

South Littleton		CFS0337 Land to the east of Cleve Road	CFS0381 Land South of Shinehill Lane	CFS0461 Long Hyde Road	CFS0509 Land adjacent to Hyde Lodge, Long Hyde Road	CFS0512 Land off Long Hyde Road	CFS0516 Land off Station Road	CFS0517 Land off Station Road, to the south of SWDP60/26
MAJOR CRITERIA	SHELAA Site Reference and Address:							
	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	No - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - 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)?		Available now	Available within 5 years	Available now	Yes - Available now	Yes - Available now	Yes - Available now
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.		94% Flood Zone 1. 6% Flood zone2 along southern boundary of the site. 0% risk of flooding in 100years.	100% Flood Zone 1. No risk of flooding in 100years	100% Flood Zone 1. No risk of flooding in 100years	100% Flood Zone 1. No risk of flooding 100 years	100% Flood Zone 1. No risk of flooding 100 years	100% Flood Zone 1, 16% risk of flooding in 100 years.
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?		WCC - No concern over access. Highways England consider the site to be acceptable.	WCC - No concern over access. Highways England consider the site to be acceptable.	WCC - No concern over access. Highways England consider the site to be acceptable.	WCC - No concern over access. Highways England consider the site to be acceptable.	WCC - TBC. Highways England consider the site to be acceptable.	WCC - TBC. Highways England consider the site to be acceptable.
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?		LOW IMPACT - 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. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	LOW IMPACT - 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. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	LOW IMPACT - 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. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	LOW IMPACT - 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. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	MEDIUM IMPACT - The site will drain to South Littleton Farm Lane TPS which has capacity and pollution issues. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is undertaken for these sites to determine any improvement requirements. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	MEDIUM IMPACT - The site will drain to South Littleton Farm Lane TPS which has capacity and pollution issues. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is undertaken for these sites to determine any improvement requirements. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?		SSSI	SSSI	SSSI	SSSI	SSSI, Within 200m of LWS	Within 100m of LWS
	Is the site in Green Belt?		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?		No	No	No	No	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?		No	No	No	No	No	No	
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.		Yes - housing	Yes - housing	Yes - housing / farm	Yes - housing	Yes - housing	Yes - housing / adjacent reservoir	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?		TBC WCC	TBC WCC	TBC WCC	TBC WCC	TBC WCC	TBC WCC
	Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or Archaeology?		No - CA. Prehistoric, Romano/British , medieval potential Evaluation, possible mitigation	No-ca. Prehistoric, Romano/British , medieval potential Evaluation, possible mitigation	No-CA. Prehistoric, Romano/British , medieval potential Evaluation, possible mitigation	No-CA. Prehistoric, Romano/British , medieval potential Evaluation, possible mitigation	No - CA. Prehistoric, Romano/British , medieval potential	No CA. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation Prehistoric, Romano/British , medieval potential
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).		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
	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 landscape comment at this stage	No landscape comment at this stage	CFS0509 and CFS0512 – would be visible on ridge line but would complement other dwellings adjacent provided only infill individual dwellings fronting the road are proposed.	CFS0509 and CFS0512 – would be visible on ridge line but would complement other dwellings adjacent provided only infill individual dwellings fronting the road are proposed.	CFS0516 – on rising land, highly visible at entrance into village from Blackminster. Would interfere with views of trees on higher ground to north which are prominent landscape features.	Yes - site within Village Farmlands with Orchards Landscape Type where settlement pattern is identified as being nucleated. Development on this site would extend settlement unacceptably away from the nucleated heart of the village into open countryside. Would not respect settlement pattern as an indicator of landscape character .
