

# **South Worcestershire Development Plan**

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

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

#### **Wychavon District Council**

#### **Site Assessment Forms**

Ref. and Hyperlink	Location	Category	Approx. No. of dwellings	Size of site (ha)	New site / amended allocation
<a href="#">SWDP47/1</a>	Land North of Pershore (site A)	Town	<del>600</del> <b>695</b>	30.12	A
<a href="#">SWDP59/17</a>	Land to the east of Kingsdale Road, Broadway	1	<del>42</del> <b>13</b>	0.50	A
<a href="#">SWDP59/25</a>	The Racks (east), Ombersley	1	<del>44</del> <b>34</b>	1.08	A
<a href="#">SWDP60/27</a>	Land at Shine Hill, adjacent to The Lanterns	2	<del>6</del> <b>30</b>	2.13	A
<a href="#">SWDP61/2</a>	Land west of Main Street	3	<del>6</del> <b>12</b>	1.40	A
<a href="#">WY003</a>	Land opposite Horsebridge Avenue, Badsey	1	36	1.78	N
<a href="#">WY008</a>	Land between Leasowes Road and Laurels Road, Offenham	1	50	1.78	N
<a href="#">WY009</a>	Spencer Commercial Services Ltd, Evesham Road, Offenham	1	9	0.33	N
<a href="#">WY045</a>	Yew Tree Hill, Droitwich Spa	Droitwich Spa	765	44	N
<a href="#">WY051</a>	Land at Aldington Lodge, Offenham Road	Town	60	3.8	N
<a href="#">WY057</a>	Land off Defford Road	Town	21	1.22	N
<a href="#">WY058</a>	Land between Pentalow and Berrycroft, Blacksmith's Lane, Crophorne	2	8	0.44	N
<a href="#">WY059</a>	Stonebow Road, Drake's Broughton	2	39	2.86	N

**Wychavon - new site summaries**

	<b>SHLAA site reference</b>	Yew Tree Hill WY045, Droitwich Spa
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	<b>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</b>	Town
	<b>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</b>	Yes. Barberry Ltd/Persimmon Homes.
	<b>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</b>	No
	<b>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</b>	No
	<b>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</b>	Yes
	<b>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</b>	Yes
	<b>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</b>	No
	<b>Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?</b>	No. Immediately adjacent to green belt to south of Droitwich.
	<b>The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.</b>	Yes. Adjacent to Ridings/Primsland.
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	<b>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</b>	No
	<b>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</b>	No
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</b>	No
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</b>	No
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</b>	No
	<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>	No
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</b>	No
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</b>	No
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</b>	No
	<b>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</b>	No
	<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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</b>	No
	<b>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</b>	No
	<b>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</b>	No
	<b>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</b>	Yes
	<b>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</b>	Yes
	<b>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</b>	
	<b>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</b>	Yes. Town Plan identifies Diamond Jubilee Walk and other infrastructure improvements that additional development could assist.
	<b>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</b>	No. Vehicle access via Pulley Lane. Public transport via Primsland.
	<b>Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?</b>	Yes site has planing permission.

	<b>Summary</b>	The site was put forward as a Preferred Options strategic location in the SWJCS in 2007. The proposal was not included in the SWDP Preferred Options, in preference to Copcut Lane (that provided an employment element) and the overall reduced housing supply numbers. Subject to a separate planning application by Barberry/Persimmon (W/11/01073/OU and W/12/02336/OU) that was refused permission in 2013. Called in by Secretary of State and public inquiry held January 2014. SoS granted permission in July 2014. Included as an allocation in main modifications September 2014.
--	----------------	---

