to width and layout.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Not part of June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site has unknown potential for unrecorded heritage assets and insufficient information to determine its historic landscape significance and will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Part of eastern portion of site could be developed subject to careful design and landscaping and to suitable remediation of vehicular access and parking issues along Winsmore. Site could deliver approx. 35 dwellings with extension. Note site already allocated at Proposed Submission stage for 30 dwellings, therefore uplift is for 5 extra dwellings on slightly larger site.

Broadwas		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: N/A SWDP Ref: SWDP 60 a - Land at Stoney Ley, Broadwas
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period. ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Within 5 years. 0.4 hectares. Assuming density of 30 dwellings per hectare, potential for 12 dwellings. Site has planning permission for 8 dwellings (subject to S106 as at 28/07/2014).
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within Flood Zone 3 or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	See Highways comments below. Site not affected by PROW.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Due to the size of these sites, provided surface water is dealt with sustainably, the foul water only flows are not expected to cause any impact on the downstream sewer network.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site. SSSI 400m from site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Possibly compatible with surrounding land uses and residential amenity despite being just outside settlement boundary.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Green Infrastructure classed as "average, protect and invest". (Has been assessed through planning application.)
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No Historic Environment Implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No Historic Environment Implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No Historic Environment Implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. SSSI 400m from site.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	Site does not include any TPO's. However, 4 TPO's within 100m of site would require consideration.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	No
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	No
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No evidence of contaminated land.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes
EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - Site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	Limited access potential adjacent to The Bungalow, possible access via existing drive with improvements. Appraisal of A44 junctions. Consider pedestrian links and crossing facilities.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	Not assessed in June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
SUMMARY	WCC Archaeology Comments	Contains either known undesigned heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR is located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation with more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions.
	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	13/01224/FUL - Residential development of 8 dwellings (3 affordable) granted 5th March 2014 (subject to S106).

Powick		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHPW14 SWDP Ref: SWDP 60 b - Land adj. to the Crown Public House, Powick
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Submitted originally through the SHLAA. This is a windfall site that has planning permission for 45 dwellings, allowed on appeal 10/01/2014. Site is now under construction.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within flood zone 3 or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access off Malvern Road and Russell Close considered acceptable by highway authority. Site not affected by PROW.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	As per planning permission.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes. Site adjacent to settlement boundary and residential development to south and commercial (pub) to north east.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13. However, open space protected under CN13 opposite site.
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Listed building adjacent (15m) from the site, potential impact would need to be assessed.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features. Issue over views to Malvern Hills examined at planning appeal.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	TPO on south east boundary and a number of TPO's within 100m of site.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known. Site appears to be contained by hedges around boundary.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Western corner of site possibly susceptible to surface water flooding (1 in 200 shallow).
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No major concerns, although a Phase I Survey will be required to be submitted with any application on the site due to the potential for contamination from the former industrial use of the site.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Some services within 800m (Public House, Chinese Restaurant).
	EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT	Valuation Office Comments
County Highways Access Comments		Dealt with through planning application and appeal.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		No comments in June 2014 update.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No major concerns, although a Phase I Survey will be required to be submitted with any application on the site due to the potential for contamination from the former industrial use of the site.
WCC Archaeology Comments		Site contains either known undesignated heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR is located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation for more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required before any consent can be granted.
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Site has planning permission for 45 dwellings allowed on appeal 10/01/2014. Site is now under construction.

Powick		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHPW03 SWDP Ref: SWDP 60 c - Land south of Sparrowhall Lane
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Windfall site promoted through the SHLAA. Site now has planning permission for 39 dwellings 02/04/2014 subject to S106 (13/00216/OUT).
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Not within Flood Zone 3 or 2.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Not within distance for either facility.
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access off Sparrowhall Lane or Malvern Road, resolved through planning application. Site not affected by PROW.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	To be advised by Severn Trent.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No designated areas within vicinity of site.
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes. Site adjacent to settlement boundary.
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No TPO's on site. Cluster of TPOs around 50m away.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Site not appear to be in fluvial flood zone or susceptible to surface water flooding.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 3 ALC.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Some facilities within 800m (Public House, Chinese Restaurant).
<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
	County Highways Access Comments	Access from Sparrowhall Lane, consider junction with A449 and pedestrian links.
	EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	No comments, site not in June 2014 update.
	Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments	No comments.
	WCC Archaeology Comments	The site contains either known undesigned heritage (or a very high potential to contain previously unrecorded remains) OR are located in an area with a high Historic Landscape Character. Any development would need to take into account the historic environment and a field evaluation with more detailed assessment of the landscape setting would be required, before any consent can be granted. The site may have existing consent with archaeological conditions.
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Windfall site that has planning permission for 39 dwellings 02/04/2014 subject to S106 (13/00216/OUT).