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.		No	TPOs around the site	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?		No					
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?		No					
	Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?		no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	potential surface water ponding across southern third of the site 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	No	No
	Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?		Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.		Yes - 330m	Yes - 170m	Yes - 390m	Yes - 390m	Yes - 380m	Yes - 390m
	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.		Y - School - 965m, Shop - 930m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 1400m- Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	Y - School - 460m, Shop - 195m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, adjacent Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	Y - School - 562m, Shop - 390m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 158m- Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	School - 815m, Shop - 500m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 158m- 170m-Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	School - 800m, Shop - 485m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, Adj -Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	School - 780m, Shop - 440m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 560m-Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?		No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.		No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?		No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
OUTCOME	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Location	In	In	In	In	Out - Access / Landscape	Out - Wildlife / Landscape
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No	Yes	No - Alternative site preferable in the village	Yes	No	No
	Summary	Location	Potential site for development, opposite existing properties - however 0461 preferable and closer to village facilities .	Site is considered the most logical location for development, continuation of ribbon development and replicates development on the other side of the road.	Potential site for frontage only development, eastern side of the site within the development boundary. Continuation of ribbon development and replicate development on the other side of the road. Landscape supportive of this.	Potential site for development. Continuation of ribbon development and replicate development on the other side of the road. Landscape supportive of this. However cs461 closer to local services and facilities and logical infill development.	Landscape Officer has raised objection as a highly visible site. There are also concerns over access.	Landscape concerns as the development of this site would not respect the traditional settlement pattern. Very close to LWS. Other sites preferable.

South Littleton		CFS0926 Bleinham Nursery, Station Road	CFS0958 Land off Farm Lane	CFS0959 Land off Shinehill Lane	CFS1031 South House, Main Street	CFS1032 Land to rear of Main Street	CFS1087 Land at Farm Lane (Additional site)
MAJOR CRITERIA	SHELAA Site Reference and Address:						
	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - 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 within 5 years	Yes - Available within 5 years	Yes - Available within 5 years	Yes - Available within 5 years	Yes - Available within 5 years
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	Flood Zone 1 - 68%, Flood Zone 2- 32% FZ3 - 2% 17% risk of flooding in 100 years.	FZ1 - 95% f2 - 5% 1% risk of flooding in 100 years	FZ1 - 65%, FZ2 35%, FZ3 A AND B 31%. 14% risk of flooding in 100 years	FZ1 - 100%, Less than 1% risk of flooding in 100years	FZ1 - 100%, 1% risk of flooding in 100years	Yes - Flood zone 1 - approx. 70%, approx. Flood zone 2 - approx. 30% Flood Zone 3 - approx. 2%.
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	WCC - TBC. Highways England consider the site to be acceptable.	WCC - TBC. Highways England consider the site to be acceptable.	No concerns received from WCC.	TBC FROM WCC.	TBC FROM WCC.	No concerns received from WCC.
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	MEDIUM IMPACT - The site will drain to South Littleton Farm Lane TPS which has capacity and pollution issues. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is undertaken for these sites to determine any improvement requirements. LOW IMPACT - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	LOW IMPACT - 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. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	MEDIUM IMPACT - The site will drain to South Littleton Farm Lane TPS which has capacity and pollution issues. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is undertaken for these sites to determine any improvement requirements. LOW IMPACT - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	LOW IMPACT - 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. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	MEDIUM IMPACT - The site will drain to South Littleton Farm Lane TPS which has capacity and pollution issues. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is undertaken for these sites to determine any improvement requirements. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	TBC
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	Habitat / LWS YES. borders LWS and area of woodland / scrub	within 60m of brook LWS & associated ecological corridor; partially within dispersal area for BAP ecological network	No	Yes - part of core and dispersal area for BAP ecological network; within 150m of brook LWS	Yes - site noted as a grassland site of value (UK priority habitat)	Yes - LWS Littleton, Badsley and Broadway bk bounds the site
	Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Yes - housing / former nursery	Yes - housing / farm/adjacent school	Yes - housing	Yes - housing / open space adj / adjacent school	Yes - housing / church	Yes - housing / open space	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	TBC WCC	TBC WCC	TBC WCC	TBC WCC	TBC WCC	TBC WCC
	Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No	No	No	Yes	No	Scope for development on all but the Green Space to the western end of the site, subject to retention of existing hedges/trees and buffer planting to the northern boundary
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or Archaeology?	No - CA, DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation Prehistoric, Romano/British, medieval potential	Yes impact on the CA - partially in CA and abutting setting of 3 listed buildings. Prehistoric, Romano/British, medieval potential Evaluation, possible mitigation	No CA, Prehistoric, Romano/British, medieval potential DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation	Yes - CA, Prehistoric, Romano/British, medieval potential Evaluation, possible mitigation	No - although very close to boundary of CA and a few listed buildings. Prehistoric, Romano/British, medieval potential DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation	Yes - CA, Archaeology TBC
