

Clifton upon Teme Category 1

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CFS0042, Hope Lane, Clifton upon Teme	CFS0042sc, Hope Lane, Clifton upon Teme	CFS0425, Blushot Works, Pound Lane, Clifton-on-Teme	CFS0425sc, Blushot Works, Pound Lane, Clifton-on-Teme
	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1
Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1	Category 1
Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	No legal constraints, available within 5 years and landowners supportive.	No legal constraints, available within 5 years and landowners supportive.	No legal constraints, available immediately and landowners supportive.	No legal constraints, available immediately and landowners supportive.
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	No	No	No	No
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	<p>Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: low</p> <p>Potential impact on sewage infrastructure: low</p> <p>Development size in relation to the existing network may cause some issues, however no reported flooding or pollution issues.</p> <p>Outfall assumption: nearby watercourse</p> <p>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.</p> <p>Existing hydraulic capacity at the Sewage Treatment Works is less than required and investment would be required.</p> <p>Development size in relation to the existing network may cause some issues, however no reported flooding or pollution issues. The cumulative growth in this catchment may have an impact at the Sewage Treatment Works which currently serve a small population.</p>	<p>Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: low</p> <p>Potential impact on sewage infrastructure: low</p> <p>Development size in relation to the existing network may cause some issues, however no reported flooding or pollution issues.</p> <p>Outfall assumption: nearby watercourse</p> <p>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.</p>	<p>Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: low</p> <p>Potential impact on sewage infrastructure: medium</p> <p>Outfall assumption: nearby watercourse</p> <p>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.</p> <p>This development is large in comparison to the existing network. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to understand the potential impact on the network.</p>	<p>Sewerage: The sewer network is likely to have capacity as connection direct to Clifton Upon Teme Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) is likely to be possible. However, there are significant constraints with the environmental conditions of the watercourse even with best available technology and this site should be avoided if possible.</p>
Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No	No	No
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No	No	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	Would go against CH1 and CH2, however, these are considered to be policies for Development Management purposes rather than plan making purposes. The site would not conflict with other Neighbourhood Plan Policies such as key views or open space in any significant way.	Would go against CH1 and CH2, however, these are considered to be policies for Development Management purposes rather than plan making purposes. The site would not conflict with other Neighbourhood Plan Policies such as key views or open space in any significant way.	Would go against CH1 and CH2, however, these are considered to be policies for Development Management purposes rather than plan making purposes. The site would not conflict with other Neighbourhood Plan Policies such as key views or open space in any significant way.	Would go against CH1 and CH2, however, these are considered to be policies for Development Management purposes rather than plan making purposes. The site would not conflict with other Neighbourhood Plan Policies such as key views or open space in any significant way.
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Adjacent to a open fields, residential development which would need amenity safeguarding through sympathetic design, and sewage works?	Adjacent to a open fields, residential development which would need amenity safeguarding through sympathetic design, and sewage works?	Adjacent to a open fields, residential development which would need amenity safeguarding through sympathetic design	Adjacent to a open fields, residential development which would need amenity safeguarding through sympathetic design
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Protect and enhance	Protect and enhance	Protect and enhance	Protect and enhance
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or on archaeology?	DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. medieval Occupation	DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. medieval Occupation	DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. medieval occupation	DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. medieval occupation
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)?	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site?	No	No	May impact on SSSI	May impact on SSSI
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	No	No	No	No
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	Yes Grade 2	Yes Grade 2	Yes Grade 2	Yes - Grade 2
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	No History of PCL activities on site in regards to land contamination. Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings	No History of PCL activities on site in regards to land contamination. Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings	PCL on site - Unknown Filled Ground (Pond), Risk Assessment and likely Site Investigation required in terms of land contamination. Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings	PCL on site - Unknown Filled Ground (Pond), Risk Assessment and likely Site Investigation required in terms of land contamination. 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 - 4-500m Nearest Train Worcester 20km	Bus - 4-500m Nearest Train Worcester 20km	Bus 500-600m Nearest Train Worcester 20km	Bus 500-600m Nearest Train Worcester 20km
How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service.	Primary School 4-500m General Store and Post Office: 4-500m Doctors: None within village Village Hall: 0-100m	Primary School 4-500m General Store and Post Office: 4-500m Doctors: None within village Village Hall: 0-100m	Primary School 500-600m General Store and Post Office: 500-600m Doctors: None within village Village Hall: 100-200m	Primary School 500-600m General Store and Post Office: 500-600m Doctors: None within village Village Hall: 100-200m
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Due to size it is not considered it would have an adverse impact on local health provision
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	No	No	No	No
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	Due to the development of the site on Pound Lane - no.	Due to the development of the site on Pound Lane - no.	The site is large and as such if the whole site was allocated the development would have a material affect on the character of the settlement. Conversely, due to development on the B4204, the very northern parcel of land submitted within the site could be developed without major impact on the character of the village as could the southern part. Both would represent continuations in the urban form of the village extending to the north and east.	No
Outcome Preferred Options 2019	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Ruled out	Ruled in	Ruled out
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	Yes - part of the site is already allocated	No - see below for reasoning	No
Summary	The site in its entirety would be too large as Clifton has experience a lot of growth. As such as smaller out of the land is proposed.	The site will not have any significant impacts. The site is also already partly allocated and would represent a natural extension to the village.	The whole site should be ruled out due to scale but the south section of the site would be acceptable subject to land contamination investigation, however CFS0042 is preferred.	The site is suitable as a reasonable alternative subject to land contamination investigation CFS0042 is preferred as an allocation
Outcome Publication 2022	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Ruled in	In	Ruled out - Scale
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	Yes	No	No	No - see below for reasoning
Summary	Due to a need to provide more housing throughout South Worcestershire, this site in its entirety is now considered suitable for allocation, rather than just a smaller out. The site is relatively constraint free, already partly allocated as part of the SWDP and is bounded by other residential development, creating a natural extension to the village.	It was deemed appropriate to allocate the larger out of land - CFS0042	The whole site should be ruled out due to scale but the south section of the site would be acceptable subject to land contamination investigation, however CFS0042 is preferred.	The site is suitable as a reasonable alternative subject to land contamination investigation CFS0042 is preferred as an allocation

