

| Kempsey | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address: | CFS0073 Draycott Villa Nurseries, 23 Main Road | CFS0124 Farm Buildings, yard and land at Greens Farm, Kerswell Green | CFS0124b Land west of Old Road South | CFS0184 Land of Main Road (Plot 1) | CFS0185 Land off Main Road (Plot 2) | CFS0249 Napleton House, Napleton Lane | CFS0262 Land to the rear of The Croft, Green Street | CFS0300 Land off Brook Close | CFS0358 Land off Pixham Ferry Lane |
| Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village? | No. Kempsey is a Category 1 village - site >400m from development boundary. | No. Site is in Kerswell Green. | Category 1 - adjacent to development boundary | Category 1 - adjacent to development boundary | Category 1 - adjacent to original SWDP development boundary, but not adjoining revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary | No. Kempsey is a Category 1 village - site 280m from original SWDP development boundary and about 150m from revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. | No. Site is in Green Street, >1km from Kempsey development boundary. | Category 1 - adjacent to development boundary | Category 1 - adjacent, but not abutting the development boundary |
| 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 | Yes | Yes |
| Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone. | | | Partially, Flood Zone 2 and 3 along western boundary | No | No | | | No | No |
| Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | | | No. Oil pipeline runs through south-west corner of the site. | No. Oil pipeline runs south to north through western side of site | No. 170m from oil pipeline | | | Yes | No. Site 130m from oil pipeline |
| Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway? | | | | | | | | Yes | |
| Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area? | | Severn Trent - Site could pump directly to the works | Severn Trent - Site could pump directly to the works | Severn Trent - There are known hydraulic flooding and pollution issues at Main Rd SPS, improvements are likely to provide capacity. There are also issues with self cleaning and blockages. Hydraulic modelling is recommended. | Severn Trent - There are known hydraulic flooding and pollution issues at Main Rd SPS, improvements are likely to provide capacity. There are also issues with self cleaning and blockages. Hydraulic modelling is recommended. | | | Severn Trent - 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 | |
| Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance? | | | No | No | No | | | impact zone SSSI | No |
| Is the site in Green Belt? | No | No | 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 | No | No |
| Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what? | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site has potential to conflict with Policy K12 (site 65m from South Ham), K8/5 (St Marys Church) and K10B (land for future community and recreation use) which is adjacent to the site | Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). Site is 30m from designated Local Green Space (Policy K11/1), adjacent to North Ham (Policy K12) | Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). Site is 150m from designated Local Green Space (Policy K11/1) | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site 300m from South Ham (Policy K12) |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are. | | | Agriculture. Adjacent to Conservation area and future community and recreation land | Yes. Agriculture and residential | Yes. Agriculture | | | Redundant pumping station and infrastructure. Adjacent to residential. | Agriculture. New residential development to north of site |
| Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | | | | | | | | | |
| Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space? | | | No | No | No | | | No | No |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area? | | Yes. abutting CA setting of grade I Listed church Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. | Yes. Abutting CA. Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. | No. Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential | No. Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. | | | No. 110m from Conservation Area. Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential | No |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s). | | Yes. abutting CA setting of grade I Listed church | Yes. abutting CA setting of grade I Listed church. 120m from church | No | No | | | No | Site approx. 130m from Draycott Lodge and 150m from Draycott Coach House |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument? | | | No | 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? | | | Site adjacent to Kempsey Lower Ham Site of Regional or Local Wildlife Importance and 150m from River Severn Site of Regional or Local Wildlife Importance. Auts boundary of Lower Hams LWS & grassland inventory site. Landscape Officer comments - Over development of an already heavily developed village. Poor relationship with existing village and to detriment of rural character of neighbouring Old Road South and Squires Walk. Ecological officer comments - encompasses ancient woodland | Potential impact on Special Wildlife site. Site 50m from Kempsey Upper Ham (Grassland Marshland Swamp). Less than 100m from Kempsey Upper Ham LWS. Landscape officer comments - Overly visually prominent on the approach to Kempsey and in the significant gap. To the detriment of open views of the Malvern Hills to the west. Ecological officer comments - SSSI | Landscape officer comments - Overly visually prominent on the approach to Kempsey. Existing development to the south is set at a slightly lower land level and its presence will (eventually) be softened by a newly planted orchard. Development of the proposed site would be considerably more prominent by comparison and in the significant gap. Ecological officer comments - CA, Landscape. Site 270m from Kempsey Upper Ham (Grassland Marshland Swamp). | | | 850m from Napleton Meadow SSSI BAP habitat - Traditional Orchard. Landscape comments - If the small woodland is to be retained, this would require considerably more than the 20% land area for GI currently proposed. Ecological officer comments - SSSI | No |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs. | | | No | No | No | | | No | No |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap? | | | No | Yes. Whole site within Significant Gap | Yes. Whole site within Significant Gap | | | No | No |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland? | | | Yes | | | | | | |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow? | | | Possibly | | | | | | |
| Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it? | | | Severn Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | Parts on north and west of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Severn Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | Severn Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | | | Severn Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | Parts on north and south west of site susceptible to surface water flooding |
| Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land? | Grade 1 Agricultural Land Classification | Grade 2 Agricultural Land | South of site Grade 1 on Agricultural Land Classification | Whole site Grade 1 on Agricultural Land Classification | Approx. 5% Grade 1 on Agricultural Land Classification | | | No | Whole site Grade 1 on Agricultural Land Classification |
| Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development? | | | Contaminated Land Comments - PCL on site - Unknown filled ground (pond). Risk assessment and likely site investigation required. Air Quality Comments - Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings | Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities. Air Quality Comments - Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings | Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities. Air Quality Comments - Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings | | | Contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc.) in south-west corner of site. Severn Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | Site 30m and 150m from 2 sites of contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc.) |
| Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance. | | | | | | | | Yes - bus stop. No - rail station. | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | | |
| Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision? | | | Yes. Housing and employment. An employment & education sites accessible within 3 miles? Age friendly environments: Will this site be conducive to an ageing population accessing the wider community and facilities (without access to a personal vehicle). Community facilities: Will residents easily be able to access: 1) healthcare (Large and/or cumulative impact on health services including ability to register with a GP practice. Community health care may be impacted. Acute trust provision would need to be addressed (including shortfall in allocation of beds/staff for the financial year in which the development is built) 2) community/village halls 3) recreational activities 4) Shops/groceries 5) Green space Air quality, noise, light and water: Will the proposed site link up with appropriate road capacity and continuous cycle & pedestrian routes (taking into account all surrounding developments). | Yes / possible. Housing and employment. An employment & education sites accessible within 3 miles? Age friendly environments: Will this site be conducive to an ageing population accessing the wider community and facilities (without access to a personal vehicle). Community facilities: Will residents easily be able to access: 1) healthcare (Large and/or cumulative impact on health services including ability to register with a GP practice. Community health care may be impacted. Acute trust provision would need to be addressed (including shortfall in allocation of beds/staff for the financial year in which the development is built) 2) community/village halls 3) recreational activities 4) Shops/groceries 5) Green space Air quality, noise, light and water: Will the proposed site link up with appropriate road capacity and continuous cycle & pedestrian routes (taking into account all surrounding developments). | Yes / possible. Housing and employment. An employment & education sites accessible within 3 miles? Age friendly environments: Will this site be conducive to an ageing population accessing the wider community and facilities (without access to a personal vehicle). Community facilities: Will residents easily be able to access: 1) healthcare (Large and/or cumulative impact on health services including ability to register with a GP practice. Community health care may be impacted. Acute trust provision would need to be addressed (including shortfall in allocation of beds/staff for the financial year in which the development is built) 2) community/village halls 3) recreational activities 4) Shops/groceries 5) Green space Air quality, noise, light and water: Will the proposed site link up with appropriate road capacity and continuous cycle & pedestrian routes (taking into account all surrounding developments). | | | No | |
| Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan. | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | | | Scale and location of development next to the Conservation Area would affect character of the settlement | Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. | Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. | | | No | No. |
| Is the site ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason? | Out. Location - isolated location. High agricultural land value | Out. Isolated location. High agricultural land value | Out. Scale. Impact on historic environment. Flood Risk. | Out. Scale and high agricultural land value. | Out. Scale and isolated location. | Out. Isolated location. | Out. Isolated location | In. | Out. Scale. High agricultural land value. |
| Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR? | No. Location - isolated location. High agricultural land value | No. Isolated location. High agricultural land value | No. Scale. Impact on historic environment. Flood Risk. | No. Scale and high agricultural land value. | No. Scale and isolated location. | No. Isolated location. | No. Isolated location | Yes. | Out. Scale. High agricultural land value. |