	<b>SHLAA site reference</b>	Land at Aldington Lodge, Evesham (WY051)
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	<b>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</b>	Town
	<b>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</b>	Available Now
	<b>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</b>	Flood zone 1
	<b>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</b>	Yes
	<b>The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.</b>	TBC separate decision awaited for access
	<b>Sewerage and Water supply adequate?</b>	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. Potential impact on sewage infrastructure: Low - subject to hydraulic modelling
	<b>Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.</b>	no
	<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>	large residential urban extension to south for 508 dwellings - currently under construction
	<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	<b>There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?</b>
<b>There is not significant net loss of protected open space?</b>		TBC
<b>There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?</b>		Conservation Officers comments: no conservation-related objection
<b>There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).</b>		no
<b>There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</b>		no
<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>		Some concerns were raised during the application process. Landscape Officer comment: application W/13/01294. Please see various comments/concerns on that application. However, my comments concluded: .....On balance, therefore, from a landscape perspective I feel that I could now support development on the southern part of the site but remain concerned regarding development within the triangular area to the northern part – although I do accept that adequate boundary treatments in terms of new and supplementary planting could help to reduce the visual impact in time, as planting matures, by filtering views of any dwellings. WWT comments: We understand that this site already has planning permission. However it appears to be an orchard and therefore some further work will be required to scope out whether it has any elements of traditional (and therefore BAP quality) habitat if any extensions are proposed. The underlying grassland may also be of value.
<b>There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.</b>		yes - the site falls within a TPO's protected area
<b>There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.</b>		no
<b>There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.</b>		no
<b>There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.</b>		no
<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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).</b>		none shown on latest mapping
<b>Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.</b>		

	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	TBC from Worcestershire Regulatory Services
	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
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	site area 2.84 ha giving 70 dwellings (outline approval)
	The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	no
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes site has permission
	Summary	Site was granted outline pp for 70 dwellings - W/13/01294/OU - (awaiting 106)

	SHLAA site reference	71-35 - land adj Ford House, west of Station Rd - now known as extension to SWDP47/1
MAJOR CRITERIA	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	Town
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Yes
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Flood Zone 1
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	TBC
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Not on its own - would need to gain access from Station Road through 71-37 (to east) or 71-36 ( to south)
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	TBC
	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.	Currently mainly agriculture but two houses on south western tip - Ford House and the Willows.
	OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
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 - trees in hedges
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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).		TBC
Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.		Grade 3

	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Unlikely
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Bus stop 200m
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Employment opposite site, 250m High School, shop 400m, train station 300m
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	No - Town Plan.
	The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	The site slopes up with a ridge just under half way up the field. The northern part of the site is very prominent when viewed from Walcot Lane. The southern part of the site is contained by the ridge and the hedges around the field. Access to site would have to be through adjacent field 71-37 or from south 71-16 via 71-28.
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes - site has planning permission
	Summary	The site slopes up with a ridge just under half way up the field. The northern part of the site is very prominent when viewed from Walcot Lane. The southern part of the site is contained by the ridge and the hedges around the field. Access to site would have to be through adjacent field 71-37 or from south 71-16 via 71-28. The site was excluded from the submission document following concerns from local community and local councillors and that it was not needed to accommodate the 600 homes as originally proposed for the Pershore urban extension. However, the development of the site is in accordance with the SWDP development strategy and the site has been re-introduced as an allocation because planning permission has now been granted for 190 dwellings (w/14/00219) on this parcel of land and on the adjoining land to the west for 50 dwellings (w/14/00951). Area to be extended to correspond with the planning consents.

	SHLAA site reference	71-32 - Land at Tempwood, Defford Road, Pershore- partly in flood plain - Planning permission granted subject to S106; now known as WY057
MAJOR CRITERIA	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	Town
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Yes
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Southern edge of site within flood zone 3a - approx 20% of site.
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Yes
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Highways considered and agreed as part of planning application.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	TBC
	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
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Hedgerow connectivity, developing scrub woodland, potential relic orchard
	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 - chapel in cemetery is listed
	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

OTHER CRITERIA	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	TBC
	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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).	Flooding
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	No - Grade 3
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Low risk - phase 1 with application
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.	Yes - on site boundary
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	School 1020m, shop 540m, drs surgery 980m, emp opportunities 780m, community hall 1060m.
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	No - 29 units 0.9%
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	No Town Plan. SAP responses - 2 for - affects few people.
	The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	No.
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes site has planning permission
	Summary	Planning application has been submitted on the land for 21 homes (w/13/01258/PN) and approved awaiting the signing of a S106 Agreement, therefore now allocated for housing to reflect the planning permission. Site location is in accordance with development strategy as is located adjacent to town and all other criteria satisfied.