Leigh Sinton		
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: Original MHLS03, now with planning permission on part of site. New references include reduced area under MHLS03 and MHLS10. SWDP Ref: SWDP 60 d - Kiln Lane
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).	Site is adjacent to the settlement boundary. 13/00952/OUT - Outline planning permission granted for 53 dwellings 6th June 2014. Site is 1.85ha and will deliver 53 dwellings = 28.6 dph (gross).
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	No
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Yes, from Kiln Lane.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Assume yes if p.p. granted.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes, residential on three sides, with open countryside to south.
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No HE implications.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No. Tree belt on north west boundary.
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	Yes, site is in the Significant Gap.
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known. Some hedgerow along SW boundary.
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Some surface water events on north eastern boundary.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Predominantly Grade 2 ALC.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes, quite close to village centre. Approx. 700m to school (via road); 320m to shop.
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	Valuation Office Comments
County Highways Access Comments		Direct access from Kiln Lane, approx. 5.5m.
EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments		Site not assessed in June 2014 update.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.
WCC Archaeology Comments		Site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component and will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In
	Summary	Leigh Sinton is a category 2 settlement where some housing development would be appropriate if appropriate in size and scale to the village. 13/00952/OUT - Outline planning permission granted for 53 dwellings 6th June 2014.

Rushwick			
	SHLAA site reference	SHLAA Ref: MHRW08 SWDP Ref: SWDP 60 t - Land off Bransford Road	
MAJOR CRITERIA	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHLAA).	Yes, within five years. Promoted through SHLAA and call for sites. Site is 5.37ha. If 40% GI included, this would leave up to 3.22ha @ 30dph = 96 dwellings, as an indicative capacity. But see summary below regarding constraints. Suggested capacity only 50 dwellings. Partly brownfield as occupied by garden facilities business and associated car parking.	
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Eastern boundary of site within Flood Zone 3 and 2 (follows line of Laughern Brook).	
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Site contains electricity pylon.	
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access directly from Bransford Lane according to promoter. Access track running across western part of site from north to south and also along western boundary.	
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Severn Trent to advise, as necessary.	
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	No	
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	No	
OTHER CRITERIA	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Agricultural, golf course to east (beyond strong tree belt). Residential development across road to north and west.	
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No	
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.	Laughern Brook SWS forms eastern boundary of site, therefore ecology considerations important.	
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No, however there is a thick tree belt to immediate east of Laughern Brook, on adjacent land.	
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	Not known.	
	The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.	Surface water flooding issues associated with Laughern Brook to eastern boundary and along Hams Way to south-west.	
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Grade 2 ALC (south-western part of site) and urban (north-east); with >60% likelihood of BMV land.	
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	No. Road noise could be an issue., so buffer may be required.	
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes, to Worcester and Rushwick.	
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Rushwick school, playing fields, within 500m.	
	Greenfield/Brownfield	Greenfield.	
	EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT	Valuation Office Comments	No comments - site not sent.
		County Highways Access Comments	Potential for 2 accesses onto Bransford Road, subject to design, consider footpath links.
		EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments	20% of the site is within the floodplain of the Laughern Brook (mainly FZ3b, plus 3a and 2). Provided development avoids these areas then site could be ok. We would recommend residential capacity is reduced to recognise this. We would also note we have records of 2 water abstraction licenses at this location, which appear to be for agricultural use. Any development at this location will need to ensure these abstraction points/water sources are protected from pollution and a higher standards of SuDS may be needed to ensure they are not affected by pollutants in run-off.
Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments		No comments.	
WCC Archaeology Comments		The site has a predominantly unknown archaeological potential and a low historic landscape component. It will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required, as a condition of planning consent.	
SUMMARY	Site ruled in or out of SWDP	In	
	Summary	Site is immediately adjacent to a main road to the south and west, and close to the settlement boundary of both Worcester and Rushwick. Part of site is previously developed. Development would be associated with built up area of Worcester. May be scope for some development, but would need to allow for flood risk constraints, pylons, road noise from by-pass and the potential ecological value along the SWS watercourse. Indicative number: 50 dwellings, therefore on a much reduced site area, approx. 2ha.	

