

Honeybourne								
SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0116 All Things Wild, Station Road	CFS0372 Land adjacent to Harvard Avenue	CFS0470 Land at Perrie Drive	CFS0715 Land to south west of St Egwins Church	CFS0793 Buckle Street	CFS0795 Land off Weston Road	CFS0858 Corner Farm, Breferton Road
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1
	Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	Yes - 3a; 3b	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Yes	Highways comment not provided	Yes	Highways comment not provided	Highways comment not provided	Highways comment not provided	Highways comment not provided
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	No. Recent flood events recorded. Modelling would be required to assess any impact from proposed allocation and scope of any capacity improvements.	No. Recent flood events recorded. Modelling would be required to assess any impact from proposed allocation and scope of any capacity improvements.	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	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	Yes	There are 4 reported flooding incidences and 2 pollution incidences on the system upstream of Gate Inn SPS. The developments will increase foul flows to Gate Inn SPS by approximately 50% and will increase flood risk in the area. Modelling will be required to assess the scope of any capacity improvements. 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.	There are 4 reported flooding incidences and 2 pollution incidences on the system upstream of Gate Inn SPS. The developments will increase foul flows to Gate Inn SPS by approximately 50% and will increase flood risk in the area. Modelling will be required to assess the scope of any capacity improvements. 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.
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	No	Yes. Site proposed residential allocation (Policy H1) in Draft Honeybourne NP February 2019.	No	No	No	No	No
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Yes - housing	Yes- housing /open countryside. Adjacent to the railway line.	Yes- residential	No - open countryside	No - open countryside	Yes - adjacent to allocated site that has been built out.	Yes - residential/edge of village location	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	No	No	Yes - loss of open space/GI in residential development.	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No	No	No	Yes. Considerable impact on the setting of the church, intervening between the church and vicarage, Vicarage, Church and Manor Farm form important historic complex.	No	No	Yes
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument or archaeology?	No. Romano/British occupation. DBA survey, targeted evaluation and mitigation.	No. Romano/British occupation. DBA survey, targeted evaluation and mitigation.	No. Romano/British occupation. Mitigation.	No. Romano/British occupation. Mitigation.	No	No. Romano/British occupation. DBA survey, targeted evaluation and mitigation.	No. Romano/British occupation. DBA survey, targeted evaluation and mitigation.
	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	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	No	No	No	No	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?	Yes	No	No	Yes. Part of site has been subject to 1 in 200 year rainfall event < 0.3m flood depth. Unknown.	No	No	No
	Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3	No - not greenfield	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3
	Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	No - 552 bus stop - 300m; station 500m	No - 553 bus stop - 500m; station 2km	Yes - 552 bus stop 350m; No station 800m	Yes-553 bus stop - 400m; No station 1km	Yes - 552 bus stop - 230m; station 400m	Yes - 552 bus stop 350m; No station 1km	Yes - 553 bus stop 270m; No station 2km
	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.	Honeybourne Primary Academy 800m; Co-op 200m; Premier Store 800m; St Egwins Church 850m; public house 500m; village hall 1km.	Honeybourne Primary Academy 1km; Co-op 1km; Premier Store 330; St Egwins Church 500m; public house 700m; village hall 1km.	Honeybourne Primary Academy 1km; Co-op 490m; Premier Store 370m; St Egwins Church 600m; public house 780m; village hall 1km.	Honeybourne Primary Academy 1km; Co-op 1km; Premier Store 230m; St Egwins Church 50m; public house 450m; village hall 1km.	Honeybourne Primary Academy 1km; Co-op 460m; Premier Store 1km; St Egwins Church 1km; public house 950m; village hall 2km.	Honeybourne Primary Academy 500m; Co-op 1km; Premier Store 1km; St Egwins Church 1km; public house 350m; village hall 650m.	Honeybourne Primary Academy 650m; Co-op 1km; Premier Store 1km; St Egwins Church 1km; public house 700m; village hall 350m.