| Summary | Site not considered appropriate because isolated location (400m from development boundary) and high agricultural land value (Grade 1) | Site not considered appropriate because isolated location and high agricultural land value (Grade 1). Also, potential impact on the historic environment. Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale, impact on the historic environment and flood risk. Also, oil pipeline on site, potential conflict with adopted Neighbourhood Plan, potential impact on site of regional or local wildlife importance, south of site on Grade 1 agricultural land, potential contaminated land issues and PRow runs west to east through centre of site. Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale and high agricultural land value. Also, the site is within the Significant Gap and would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester, conflicts with adopted Neighbourhood Plan, oil pipeline runs through the site, potential sewerage and water supply issues, potential impact on site of regional or local wildlife importance and some parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale and isolated location (sites does not adjoin revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary). Also, the site is within the Significant Gap and would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester, conflicts with adopted Neighbourhood Plan, is in close proximity to oil pipeline, potential sewerage and water supply issues and has potential landscape issues. Noted that whole site is in sand & gravel safeguarding area. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale and isolated location - 280m from original SWDP development boundary and approx. 150m from revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. | Site not considered appropriate because isolated location - >1km from development boundary. | Small site. Impact on SSS to be assessed. Contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc.) in south-west corner of site | Site not considered appropriate because of scale and high agricultural land value (Grade 1 agricultural land). Also, 130m from oil pipeline and parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Site not about development boundary. Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area. |

| Kempsey | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address: | | CFS0391 SO 875 486, Green Street | CFS0505 Land off Post Office Lane | CFS0526 Land at Main Road | CFS0552 Land at Lower Broomhall Farm | CFS0555 Land at Lower Broomhall Farm | CFS0558 Land at Post Office Lane | CFS0606 Land at Brook End Lane, Brook End | CFS0655 Land at Holdings Lane, Broomhall | CFS0662 Land at Broomhall Lane, Broomhall |
| MAJOR CRITERIA | Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village? | No. Site is in Stonehall. Approx. 2km from Kempsey development boundary. | Category 1 - not adjacent to original SWDP development boundary, but adjoining revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary | Category 1 - site 400m from development boundary. | No. Kempsey is a Category 1 village - site 300m from Kempsey development boundary. Site adjacent to Worcester South development boundary. | Category 1 - adjacent to original SWDP development boundary, but not adjoining revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary | Category 1 - not adjacent to original SWDP development boundary or revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. 150m from revised development boundary. | Category 1 - not adjacent to original SWDP development boundary or revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. 500m from revised development boundary. | Category 1 - not adjacent to original SWDP development boundary or revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. 650m from revised development boundary. 200m from Worcester South development boundary. | No. Kempsey is a Category 1 village - site approx. 1km from Kempsey development boundary. Site adjacent to Worcester South development boundary. |
| | 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 | Yes | Yes |
| | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone. | | No | No | No | No | No, but Flood Zone 3 runs along eastern boundary of site. | No | No | No |
| | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | | Yes | No. Site 250m from oil pipeline | No. Site 130m from oil pipeline | No. 340m from oil pipeline | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway? | | | | | | | | | |
| | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area? | | | | | Severn Trent - There are known hydraulic flooding and pollution issues at Main Rd SPS, improvements are likely to provide capacity. There are also issues with self cleansing and blockages. Hydraulic modelling is recommended. | | | | |
| | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance? | | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| | Is the site in Green Belt? | No | No | 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 | No | No |
| | Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what? | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site adjacent to Kempsey Common (Policy K12). | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site 550m from South Ham (Policy K12) | Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). Site is approx. 220m from North Ham (Policy K12) | Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site adjacent to Green Infrastructure (Policy K12) | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site adjacent to Green Infrastructure (Policy K12) | Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). | Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are. | | Agriculture. New residential development to west of site | Horticultural nursery, Draycott Villa on site. | Agriculture. South of Worcester South urban extension. | Yes. Agriculture | Agriculture. | Equine Paddock | Agriculture. | Agriculture. South of Worcester South urban extension. | |
| OTHER CRITERIA | Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | | | | | | | | | |
| | Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space? | | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area? | | No | No | No | No. Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. | No | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s). | | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument? | | No | No | No | No | 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? | Site adjacent to Site of Regional or Local Wildlife Importance - Kempsey & Stonehall Common | Site 170m from SSSI (Napleton Meadow) | No | Site approx. 100m from Site of Regional or Local Importance (Kempsey Upper Ham). | Landscape officer comments - Very poor relationship with village, visually prominent (negative) from Holdings Lane and to the detriment of its rural surroundings | No | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs. | | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap? | | No | No | Yes. Whole site in Significant Gap | Yes. Whole site within Significant Gap | No | No. Site adjacent to Significant Gap. | Yes. Whole site in Significant Gap | Yes. Whole site in Significant Gap |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland? | | | | | | | | | |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow? | | | | | | | | | |
| Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it? | | Most of north of site susceptible to surface water flooding | North-east of site susceptible to surface water flooding | Yes. Large area running north to south of site susceptible to surface water flooding | Yes. Eastern side of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Severn Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | Most of west and north-west of site susceptible to surface water flooding | Parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding | No | No | |
| Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land? | | No | Whole site Grade 1 on Agricultural Land Classification | Western side of site Grades 1 and 2 on Agricultural Land Classification | No | No | No | No | No | |
| Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development? | Contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc.) in north of site | Contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc.) in centre of site | | Yes. 2 areas of contaminated land on the site - quarry + Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc. 2 landfill buffer zones on the site. | Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities. Air Quality Comments - Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings | Contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc.) in south-west of site | No | 2 areas of contaminated land within 100m of site - unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc. Also landfill buffer zone covers most of the site. | 3 areas of contaminated land - unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc. - within 150m of site | |
| Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision? | | | | | Yes / possible. Housing and employment: Are employment & education sites accessible within 3 miles? Age friendly environments: Will this site be conducive to an ageing population accessing the wider community and facilities (without access to a personal vehicle). Community facilities: Will residents easily be able to access: 1) healthcare (Large and/or cumulative impact on health services including ability to register with a GP practice. Community health care may be impacted. Acute trust provision would need to be addressed (including shortfall in allocation of beds/staff for the financial year in which the development is built) 2) community/village halls 3) recreational activities 4) Shops/groceries 5) Green space Air quality, noise, light and water: Will the proposed site link up with appropriate road capacity and continuous cycle & pedestrian routes (taking into account all surrounding developments). | | | | | |
| Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan. | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | | No. | | Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. | Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. | Yes. Development of the site would extend eastern boundary of Kempsey to the Roman Road | Open countryside. Isolated location | Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. | Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. | |
| Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason? | Out. Isolated location | In. | Out. Isolated location. High agricultural land value | Out. Scale | Out. Scale and isolated location | Out. Isolated development. | Out. Isolated location | Out. Isolated location. | In | |
| Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR? | No. Isolated location | Out. Impact on Napleton Meadow SSSI (170m) would require further examination, parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding and potential contaminated land would require further examination. | No. Isolated location. High agricultural land value | No. Scale | No. Scale and isolated location | No. Isolated development. | No. Isolated location | No. Isolated location. | No. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester and conflict with adopted Neighbourhood Plan. | |
| Summary | Site not considered appropriate because isolated location - approx. 2km from development boundary. Also, adjacent to Site of Regional or Local Wildlife Importance (Kempsey & Stonehall Common) and | Adjacent to revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. Impact on Napleton Meadow SSSI (170m) would require further examination, parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding and potential contaminated land would require further examination. | Site not considered appropriate because isolated location (approx. 400m from development boundary) and high agricultural land value (Grade 1 agricultural land). Also, less than 450m from oil pipeline and north-east of site susceptible to surface water flooding | Site not considered appropriate because of scale. Site 300m from Kempsey development boundary. Adjacent to Worcester South development boundary but would significantly reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. Also, site would conflict with adopted Neighbourhood Plan, 130m from oil pipeline, Site of Regional or Local Importance (Kempsey Upper Ham), western side of site has Grades 1 and 2 on agricultural land, 2 areas of potential land contamination, large area running north to south of site susceptible to surface water flooding and PRSW runs from south to north through the site. Note that western side of site in sand & gravel safeguarding area. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale and isolated location (sites does not adjoin revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary). Also, the site is within the Significant Gap and would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester, conflicts with adopted Neighbourhood Plan, is less than 450m from oil pipeline, potential sewerage and water supply issues, potential landscape issues and some parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. | Site not considered appropriate because isolated development (150m from revised development boundary). Also, west and north-west of site susceptible to surface water flooding and potential land contamination would require further examination. | Site not considered appropriate because isolated development. Also parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. | Site not considered appropriate because isolated development. Also, site within the Significant Gap and would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester, conflicts with adopted Neighbourhood Plan and landfill buffer zone covers most of the site. | Site not considered appropriate because development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester, would conflict with adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Site is approx. 1km from Kempsey development boundary, but adjacent to Worcester South development boundary. | |

