

| Tibberton | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address: | | CFS0218 - Highfield, Church Lane | CFS0379 - Land on the north side of Church Lane | CFS0529 - Court End Farm | CFS0630a - Speed The Plough | CFS0630asc - Speed The Plough (smaller cut) | CFS0630b - Speed The Plough |
| MAJOR CRITERIA | 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 | No - Cat 2 |
| | Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)? | Yes - Available within 5 years | Yes - Available now | Yes - Available within 5 years | Yes - Available | Yes - Available | |
| | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone. | 100% Flood Zone 1. | 100% Flood Zone 1 | 100% Flood Zone 1 | 100% Flood Zone 1 | 100% Flood Zone 1 | |
| | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway? | WCC Highways - access considered achievable. | WCC Highways - access considered achievable. | The site has been submitted to WCC Highways, no concern over access. | The site has been submitted to WCC Highways, no access concerns | The site has been submitted to WCC Highways, no access concerns | |
| | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area? | LOW IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - 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. No SW sewer or nearby watercourse. MEDIUM IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | MEDIUM IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - There are known hydraulic flooding incidents in the downstream network. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is undertaken. 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. MEDIUM IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | LOW IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - 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. No SW sewer or nearby watercourse. MEDIUM IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | HIGH IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - Development site is very large in comparison with existing network. Storage at Plough Rd SPS is likely to be deficient. Further hydraulic modelling recommended. LOW IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. Adjacent watercourse. | HIGH IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - Development site is very large in comparison with existing network. Storage at Plough Rd SPS is likely to be deficient. Further hydraulic modelling recommended. LOW IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. Adjacent watercourse. | |
| | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance? | TBC | TBC | TBC | Habitat, LWS, SSSI | Habitat, LWS, SSSI | |
| | Is the site in Green Belt? | No | No | No | No | No | |
| | Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of? | 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 | |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are. | Yes - Housing | Yes - Housing | Yes - Housing | Yes - Housing / Pub | Yes - Housing / Pub | | |
| 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 | |
| | 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 OR Archaeology? | No - CA. Archaeology - Prehistoric, Romano/British , medieval potential Evaluation, possible mitigation | No - CA. Archaeology - Significant site possibly of national significance. Land is contaminated from 2001 cattle slaughter with foot and mouth disease. | No - CA. Evaluation, possible mitigation. Romano/British , medieval potential | DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation Prehistoric, Romano/British , medieval potential | 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). | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | |
| | 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? | CFS0379 and CFS0218 – Tibberton is within the Settled Farmlands with Pastoral Land Use Landscape Type which has an identified 'Dispersed settlement pattern of farmsteads and groups of wayside dwellings.' Whilst Tibberton does have some development extending further back from the main road, the main pattern of settlement relates to the main road through the village in a linear pattern of wayside development. Development on this site would result in a nucleation of settlement in the vicinity of the church and would not respect the identified or existing settlement pattern of the village as a whole, and in particular this part of the village – and so would not respect settlement pattern as an indicator of landscape character. Furthermore, the rural landscape character in the vicinity of the church would be adversely affected. May also involve the loss of established vegetation to site boundaries with the creation of an access and any required visibility splays, which would also impact adversely on the rural character of Church Lane. | Yes - large site in open countryside. Unacceptable visual impact in consideration of cumulative impact with Worcester 6 and loss of views towards Tibberton church and associated hamlet on hillside. Would not respect rural landscape character. CFS0379 and CFS0218 – Tibberton is within the Settled Farmlands with Pastoral Land Use Landscape Type which has an identified 'Dispersed settlement pattern of farmsteads and groups of wayside dwellings.' Whilst Tibberton does have some development extending further back from the main road, the main pattern of settlement relates to the main road through the village in a linear pattern of wayside development. Development on this site would result in a nucleation of settlement in the vicinity of the church and would not respect the identified or existing settlement pattern of the village as a whole, and in particular this part of the village – and so would not respect settlement pattern as an indicator of landscape character. Furthermore, the rural landscape character in the vicinity of the church would be adversely affected. May also involve the loss of established vegetation to site boundaries with the creation of an access and any required visibility splays, which would also impact adversely on the rural character of Church Lane. | No landscape objection subject to retention and supplementation of boundary vegetation | Yes, this site overlaps a traditional orchard and sits next to woodland and large hedges. Any allocation here should avoid the features of ecological interest and will require mitigation and buffering from harm. Accordingly, the developable area may be reduced. | Yes, this site overlaps a traditional orchard and sits next to woodland and large hedges. Any allocation here should avoid the features of ecological interest and will require mitigation and buffering from harm. Accordingly, the developable area may be reduced. | |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs. | No | No | TPO nearby | Yes - entire site | Yes - entire site | |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap? | No | No | No | No | No | |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland? | No | No | No | No | No | |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow? | No | No | No | Yes, possibly | Yes, possibly | |
| | 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 | Yes overland flood flows from higher ground behind the site | The larger site (0630a) has various sources of surface water flooding within the site. The railway culvert at the NE corner of the site potentially generates large areas of flooding upstream | This comment relates to the larger site as a whole (0630a) - has various sources of surface water flooding within the site. The railway culvert at the NE corner of the site potentially generates large areas of flooding upstream, however this part of the site will not be included in this part of the site. | |
| | 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 | |
| | 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 | Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings PCL on site - Quarry. PCL sites adjacent - sewage works, railway tracks. Risk Assessment required. | Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings PCL on site - Quarry. PCL sites adjacent - sewage works, railway tracks. Risk Assessment required. | |
| | Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance. | No - 890m | No - 820m | Yes - 180m | Yes - adjacent site | Yes - adjacent site | |
| | How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service. | School: 1000m, Village Hall: 918m, Shop: 900m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps. | Yes. School: 740m, Village Hall: 625m, Shop: 640m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps. | Yes. School: 370m, Village Hall: 350m, Shop: 365m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps. | Yes. School: 180m, Village Hall: 420m, Shop: 440m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps. | Yes. School: 180m, Village Hall: 420m, Shop: 440m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps. | |
| Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision? | | No but conditional | No but conditional | No but conditional | No but conditional | | |
| Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan. | No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton | No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton | No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton | No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton | No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton | | |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | |
| OUTCOME | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason? | Out - Heritage / Landscape | Out - Landscape | In | Out - Scale | In - Smaller Cut | Out - Location |
| | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR? | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| | Summary | Impact on the rural character and does not respect the traditional pattern of development. Would impact on the setting of the church. CFS052 and CFS0630asc considered the preferred sites. | Impact on the rural character and does not respect the traditional pattern of development. Would impact on the setting of the church. CFS052 and CFS0630asc considered the preferred sites. | No significant concerns on this site, potential location to deliver a small scale development to replicate Hawthorn Rise - Medium impact on surface water that therefore will need to be mitigated against. | The site as it stands would be ruled out for scale, however a smaller cut maybe acceptable. The most suitable access needs to be agreed by WCC. Impact on sewerage will need to be mitigated against. Hydraulic modelling would be required. Any allocation here should avoid the features of ecological interest and will require mitigation and buffering from harm. Accordingly, the developable area may be reduced. | The site as it stands would be ruled out for scale, however a smaller cut maybe acceptable. The most suitable access needs to be agreed by WCC. Impact on sewerage will need to be mitigated against. Hydraulic modelling would be required. Any allocation here should avoid the features of ecological interest and will require mitigation and buffering from harm. Accordingly, the developable area may be reduced. | Location |