MAJOR CRITERIA	SHLAA site reference	SWDP 59/17: Land to East of Kingsdale Court, Broadway
	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	1
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Available in 5 years.
	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?	Yes
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Kingsdale Road is a private road owned by a Housing Association serving a number of retirement homes, over which runs a public right of way. The road width, footway provision and construction gives the appearance that it is an adopted highway and subject to meeting requirements set out under Section 37 Highways Act 1980, we would not resist its adoption if it were to be offered. The developemnt of additional units off this road would in principle be acceptable especially if they were developed by the Housing Association. If a private development were promoted then we consider the adoption of the road and provision of a turnhead as being the minimum requirements necessary to developp this site.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	No in principle objections from Severn Trent
	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 2 faces of triangle
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	GI comment - Landscape sensitivity high - Forms part of interesting wider mature tree and grassland matrix (orchard remnants?) - need survey; footpath along north western boundary. Landscape comment: No visual objection subject to additional planting to eastern boundary – but site is a traditional apple orchard with ridge and furrow. Referred to Natural Heritage Officer and Heritage Manager for comment.

OTHER CRITERIA	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	No
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No: Conservation Officers comments: no conservation-related objection
	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 falls within AGLV and AONB. Landscape Officers comment: No visual objection subject to additional planting to eastern boundary – but site is a traditional apple orchard with ridge and furrow. Referred to Natural Heritage Officer and Heritage Manager for comment.
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	TBC
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	No
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	No comments made by GI group
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	GI group comment: Forms part of interesting wider mature tree and grassland matrix (orchard remnants?) - need survey; footpath along north western 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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).	Not an issue according to the SFRA
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	not graded in the ALC
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Yes - low - Phase I with application
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	419m to bus stop
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	975m from shop / 723m from GP / 1148m from village hall / 485m from church / 569m from employment / 518m from school
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	No - site area = 0.54 giving approx 16 units @ 30dph (however less units are deemed more acceptable)
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	Broadway have an existing parish plan in place
	The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	No
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes
	Summary	2014 update - site now has pp for 13 units - W/13/01493 (awaiting s106). Minerals present = no
MAJOR CRITERIA	SHLAA site reference	SWDP 59/25: 67-02 (boundary change to The Racks site), Ombersley.
	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	Category 1
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Yes. Although site not deliverable without access via 'The Racks' site adjacent. Although the latter was allocated in the 1998 Local Plan, and had a planning permission for 20 houses (W/10/00732). This was not implemented and has now lapsed.
	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?	Yes
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	No objection
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	To be confirmed. But earlier planning permission granted with no objection from Severn Trent.
	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 but surrounded by open land.
	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No

<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	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.	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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).	Unknown.
	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)	Unknown. Unlikely given greenfield.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes. Bus stop within 250m.
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Yes. Village centre 650m.
		Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?
Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.		Adopted Parish Plan identifies issues relating to HGVs, pedestrian safety, street lighting.
The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.		This site can not have been delivered with 'The Racks' permission, as identified in the Local Plan, for development moving forward. As a stand alone development, even if access across The Racks could be secured would be isolated small development within open landscape setting adjacent to A449. However, now permission has lapsed there is now an opportunity to rationalise the site as a single application and the landowner is supportive of this approach.
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes site extended.
	Summary	Site put forwards as a proposed allocation in submitted SWDP for 14 dwellings. Forms second half of a potential single overall allocation. Front of site is allocated in Local Plan and had permission that has now lapsed. Propose to incorporate into a single site as a major mod for 34 dwellings September 2014. Trust will be submitting a single application for the whole site in due course.