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No	Yes - setting of LB	No	No	No - although very close to boundary of CA and a few listed buildings.	Yes
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	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?	Yes - site within Village Farmlands with Orchards Landscape Type where settlement pattern is identified as being nucleated. Development on this site would extend settlement unacceptably away from the nucleated heart of the village into open countryside. Would not respect settlement pattern as an indicator of landscape character - WWT -Yes, Overlaps traditional orchard and is contiguous with LWS Allocation here should avoid orchard and buffer the LWS from adverse effects of development. Developable area may reduce as a result	CFS0958 - as I commented at the time of application 18/01412, 'It is the loss of this openness as a result of proposed development that would have the greatest impact on landscape character. The introduction of built form into open countryside to the north of the line of existing settlement (in consideration of dwellings and curtilage) would also impact on landscape character - both in terms of settlement pattern itself and in terms of its impact on the rural setting..... I would have concerns about developing to the north of the ditch for a number of reasons. Looking at mapping and aerial photography, existing dwellings and gardens are all located south of the ditch line - south of a line running east-west to the northern boundary of this part of the village. To develop north of the ditch would effectively be developing into countryside.' I commented for that application that 'One, or two smaller, dwelling(s) could in my opinion be accommodated on the site between this ditch and the proposed orchard area without being visually obtrusive or impacting significantly on the local landscape character - providing the landscape recommendations included in the LVA are applied.'	Some development on this site, fronting Shinehill Lane to respect local landscape character, may be acceptable	Yes - open designated Green Space within village contributes to the local landscape character at the heart of the village. Orchard trees on site are a feature of the locality. Loss of openness as a result of any development would impact negatively on the local landscape character.	WWT -Yes, wholly overlaps a grassland inventory site and should be removed. It would be worth confirming the grassland value here but if the site proves to be BAP quality habitat it should be removed.	Landscape - Scope for development on all but the Green Space to the western end of the site, subject to retention of existing hedges/trees and buffer planting to the northern boundary. WWT - Yes, the site overlaps a grassland inventory site. The grassland inventory site should be removed from any allocation here and will reduce the developable area by more than 50%.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	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
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	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?	no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event. South boundary & SE quarter of the site affected by adjacent watercourse	no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event. Eastern boundary of the site affected by flood zone of adjacent watercourse	No details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event. Southern part of the site affected by flood zone of adjacent watercourse.	No details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	yes overland flood flows along SW boundary	TBC
	Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	No	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?	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. Current use as a Nursery is a PCL activity. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. PCL on site - Tank. PCL site adjacent - pond (in/filled) Risk assessment and likely site investigation required	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Yes - 390m	No - 450m	No - 620m	No - 480m	Yes - 110m	Yes - 270m
	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.	School - 780m, Shop - 440m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 560m-Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	School - Adjacent, Shop - 680m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 950m-Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	School - 1100, Shop - 1300m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 950m-Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	School - Adjacent School, Shop - 680m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 950m-Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	School - 180m, Shop - 230m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 500m-Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.	School - 670m, Shop - 230m, Employment and Doctors - not in village, 860m-Scout Hut - on Long Hyde Road.
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	TBC	
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	No Neighbourhood Plan in South Littleton	
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
OUTCOME	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Landscape / Wildlife	Out - Access / Landscape / Wildlife	In	Out - Protected open space / Landscape/Access / Heritage	Out - Access / Wildlife	Out - Access?
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Summary	Landscape Objection - development of this site would not respect the traditional settlement pattern. Borders LWS. Flood zone 2 to east of site. Other sites preferable.	Borders LWS brook and ecological corridor, Concern over Access, Landscape objection - loss of openness.	Potential for frontage development to replicate ribbon development on the opposite side. Landscape Officer also supportive of this. However approx. third of the site to the south is in high to medium flood zones. Hydraulic modelling will be necessary to determine mitigation required. CS461 closer to local services and facilities.	Site is within the Conservation Area and an area of Public Open Space and currently used for grazing alpacas. Access is an issue as single lane adjacent first school. Not a suitable site for development due to the reasons above.	Advised by WWT that the site is a grassland inventory and should not be allocated. Concern over access to the site as just off an s bend.	Part of the site to the west is designated public open space which is a grassland inventory site and should be removed from any allocation. This portion of the site is also within medium flood risk. Concern over access