

Flyford Flavell								
SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0448 Land off Radford Road	CFS0584 Meadowcroft, Bishampton Road	CFS0620 Land to the South of The Flyford Arms, west of Flyford Flavell	CFS0770 Land near the Boot Inn	CFS0847 Land off Radford Road, Flyford Flavell	CFS0850 Land at Alcester Road, Kington	CFS0862 Cratthorne, Bishampton Road
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?		yes - Adjacent (and partially within) Development Boundary - Cat 3	yes - Adjacent Development Boundary - Cat 3	No		yes - Cat 3	
	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 now	Yes - Available now	Yes - Available within 5 years			
	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.		100% Flood Zone 1	
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?		YES	YES	YES		YES	
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?		Access possible but not a sustainable location	Highways comment not provided	Highways comment not provided		Highways comment not provided	
	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. 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.	LOW - Site will drain to Flyford Arms SPS, hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine combined impact of this and CFS0850 developments.	LOW - Site is likely to require pumping a combined strategy with CFS084 would be desirable. 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.		LOW - Site will drain to Flyford Arms SPS, hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine combined impact of this and CFS0620 developments.	
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?		Any residential development of 100 units or more, or 50 outside existing settlements	Any residential development of 100 units or more, or 50 outside existing settlements	Any residential development of 100 units or more, or 50 outside existing settlements		Any residential development of 100 units or more, or 50 outside existing settlements	
	Is the site in Green Belt?		No	No	No		No	
	Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?		No	No	No		No	
	Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?		No	NO	NO		NO	
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.		Yes - residential	YES - residential	YES - residential		YES - residential		
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?		TBC	TBC	TBC		TBC	
	Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?		No	NO	NO		NO	
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or on archaeology?		Site not within Conservation Area. Archaeology: Medieval potential - DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation; Possible prehistoric settlement, medieval agricultural activity	Site not within Conservation Area. Archaeology: Medieval potential - DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation; Possible prehistoric settlement, medieval agricultural activity	Site not within Conservation Area. Evaluation, possible mitigation; Medieval potential		Site not within Conservation Area. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation; Medieval potential	
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).		No detrimental impact on listed buildings	No detrimental impact on listed buildings	NO		NO	
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?		NO	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	NO	NO		NO	
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.		No	Significant and TPO trees may partially compromise development of this site.	NO		NO	
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?		NO	NO	NO		NO	
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?		NO	NO	NO		NO	
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?		NO	NO	NO		NO	
	Has the site has been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?		1% 100 yr and 22% 1000 yr surface water flooding, potential surface water flows in middle part of the site but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	No surface water flooding (less than 1% 1000 yr), no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event.	<1% 100 yr and 7% 1000 yr surface water flooding, potential surface water flows around the perimeter of the site but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event.		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		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 - No History of PCL activities	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		No History of PCL activities on site. PCL site adjacent - Fuel Filling Station. Risk assessment required	
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.		yes, the closest bus stop is 121 metres (0.08 miles) away from site. No - The closest train station (Pershore) is 9495 metres (5.9 miles).	yes, closest bus stop is 66 metres (0.04 miles) away from site. No - The closest train station (Pershore) is 10,299 metres (6.4 miles).	yes, closest bus stop is (0.1 mile) away from site. No - the closest train station (Pershore) is (6.1 miles).		yes, closest bus stop is 115 metres (0.07 miles) away from site. No - the closest train station (Pershore) is 10622 metres (6.6 miles).	
	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 (Flyford Flavell first school) is 322 metres (0.2 miles). General store (Londis) is 1770 metres (1.1 miles). Post office (Inkberrow Post Office) is 5472 metres (3.4 miles). Doctors surgery (Grey Gable Surgery) is 5633 metres (3.5 miles). Village hall (Rous Lench Village Hall) is 4828 metres (3.0 miles)	Primary school (Flyford Flavell first school) is 483 metres (0.3 miles). General store (Londis) is 322 metres (0.2 miles). Post office (Inkberrow Post Office) is 5472 metres (3.4 miles). Doctors surgery (Grey Gable Surgery) is 5472 metres (3.4 miles). Village Hall (Rous Lench Village Hall) is 5150 metres (3.2 miles).	Primary school (Flyford Flavell first school) is 322 metres (0.2 miles). General store (Londis) is 966 metres (0.6 miles). Post office (Inkberrow Post Office) is 5311 metres (3.3 miles). Doctor surgery (Grey Gable Surgery) is 5311 metres (3.3 miles). Village Hall (Rous Lench Village Hall) is 4506 metres (2.8 miles).		Primary school (Flyford Flavell first school) is 644 metres (0.4 miles). General store (Londis) is 62 metres (0.04 miles). Post office (Inkberrow Post Office) is 5311 metres (3.3 miles). Doctors Surgery (Grey Gable Surgery) is 5150 metres (3.2 miles). Village Hall (Rous Lench Village Hall) is 5311 metres (3.3 miles).	
	Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?		NO	POSSIBLE	POSSIBLE		POSSIBLE	
	Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.		No	No	No		No	
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?		Conservation comments: SSSI	Landscape Comments: whilst development on these sites would maintain a nucleation of settlement, typical of the identified Landscape Type, CFS0620 would be especially visible on sloping land from the A422 ad the Radford Road when entering the village from the west. This would be considered visually unacceptable. CFS0850 is more contained in the wider landscape and there may be scope for some development on this site but, I suggest, not the whole site which would not maintain 'the distinctive settlement pattern of small villages' as required by the Guidelines for the LT. Conservation comments: SSSI, TPO	Landscape Comments: Flyford Flavell is within the Village Claylands Landscape Type where settlement pattern is identified as having a 'nucleated settlement pattern of usually small, rural villages.' Landscape Guidelines for the LT include 'seek to retain the integrity of the distinctive settlement pattern of small villages.' Development on this site would extend the village away from the nucleated heart and so would not respect the identified settlement pattern or Guidelines for the LT. Furthermore, development would be highly visible on the approach into the village from the east.		Landscape Comments: whilst development on these sites would maintain a nucleation of settlement, typical of the identified Landscape Type, CFS0620 would be especially visible on sloping land from the A422 ad the Radford Road when entering the village from the west. This would be considered visually unacceptable. CFS0850 is more contained in the wider landscape and there may be scope for some development on this site but, I suggest, not the whole site which would not maintain 'the distinctive settlement pattern of small villages' as required by the Guidelines for the LT. Conservation comments: SSSI		
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Location	In	Rule out - Historic Environment	Rule out - Historic Environment	Out - Location	Out - Scale / Historic Environment	Out - Size and Isolated	
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	
Summary	Rule out - Location	Site area 0.51 ha - Possible 12 units	TPO's. Previous application refused on south of site due to TPO's and historic environment / character. Rule out - Historic Environment	Rule out - Historic Environment	Rule out - Location	Rule out - Scale / Historic Environment. Could possibly support a smaller site.	Rule out - Size and Isolated	