	SHLAA site reference	66-14 Land between Leasowes Rd and Laurels Road, Offenham WY008
<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	1
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Yes. Has developer interest. David Wilson Homes.
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	N
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Y
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Y
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	No principle objection rased by Severn Trent.
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	Y

	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	N
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Immediately adjacent to residential uses.
OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	N
	There is not significant net loss of protected open space?	N
	There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?	N
	There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	N
	There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	N
	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.	N
	There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.	N
	There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.	N
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.	N
	There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.	N
	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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).	Unknown. Would need to be assessed. Possible surface water run-off from farmland. SUDS scheme could mitigate.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Possibly Grade 1
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Unknown. Farmland so unlikely to be contaminated.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Y
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Y
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	Less than 10%
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	No parish plan.
The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	Could be considered as a stand alone site for approx 30 dwellings. Fits with settlement pattern and existing built form better than SHLAA 66-10/08 as a stand alone site. Although could be considered as part of a larger site between Laurels Rd/Leasowes Rd.	
Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes site has planning permission	
Summary	Reasonably well located to village centre and services/bus stop. Contained by existing road although removed from the established edge of village. Application submitted by David Wilson Homes April 2013 for 50 dwellings (incorporating 66-10). Refused August 2013 but permission granted on appeal February 2014.	

	SHLAA site reference	Spencer Commercial Services, Evesham Road, Offenham WY009
MAJOR CRITERIA	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	1
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Y
	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?	Yes
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Yes
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	Yes
	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?	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.	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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).	No
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	No. Brownfield.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Unknown. Brownfield site vehicle service/storage yard. Contamination unlikely to be significant.
	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
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	Yes
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	Unknown. No parish plan.
The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	No	
Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes	
Summary	Spencer Commercial Services Ltd. Subject to current planning application for 9 dwellings (July 2014), DM minded to approve under delegated powers subject to agreement re. s106 with applicant.	
	<b>SHLAA site reference</b>	WY003 Land opp Horsebridge Avenue, Badsey (subject to planning application for 36 dwellings [14/00329] - subject to s106). SHLAA ref:06-10
	<b>Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary</b>	1
	<b>Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).</b>	Landowners supportive and available now.
	<b>Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.</b>	South West of site in Floodzone 3. Land to the east of that is in Flood Zone 2. Remainder of site outside flood plain. <b>SRFA 2014:</b> FZ3b: 11.8% FZ3a: 3.7% FZ2: 23.3% FZ1: 61.2%
	<b>Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?</b>	Yes more than 450m away

<b>MAJOR CRITERIA</b>	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	No - Difficult to access the site due to road gradients and vehicle speeds along Badsey Road. Access from Synhurst Avenue and Manor Close would involve third party land and would severely impact upon the existing highway network. No individual accesses will be permitted off Badsey Road. <b>July 2014 update: Access agreed with the Highway Authority</b>
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	<b>Severn Trent Sewerage treatment comment 2014:</b> Comparison of current measured dry weather flow against the consented dry weather flow and current quality performance assessments indicate there is no spare capacity at this treatment works. Additional capacity will be required in order to accommodate future development. We do not envisage any issues as there are no land or other physical constraints preventing expansion. Provided surface water is dealt with sustainably and foul only flows are connected into the system, the flows from 116 properties are not expected to cause any adverse impact on the downstream network. Low - subject to hydraulic modelling.
	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 adj residential.
<b>OTHER CRITERIA</b>	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	YES would have an impact - Badsey Brook corridor (well wooded along western boundary) requires significant buffering; eastern hedgerow could provide connectivity for bats roosting in settlement; potential hydrology
	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 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.	YES an impact on SWS -100M. Badsey Brook corridor (well wooded along western boundary) requires significant buffering; eastern hedgerow could provide connectivity for bats roosting in settlement; potential hydrology
	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.	YES there is an impact - Eastern hedgerow could provide connectivity for bats roosting in settlement; potential hydrology
	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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).	SWFR - 'Intermediate Risk', 'More Risk' and 'Highways Flooding Area' bordering the south west of site. <b>WCC Surface water comments 2014.</b> Flood map surface water: All return periods follow the watercourse along the boundary and intrude on the site along the left hand and bottom edge about a ¼ of the site. 2/3 of site only developable. Needs considerable buffer to watercourses or main river. <b>SFRA 2014:</b> Sources of Flood Risk: <input type="checkbox"/> Primary flood risk to the site is fluvial, resulting from overtopping of the Badsey Brook. <input type="checkbox"/> Further development and creation of impermeable surfaces may result in an increase of surface water flood risk. See SFRA JBA report for detailed comments. The housing development has been restricted to to Flood Zone 1.
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.
	Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)	Phase I contamination survey would be expected to be included within supporting information for any application proposed.
	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	Yes - 280m
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	<b>(2 out of 5)</b> School - N (1km), VH - Y (150m), Employment (Blackminster Bus. Park)- N (2.3km), Doctors - Not present in Village, Shop - Y (550m)
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	No would not increase housing stock. 1.8 ha @30dph =54 (NB planning application is for 36 dwellings) <b>NB/ 1.8ha - 40% = 1.08ha @ 30dph = 32 dwellings</b>

