

Chrch Lench				
SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0403 Land at Mayfield	CFS0447 Land accessed off Low Road	CFS0716 Land off Low Road
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Yes - Within / Adjacent to Development Boundary - cat 2	Yes - Adjacent to Development Boundary - cat 2	Yes - Adjacent to Development Boundary cat 2
	Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g through SHELAA)?	Yes - Available within 5 years	Yes - Available now	Yes - Available now
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	100 % Flood Zone 1. No historical flooding recorded.	100 % Flood Zone 1. No historical flooding recorded.	100 % Flood Zone 1. No historical flooding recorded.
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	NO	NO	NO
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Highways comment not provided	Highways comment not provided	No comment
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	LOW - Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network. Estimated spare hydraulic capacity of 20 dwellings. Significant headroom available in terms of quality performance. Improvement planned 2020-2025 to meet new Phosphorous permit.	LOW - Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network. Possible additional risks if a surface water is unable to be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. Lack of surface water network and distance to watercourse indicates this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foul network. Estimated spare hydraulic capacity of 20 dwellings. Significant headroom available in terms of quality performance. Improvement planned 2020-2025 to meet new Phosphorous permit.	LOW - Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network. Possible additional risks if a surface water is unable to be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. Lack of surface water network and distance to watercourse indicates this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foul network. Estimated spare hydraulic capacity of 20 dwellings. Significant headroom available in terms of quality performance. Improvement planned 2020-2025 to meet new Phosphorous permit.
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	No	No	No
	Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No	No
	Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	NO	NO	NO
	Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	A Neighbourhood Plan has not been adopted. However, the South Lenches Designated Neighbourhood Area was approved 10/09/2015.	A Neighbourhood Plan has not been adopted. However, the South Lenches Designated Neighbourhood Area was approved 10/09/2015.	A Neighbourhood Plan has not been adopted. However, the South Lenches Designated Neighbourhood Area was approved 10/09/2015.
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	YES - residential	YES - residential	YES - residential	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	TBC	TBC	TBC
	Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	NO	NO	NO
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or on archaeology?	Site not in Conservation Area - no detrimental impact. Archaeology comments: Medieval potential - Evaluation, possible mitigation	Site adjacent to Conservation Area - detrimental impact on the CA and access runs through it. Archaeology comments: Medieval potential - Evaluation, possible mitigation; Impact on the CA. Potential impact on The Steps, but the impact on the latter would require a site visit to definitively comment.	Site adjacent to Conservation Area and access runs through it but no detrimental impact. Archaeology comments: Medieval potential - Evaluation, possible mitigation
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No detrimental impact on Listed Buildings.	Potential impact on The Steps, but the impact on the latter would require a site visit to definitively comment.	No detrimental impact on Listed Buildings.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	NO	NO	NO
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site?	No comments.	No comments.	No comments.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	NO	NO	NO
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	NO	NO	NO
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	NO	NO	NO
	Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	8% 30 yr, 10% 100 yr and 15% 1000 yr surface water flooding. No details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	No details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event.	1% 30 yr, 2% 100 yr and 9% 1000 yr surface water flooding. potential surface water flow across the southern boundary but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event
	Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	NO	NO	NO
	Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	Air Quality - Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. Contamination - PCL on site - Woodworking workshop. Risk Assessment and likely Site Investigation required.	Air Quality - Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. Contamination - No History of PCL activities	Air Quality - Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. Contamination - No History of PCL activities
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Yes, closest bus stop is 322 metres (0.2 miles) away from site. No - the closest train station (Evesham) is 8208 metres (5.1 miles) from site.	Yes, closest bus stop is 93 metres (0.06 miles) away from site. No - the closest train station (Evesham) is 8047 metres (5.0 miles) from site.	yes, closest bus stop is 118 metres (0.07 miles) away from site. No - the closest train station (Evesham) is (5.0 miles) from site.
	How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service.	Primary school (Church Lench C of E First School) is 483 metres (0.3 miles). General Store (Londs, Flyford Flavell) is 8047 metres (5.0 miles). Post Office (Bishampton Stores and Post Office) is 5150 metres (3.2 miles). Doctors Surgery (Grey Gable Surgery) is 8047 metres (5.0 miles). Village Hall (Church Lench Village Hall) is 644 metres (0.4 miles).	Primary School (Church Lench C of E First School) is 322 metres (0.2 miles). General Store (Londs, Flyford Flavell) is 8047 metres (5.0 miles). Post Office (Bishampton Stores and Post Office) is 4828 metres (3.0 miles). Doctors Surgery (Grey Gable Surgery) is 7725 metres (4.8 miles). Village Hall (Church Lench Village Hall) is 322 metres (0.2 miles).	Primary School (Church Lench C of E First School) is 322 metres (0.2 miles). General Store (Londs, Flyford Flavell) is 8047 metres (5.0 miles). Post Office (Bishampton Stores and Post Office) is 4828 metres (3.0 miles). Doctors Surgery (Grey Gable Surgery) is 7564 metres (4.7 miles). Village Hall (Church Lench Village Hall) is 322 metres (0.2 miles).
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	POSSIBLE	POSSIBLE	POSSIBLE	
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	NO	NO	NO	
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	Landscape Comments: for previous (refused) application I advised The LCA identifies Key Characteristics for this LT as including a 'dispersed settlement pattern of farmsteads and hamlets'. It advises 'The settlement pattern is a variable one of dispersed farms and hamlets with occasional villages or wayside cottages'. Landscape Guidelines for the LT include 'Maintain the characteristic dispersed settlement pattern, avoiding the formation of pronounced settlement nuclei'. The village of Church Lench has a predominately linear settlement pattern with dwellings flanking the main routes through the village. The proposed development would not respect this linear pattern; rather, it would effectively widen the built form to the eastern part of the village such that, instead of wayside dwellings, the settlement nuclei would be much more pronounced'. Again would be contrary to SWDP25. WWT comments: Yes, this site falls adjacent to a LWS. Appropriate buffering for the LWS will be required and may lead to a reduction in developable area. Conservation comments: LWS	Landscape Comments: previous application dismissed at appeal. At time of planning application 17/01122/FUL, I advised Development as proposed under 17/01122 would dilute this linear pattern - creating more of a 'block' of development to the north of Main Street and west of Low Road. When read in conjunction with existing development to the south of Main Street, along Malt House Lane and east of Low Road, the proposed development would effectively create or nucleation of settlement. A more pronounced settlement nuclei would be created. This would be at odds with the Landscape Character Assessment and its Guidelines - and so would be contrary to SWDP25 . Conservation comments: CA, LB	Conservation comments: Habitat	
OUTCOME	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	In	Out - Historic Environment	In
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No	Yes
	Summary	Not a suitable site for development. Impact on Landscape and LWS. Out of character with village.	Rule out - Impact on Conservation Area / Listed Building. Could be an access issue in addition. Submitted for both housing and employment.	Take forward as a potential allocation for 19 units. Access will need to be assessed.