| Kempsey | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address: | CFS0669 Land South of Brookend Lane | CFS0670 Land at Brookend, Holdings Lane | CFS0671 Land at Brookend Lane | CFS0777 Broadfields, Old Road South | CFS0946 Land opposite Draycott Lodge, Main Road | CFS0987 Barn along Pixham Ferry Lane | CFS1019 Land to the west of Worcester Road | CFS1023 Land off Napleton Lane |
| Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village? | Category 1 - not adjacent to original SWDP development boundary or revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. 250m from revised development boundary. | Category 1 - not adjacent to original SWDP development boundary or revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. 270m from revised development boundary. | Category 1 - site not coterminous to original SWDP development boundary or revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. About 10m from revised development boundary. | No. Kempsey is a Category 1 village - site approx. 200m from Kempsey development boundary. | Category 1 - 100m from development boundary. | Category 1 - site not coterminous to development boundary. Filtered out - 0.16 hectares - too small | No. Kempsey is a Category 1 village - site approx. 1km from Kempsey development boundary. Site adjacent to Worcester South development boundary. | Category 1 - adjacent to development boundary |
| 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 | Yes |
| Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone. | No | Yes. Flood Zone 3 brook runs from south-west to north-east through the site | Yes. Flood Zone 3 along western boundary of site | No. Site 70m from Flood Zone 3 | No | No | Western boundary adjacent to Flood Zone 2. | No |
| Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Yes | Yes | Yes | No. Oil pipeline runs south to north through the centre of the site | Yes | Site 450m from oil pipeline. | No. Oil pipeline runs through the site from south to north | Yes |
| Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway? | | | | | | | Yes. | Potential access issues - to be confirmed |
| Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area? | | | | | | | | Severn Trent - Site could pump directly to the works |
| Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Site 135m from Napleton Meadow SSSI |
| Is the site in Green Belt? | No | 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 | No |
| Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what? | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site includes Green Infrastructure (Policy K12) | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. | Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site is adjacent to, and could potentially adversely affect, Plovers Rise sports and recreation facilities (Policy K10A), Kempsey Youth Centre (Policy K8/10) and Bannut Hill Local Green Space (Policy K11/6) |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are. | Agriculture. Includes Upper Brook Farm. East side of site next to M5 motorway - would therefore need to be a buffer between development and motorway. | Agriculture. South-east boundary close to M5 motorway. | Agriculture | Agriculture. Adjacent to sewerage plant | Vacant. Adjacent to Draycott House | Agriculture and residential | Agriculture. Site adjacent to North Ham - site of regional or local wildlife importance. | Agriculture. Adjacent to residential and Plovers Rise sports and recreation facilities. Kempsey Youth Centre and Bannut Hill Local Green Space. |
| Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | | | | | | | Site is adjacent to North Ham (Policy K12) | |
| Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space? | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No. Adjacent to Green space and 20m from another green space. |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area? | No | No | Large site, only 300m from Conservation Area. | No | No | No | No | No. 250m from Conservation Area. Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential. DGA survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s). | Upper Brook-end Farmhouse Listed Building is on the edge of the site | Upper Brook-end Farmhouse Listed Building is adjacent to the site | No | No | Site approx. 35m from Draycott Lodge and 70m from Draycott Coach House | No. Draycott Lodge 180m from site. | No | No. 130m from Draycott Lodge. |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument? | No | No | No | No | 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 | No | No | Site adjacent to North Ham and 160m from River Severn - both sites of regional or local wildlife importance. | within 200m of Napleton meadows LWS, grassland inventory site and BAP habitat. Landscape officer comments - Poor relationship with existing settlement, detrimental impact on rural nature and character of Bestmans Lane to south and Bestmans Lane to east |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs. | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap? | No. Adjacent to the Significant Gap | Yes. Whole site in Significant Gap | No. Adjacent to the Significant Gap | No | No | No | Yes. Whole site in Significant Gap | No |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland? | | | | | | | | |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow? | | | | | | | | |
| Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it? | Parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding - area running from west to east in middle of the site + area in south-east of site | Large areas of site susceptible to surface water flooding - brook runs from south-west to north-east through the site + large area in north-west of site + small area in south-east of site | Large areas of site susceptible to surface water flooding - western boundary of site and centre of the site. | No | Eastern side of site (including possible entrance) susceptible to surface water flooding | No | South-east corner susceptible to surface water flooding | Some areas of site susceptible to surface water flooding - south of site and centre of the site. Severn Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. |
| Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land? | No | No | No | Yes. Grade 1 Agricultural Land Classification | Site Grade 1 on Agricultural Land Classification | Yes. Grade 1 Agricultural Land Classification | South half of site Grade 1 and northern half of site Grade 2 on Agricultural Land Classification | Yes - Most of site Grade 2 Agricultural Land Classification |
| Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development? | Contaminated land (quarrying of sand and clay, operation of sand and gravel pits) in centre of site | No | No | No. Contaminated land (sewerage) adjacent to the site | Site 25m from site of contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc.)) | No. Contaminated land (unknown filled ground) approx. 130m from site. | Contaminated land (area liable to flood) adjacent to western boundary of site | Contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc.)) 40m from site. Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities. Air Quality Comments - Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings |
| Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance. | | | | | | | Bus Stop - Yes. Train station - no | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |
| Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision? | | | | | | | | Yes. Housing and employment: Are employment & education sites accessible within 3 miles? Age friendly environments: Will this site be conducive to an ageing population accessing the wider community and facilities (without access to a personal vehicle). Community facilities: Will residents easily be able to access: 1) healthcare (Large and/or cumulative impact on health services including ability to register with a GP practice. Community health care may be impacted. Acute trust provision would need to be addressed (including shortfall in allocation of beds/staff for the financial year in which the development is built) 2) community/village halls 3) recreational activities 4) Shops/groceries 5) Green space Air quality, noise, light and water: Will the proposed site link up with appropriate road capacity and continuous cycle & pedestrian routes (taking into account all surrounding developments). |
| Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan. | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). | Neighbourhood Plan made in November 2017. Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of potential infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CL including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K10), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15). |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | Yes. Development of site would extend eastern boundary of Kempsey to the M5 motorway. Isolated location | Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. Isolated development | Yes. Development of site would extend eastern boundary of Kempsey to the Roman Road. | No | No. | No | Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. | Possibly. Would extend the development south-eastwards. |
| Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason? | Out. Scale. Isolated location. | Out. Scale. Isolated location. Flood Risk | Out. Flood Risk. Scale. Isolated location. | Out. Isolated location. High Agricultural Land Value | Out. Isolated location. High agricultural land value. | Out. Size - too small. High agricultural land value. | Out. Scale. High Agricultural Land Value. | Out. Scale and high agricultural land value. |
| Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR? | No. Scale. Isolated location. | No. Scale. Isolated location. Flood Risk | No. Flood Risk. Scale. Isolated location. | No. Isolated location. High Agricultural Land Value | Out. Isolated location. High agricultural land value. | Out. Size - too small. High agricultural land value. | No. Scale. High Agricultural Land Value. | No. Scale and high agricultural land value. |
| Summary | Site not considered appropriate because of scale and isolated location. Also, site conflicts with adopted Neighbourhood Plan, parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding, potential land contamination would require further examination, potential impact on historic environment (Listed Building) and several PRoWs cross the site. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale, isolated location and flood risk. Also, site within the Significant Gap and would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester, would conflict with adopted Neighbourhood Plan, potential impact on the historic environment (Listed Building), parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding and PRoW runs through south-east corner of site. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale, isolated location and flood risk. Also, development of site would extend eastern boundary of Kempsey to the Roman Road and would materially affect the character of the settlement, large areas of site susceptible to surface water flooding and PRoW runs through centre of site from west to east. | Site not considered appropriate because of isolated location and high agricultural land value. Also, oil pipeline runs through the centre of the site and proximity to sewerage plant. | Site not considered appropriate because of isolated location (100m from development boundary) and high agricultural land value (Grade 1 agricultural land). Also, parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Potentially impact on listed buildings would require further examination. Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area. | Site not considered appropriate to be allocated because of size (too small) and high agricultural land value. Also, not coterminous with the development boundary. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale and high agricultural land value. Also, site within the Significant Gap and would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester, would conflict with adopted Neighbourhood Plan, adjacent to Flood Risk 2 zone, parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding, oil pipeline runs through the site and is adjacent to site of regional or local wildlife importance. Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area. | Site not considered appropriate because of scale and high agricultural land value (most of site Grade 2 agricultural land). Also, potential impact on Napleton Meadow SSSI (135m from site) would require further examination, potential conflict with adopted Neighbourhood Plan (particularly Policy K10A), poor relationship with existing settlement, some parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding and potential access issues (to be confirmed). Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area. |