	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	No Parish Plan. <b>SAP response (1)</b> - Good access via foot/cycle to local facilities. • Deliverable and achievable. • Well located in terms of existing residential development.
	The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	Yes would affect the character of the village as the site abuts the B4035 approach to the settlement
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	In
	Summary	<b>July 2014:</b> Site approved approved (14/00329) for 36 dwellings. <b>Historic Environment comment 2014:</b> Site has been archaeologically evaluation, with no significant remains recorded. Some further works as a condition of approval may be required

	SHLAA site reference	SWDP 60/27: Allocated for 6 dwellings however application was submitted Aug 2013 and approved for 30 dwellings on this site (13/02410/OU). SHLAA 78-04 Land at Shine Hill, adj Lanterns, South Littleton.
MAJOR CRITERIA	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	2
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Yes- agent representing landowner has submitted representations to the SWDP, indicating that the land is now available.
	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.	Subject to suitable access arrangements being agreed, access to this site will be acceptable.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	TBC by ST
	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 - adjacent residential
	OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
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.		TBC by GI Team
There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.		No
There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.		TBC by GI Team
There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.		TBC by GI Team
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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).		Small area of surface water flooding (strip) on west of site.
Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.		Predictive land quality map- grade 5.
Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)		TBC with Worcestershire Regulatory Services
Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.		120m

	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Y - Shop - 672m, Employment - 1.3km, Doctors - Scout Hut, 950m.
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	0.68 x 30dph= 20. Site now has planning permission for 30 dwellings.
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	No Parish Plan. <b>SAP responses:</b> Allotments and open space provision should be incorporated into any development. Flat and accessible site.
	The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	No
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes site has planning permission.
	Summary	<b>Update 2013:</b> Application was submitted and approved for 30 dwellings on this site (13/02410/OU) in August 2013. <b>July 2014:</b> Development has commenced on site.

	SHLAA site reference	25-01 - Land between Pentolow and Berrycroft, Blacksmiths Lane, Cropthorne (WY058)
MAJOR CRITERIA	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	2
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Land owner supportive promoted at Preferred Options
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	Outside flood plain
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Yes is more than 450m away
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Access from Blacksmith Lane subject to meeting current design standards would be acceptable. I would however like to see if possible rear access being provided to the existing residential properties fronting Blacksmith Lane so as to be able to remove the existing on street car parking which would hinder visibility from any new access.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	No in principle objection from Severn Trent
	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.	Y Residential and open countryside
	OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
There is not significant net loss of protected open space?		No
There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?		Conservation Area stops at entrance to 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.		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.		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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).		Not identified as an issue on SW on wychmaps.
Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.		Up to date survey not available on post 1988 map.
Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)		No known issues

	Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no stats distance.	300m to bus stop
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	School is 400 metres away and the bus stop is 300 metres.
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	Under 10%
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	Parish Plan - Support for a shop/cafe in the village. Recognise need for housing / affordable housing but as long as appropriate to local need and in keeping with character of Crophorne.
	The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	Site could be developed without affecting character, although back land development and would need to potentially knock down property for access.
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes site has planning permisison
	Summary	Outline application approved at 10 October Committee for 8 dwellings 13/01686/OU.