Clifton upon Teme Category 1

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CFS0492, Broadfield, The Village, Clifton upon Teme	CFS0495, Blueshot Works, Pound Lane, Clifton-on-Teme
	Category 1	Category 1
Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 1	Category 1
Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	No legal constraints, available within 5 years and landowners supportive.	No legal constraints, available within 5 years and landowners supportive.
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	No	No
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Yes	Yes
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Yes	Yes
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	<p>Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: medium</p> <p>Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: low</p> <p>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Outfall assumption: No nearby watercourse and no SW provision</p>	<p>Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: low</p> <p>Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: low</p> <p>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Outfall assumption: Nearby SW system</p>
Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	Unknown	Unknown
Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	Would go against CH1 and CH2, however, these are considered to be policies for Development Management purposes rather than plan making purposes. The site would not conflict with other Neighbourhood Plan Policies such as key views or open space in any significant way.	Would go against CH1 and CH2, however, these are considered to be policies for Development Management purposes rather than plan making purposes. The site would not conflict with other Neighbourhood Plan Policies such as key views or open space in any significant way.
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Located to the rear of existing residential development in a backland location meaning it would have an impact on numerous residential properties. Sympathetic design would be crucial to avoid overlooking/other amenity issues.	This small strip of land is bounded by open agricultural fields and residential properties. Sympathetic design would be needed so that the amenity of existing properties is not compromised.
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Protect and enhance	Protect and enhance
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or on archaeology?	Site is partly located within a CA, medieval Occupation Evaluation and possible mitigation needed.	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Setting of Gil Church and various Gil LBs	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	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
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	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	No
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	Yes Grade 2	Yes Grade 2
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	No History of PCL activities on site in regards to land contamination. Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings	No History of PCL activities on site in regards to land contamination. No mitigation measures required in regards to air quality
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Bus - 0-100m Nearest Train Worcester 20km	Bus 100-200m Nearest Train Worcester 20km
How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service.	Primary School: 300-400m General Store and Post Office: 0-100m Doctors: None within village Village Hall: 400-500m	Primary School: 100-200m General Store and Post Office: 400-500m Doctors: None within village Village Hall: 400-500m
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	No	yes
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	No	No
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	The site would represent unnatural backland development to the existing village core.	No
Outcome Preferred Options 2019		
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Ruled out due to impact on Historic Environment.	Ruled in
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No - see below for reasoning	No - see reasoning below.
Summary	This would have an impact on the setting of a Gil Listed building and Conservation Area. It would also represent backland development and as such development here would extend the village in an unnatural way that would be out of character with the village and adjoining Conservation Area.	The site could be allocated although there are concerns as to how it would be accessed due to the shape of the site being long and narrow. As such, CFS0042 is preferred
Outcome Publication 2022		
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Ruled out due to impact on Historic Environment.	Ruled in
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No - see below for reasoning	No - see reasoning below.
Summary	This would have an impact on the setting of a Gil Listed building and Conservation Area. It would also represent backland development and as such development here would extend the village in an unnatural way that would be out of character with the village and adjoining Conservation Area.	The site could potentially be allocated although there are concerns as to how it would be accessed due to the shape of the site being long and narrow. As such, CFS0042 is preferred