## Stourport / Astley Cross

Stourport / Astley Cross			
	<p><b>SHLAA site reference</b></p> <p><b>SHLAA Ref: MHAC01 SWDP Ref: SWDP 61/* - Land off Pearl Lane, Astley Cross</b></p>		
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	<p>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g. through SHLAA).</p>	<p>Yes. 4.26 hectares. Assuming 40% for GI and density of 30 dwellings per hectare, potential for 70 dwellings. However, due to surface water issues, only west side of site may be suitable which would reduce potential developable area. Site adjacent to the built up area of Stourport. Part of the site has planning permission approved 2/4/14 for up to 62 dwellings 13/01405/OUT subject to S106.</p>	
	<p>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</p>	<p>Not within Flood Zone 3 or 2.</p>	
	<p>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</p>	<p>Not within distance for either facility.</p>	
	<p>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</p>	<p>Access off Pearl Lane. Site not affected by PROW.</p>	
	<p>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</p>	<p>To be advised by Severn Trent.</p>	
	<p>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</p>	<p>No designated areas within vicinity of site.</p>	
	<p>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</p>	<p>No</p>	
	<p>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</p>	<p>Yes. Site adjacent to settlement boundary. Residential to northern boundary.</p>	
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	<p>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure classed as "average, restore and invest".</p>	
	<p>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</p>	<p>Site is not subject to protection under LP Policy CN13.</p>	
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</p>	<p>Site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area.</p>	
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</p>	<p>No listed buildings either within or adjacent to the site.</p>	
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p>	<p>Not adjacent or within vicinity of a SAM.</p>	
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site.</p>	<p>Site not adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of any of the specified features.</p>	
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</p>	<p>Site does not include any TPO's.</p>	
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</p>	<p>Not in Significant Gap.</p>	
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</p>	<p>No Ancient Woodland in the vicinity of the site.</p>	
	<p>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</p>	<p>Not known.</p>	
	<p>The site has not been subject to a surface water flooding event (check SFRA) and if so there is a viable engineering solution to overcome it.</p>	<p>Site not appear to be in fluvial flood zone. However, central area of site susceptible to surface water flooding (in 30 years, deep).</p>	
	<p>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</p>	<p>Grade 2 ALC with &gt;60% likelihood of BMV land.</p>	
	<p>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</p>	<p>No evidence of contaminated land.</p>	
	<p>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
	<p>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
	<b>EXTERNAL ASSESSMENTS</b>	<p>Valuation Office Comments</p>	<p>No Comments - site not sent.</p>
		<p>County Highways Access Comments</p>	<p>New access from Pearl Lane subject to design.</p>
<p>EA/Drainage Flood Risk Comments</p>		<p>Dealt with through planning application.</p>	
<p>Worcs Reg Services Contaminated Land Comments</p>		<p>No Comments.</p>	
<p>WCC Archaeology Comments</p>		<p>The site has unknown potential for unrecorded heritage assets and insufficient information to determine its historic landscape significance. It will require archaeological investigation and mitigation. For schemes under 1ha in size this assessment and mitigation is likely to be required as a condition of planning consent.</p>	
<b>SUMMARY</b>	<p>Site ruled in or out of SWDP</p>	<p>In</p>	
	<p>Summary</p>	<p>Part of site has planning permission approved 2nd April 2014 for up to 62 dwellings 13/01405/OUT subject to S106.</p>	