	SHLAA site reference	31-08: Stonebow Road, Drakes Broughton (WY059)
MAJOR CRITERIA	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	2
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	Yes
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State Flood zone.	1
	Site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No pipeline
	The site can accommodate safe access onto the public highway.	Yes
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	No in principle objections from Severn Trent
	Site would not compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance.	N
	Is the site in Green Belt Yes/ No?	N
	The adjacent/surrounding land uses are compatible with residential amenity. Yes/no, please state type.	Yes to the west, although adjacent to railway line to east
	OTHER CRITERIA	There is no adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?
There is not significant net loss of protected open space?		N
There is no detrimental impact on a conservation area?		N
There is no detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).		N
There is no detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument.		N
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.		N
There is no detrimental impact on TPOs.		N
There is no detrimental impact on a Strategic Gap.		N
There is no detrimental impact on ancient woodland.		N
There is no detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow.		N
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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).		Some surface water flooding but there is sufficient land beyond this to deliver the proposed number of dwellings
Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.		tbc
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.	Y
	Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?	Y
	Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?	Less than 10%
	Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.	No Parish or Neighbourhood Plan
	The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.	No
	Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?	Yes site has permission
	Summary	The site has been granted planning permission on appeal for 39 dwellings, and given that Drakes Broughton is a category 2 village it has been allocated accordingly.

	SHLAA site reference	SWDP 61/2: 11- 08 - land north of Copperfields, Babylon Lane, Bishampton - access - 4.01ha, includes 11-04. But part of site could be accessed from Main Street to serve a small development (known as Land west of Main Street in SWDP).
MAJOR CRITERIA	Category 1, 2 or 3 Village or within town boundary	3
	Landowner(s) have clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, ( e.g through SHLAA).	yes
	Check Site not within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. State 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.	The highway authority have approved the access arrangements as per the planning consent granted, w/14/00457 refers.
	Sewerage and Water supply adequate?	tbc
	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 on part of 3 sides
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
	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.	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 (confirm with Land Drainage Engineer).	No known flooding issues. But SFRA indicates the western half of the site is recorded as having an intermediate risk of surface water flooding
	Would not result in loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land.	no

	<b>Not contaminated land nor likely to be detrimentally affected by contaminated land. (Confirm with Contaminated Land Officer)</b>	no
	<b>Access to public transport (bus stop) is within 400m of the site? Yes/No If no state distance.</b>	Yes - bus stop within 100m.
	<b>Has reasonable access to local services, usually within 800m from proposed site?</b>	Yes - shop and pub within 200m. Village hall within 500m.
	<b>Would not increase total housing stock as at April 2010 by more than 10%?</b>	whole site - approx 120 dwellings. Small site suggested 6 units.
	<b>Would Assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Parish Plan.</b>	Parish plan dated 2006
	<b>The development of the site, including the creation of an access, should not materially affect the character of the settlement.</b>	No - the development would be to the rear of housing on existing road frontage
	<b>Included as a proposed additional allocation in the SWDP?</b>	Yes
	<b>Summary</b>	The large site is ruled out for access in the SHLAA but there is a potential to utilise a smaller area of land to the rear of properties fronting onto Main St. The land slopes down from the road and is lower lying than the houses. Planning permission refused for 13 dwellings (w/13/00870) but approved for 12 dwellings - therefore extend originally suggested site in Proposed Submission Document and increase numbers to correspond to this application (w/14/00457/OU).