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	Yes	Yes	Yes. Loss of green space in area which is under provided for could lead to negative health impacts.	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	The submitted Honeybourne NP August 2019 published for consultation. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, e.g. safer pedestrian/cycling routes; flood mitigation; green infrastructure enhancement.	The submitted Honeybourne NP August 2019 published for consultation. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, e.g. safer pedestrian/cycling routes; flood mitigation; green infrastructure enhancement. This site is allocated for a proposed 50 dwellings under Policy H1.	The submitted Honeybourne NP August 2019 published for consultation. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, e.g. safer pedestrian/cycling routes; flood mitigation; green infrastructure enhancement.	The submitted Honeybourne NP August 2019 published for consultation. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, e.g. safer pedestrian/cycling routes; flood mitigation; green infrastructure enhancement.	The submitted Honeybourne NP August 2019 published for consultation. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, e.g. safer pedestrian/cycling routes; flood mitigation; green infrastructure enhancement.	The submitted Honeybourne NP August 2019 published for consultation. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, e.g. safer pedestrian/cycling routes; flood mitigation; green infrastructure enhancement.	The submitted Honeybourne NP August 2019 published for consultation. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, e.g. safer pedestrian/cycling routes; flood mitigation; green infrastructure enhancement.	
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	The allocation of the whole of the site would be out of keeping with the existing settlement pattern as it would lead to a large freestanding residential development that would not fit easily within the built form of the village. A small area of the site may be suitable and could extend the active frontage along Station Road from the so-called 'sheep field' development.	The site is well contained by the existing 1960s housing estate and the railway line.	The site could be developed for residential and effectively infill and area of planned open space which is part of the original 1960s development. Any allocation would see the loss of greenspace though and an intensification of density in what is a period low density housing scheme.	The development of this site would not sit comfortably within the urban form of the settlement as it is a disconnected location in the open countryside.	The development of this site would not sit comfortably within the urban form of the settlement as it is a disconnected location in the open countryside. The railway line provides a physical barrier to making the site relate successfully with the existing settlement.	The site could be suitable for an allocation as it is adjacent to the current SWDP allocation that has been built out. The site is contained within Weston Road and the built edge of the settlement although it does extend edge of settlement into the open countryside. Provision of GI could soften the edge in this regard though.	The site could be suitable for a residential allocation as it represents a natural extension to the village. However extension along the Breferton Road could lead to 'ribbon' development into the open countryside. Any allocation would need to respect the village form and footprint in this location.	
OUTCOME	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	No	No	No	Yes. Negative impact on historic assets.	Yes. Removed from the existing settlement.	No	No
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Summary	There are no significant reasons why the site could not be allocated in terms of site constraints. However the site as submitted is too large to be allocated as it stands. Potentially a smaller cut of the site could be put forward as a frontage site to Station Road.	There are no significant reasons why the site could not be allocated in terms of site constraints. However the site is a proposed allocation in the Draft Honeybourne Neighbourhood Plan.	Loss of open space in an established residential development. Access to alternatives limited if lost. The site is within the development boundary and could accommodate some new residential development though but consideration would need to a density appropriate to the established housing surrounding. Probably more appropriate as a windfall site than an allocation. Subject to current planning permission for 6 dwellings (18/01447/FUL) allowed on appeal.	The development of this site would not sit comfortably within the urban form of the settlement as it is a disconnected location in the open countryside. Any development on this site would have a detrimental impact on surrounding historic assets.	The site is isolated and separated from the village by the railway line. It is not suitable to allocate given its unsustainable location.	The site is well located to the centre of the village and any development would relate to the existing village form and the current SWDP allocation that has been built out. Concerns have been raised in terms of the detrimental impact on the conservation area which would require further consideration if the site was to be proposed for an allocation.	The site is well located to the centre of the village and any development would relate to the existing village form. Concerns have been raised in terms of the detrimental impact on the conservation area and listed buildings which would require further consideration if the site was to be proposed for an allocation.