

Fernhill Heath - Category 1

| SHELAA Site Reference and Address: | | CFS0049 Land off Station Road, Fernhill Heath | CFS0684. Land between Kennels Land and Station Road, Fernhill Heath | CFS0274 Land at Tapenhall Farm, Lower Town, Fernhill Heath |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| MAJOR CRITERIA | Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village? | Category 1 | Category 1 | Category 1 |
| | Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone. | FZ 1 | FZ 1 | FZ 1 |
| | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | No | No | No |
| | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway? | Yes - to West of Site on Station Road. No further assessment required as site not to be taken forward as allocation. | Yes most likely via Kennels Lane. Though no further assessment required as site ruled out through SHELAA. | Yes most likely on Dilmore Lane or Kennels Lane. No further assessment required as site ruled out through SHELAA. |
| | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area? | High. This site will drain to Kennel's Lane SPS which has storage deficiencies and pollution issues. This development and surrounding developments will increase the risk to Kennel's Lane SPS and improvements will likely be required. | High. This site will drain to Kennel's Lane SPS which has storage deficiencies and pollution issues. This development and surrounding developments will increase the risk to Kennel's Lane SPS and improvements will likely be required. | High. This site will drain to Kennel's Lane SPS which has storage deficiencies and pollution issues. This development and surrounding developments will increase the risk to Kennel's Lane SPS and improvements will likely be required. |
| | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance? | No | No | No |
| | Is the site in Green Belt? | No | No | No |
| | Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of? | No | No | No |
| | Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what? | Yes. North Claines Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2017. Any development of this site would need to meet the policy criteria set out in the housing, landscape and environment, design and community sections of the neighbourhood plan. | Yes. North Claines Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2017. Any development of this site would need to meet the policy criteria set out in the housing, landscape and environment, design and community sections of the neighbourhood plan. | Yes. North Claines Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2017. Any development of this site would need to meet the policy criteria set out in the housing, landscape and environment, design and community sections of the neighbourhood plan. |
| | Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are. | The southern edge of the site is adjacent to the built up area of the village but any allocation would extend the built form into the open countryside. However the site is contained by the railway line and minor road which may reduce the impact of any development in this locality. | Allocation of the site would extend the developed area of the village into the open countryside although the southern edge of the site is adjacent to the existing urban edge. Part of the site is also covered by an extent, but as yet unimplemented, planning permission for residential development at The Kennels. | Any allocation would result in a significant increase in the built up area of the settlement and extend development into the open countryside and see the main part of the village join to Lower Town. |
| OTHER CRITERIA | Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | GI - Protect and Restore | GI - Protect and Restore | GI - Protect and Restore |
| | Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space? | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area? | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s). | No | No | Yes. The majority of the site could be developed without concern, but the northern-western and western edge of the site have the potential to impact on LBS. Could probably be mitigated by landscaping. |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument or archaeology? | No. Possible prehistoric settlement, medieval agricultural activity. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. | No. Possible prehistoric settlement, medieval agricultural activity. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. | No. Possible prehistoric settlement, medieval agricultural activity. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site? | No | Yes. The site overlaps with a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and any development may have a detrimental impact. If allocated the LWS element should be excluded from the site boundary. | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs. | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap? | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland? | No | No | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow? | 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 | Yes. Some surface water flooding associated with the Martin Brook which runs through the middle of the site. | Yes. Some surface water flooding through the middle of the site. |
| | Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land? | Grade 3 | Grade 3 | Grade 2/3 |
| | Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development? | No | No | No |
| | Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance. | No. Bus stop 144; 144A; 355; 51; 523 1km | No. Bus stop 144; 144A; 355; 51; 523 1.2km | No. Bus stop 144; 144A; 355; 51; 523 1.4km |
| | 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. | Village hall 1km; school 1km; public house 1km; Post Office/shop 1km | Village hall 1.6km; school 1.7km; public house 1.2km; Post Office/shop 1.5km | Village hall 1.5km; school 1.6km; public house 1.3km; Post Office/shop 1.6km |
| | Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision? | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| | Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan. | The North Claines Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2017. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, i.e. improvements to public transport, natural environment and community facilities. | The North Claines Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2017. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, i.e. improvements to public transport, natural environment and community facilities. | The North Claines Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2017. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, i.e. improvements to public transport, natural environment and community facilities. |
| | Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | No | No | The allocation of this site would significantly increase the built form of the settlement and extend the village envelope northwards into the open countryside. |
| OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019 | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason? | In | Out. Site has planning permission. | Out. scale site too large. |
| | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR? | No | No | No |
| | Summary | The site is removed from the village facilities and services and would extend into the open countryside if allocated, although it is contained to a certain extent by the railway line and minor road. There are no significant environmental constraints. ST have identified a possible need to upgrade sewerage treatment and the site is within 400m of a gas pipeline. | The site is removed from the village facilities and services and would extend development into the open countryside if allocated although there are no significant environmental constraints other than the part designation of a LWS. Part of the site enjoys an extant planning permission therefore the principle of development, in part, has been established for 90 dwellings allowed on appeal (W/14/00308/PN) in 2015. ST have identified a possible need to upgrade sewerage treatment and the site is within 400m of a gas pipeline. | The site is better located to facilities and services although any allocation would extend development into the open countryside. No significant landscape or environmental impacts identified although potential impact on listed buildings to the north and west edges of the site. ST have identified a possible need to upgrade sewerage treatment and the site is within 400m of a gas pipeline. |
| OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022 | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason? | No Change | No Change | No Change |
| | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR? | No Change | No Change | No Change |
| | Summary | No Change | No Change | No Change |

Fernhill Heath - Category 1

| SHELAA Site Reference and Address: | | CFS0689 Land west of Dilmore Lane, Fernhill Heath |
|--|--|--|
| MAJOR CRITERIA | Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village? | Category 1 |
| | Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)? | Yes |
| | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone. | FZ 1 |
| | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? | Yes |
| | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway? | Yes |
| | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area? | Medium. This site will drain to Kenne's Lane SPS which has storage deficiencies and pollution issues. This development and surrounding developments will increase the risk to Kenne's Lane SPS and improvements will likely be required. |
| | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance? | No |
| | Is the site in Green Belt? | No |
| | Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of? | No |
| | Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what? | Yes. North Claines Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2017. Any development of this site would need to meet the policy criteria set out in the housing, landscape and environment, design and community sections of the neighbourhood plan. |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are. | Tapenhall farm to the north, Dilmore Lane is adjacent to the east boundary, Fernhill Heath Development Boundary and residential dwellings is adjacent to the southern boundary and fields to the west. | |
| OTHER CRITERIA | Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network? | GI - Protect and Restore |
| | Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space? | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area? | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s). | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument or archaeology? | No. Possible prehistoric settlement, medieval agricultural activity, DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site? | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs. | No |
| | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap? | 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 has been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it? | No |
| | Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land? | Grade 2 |
| | Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development? | No |
| | Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance. | No. Bus stop 144; 144A; 355; S2 500m |
| | 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. | Village hall 1.4km; school 1.5km; public house 1km; Post Office/shop 1.3km |
| | Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision? | Yes |
| | Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan. | The North Claines Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in 2017. The NP identifies several infrastructure initiatives that could benefit from CIL, neighbourhood proportion from any development in the village, i.e. improvements to public transport, natural environment and community facilities. |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | No | |
| OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019 | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason? | In |
| | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR? | Yes. Allocate for 70 dwellings |
| | Summary | A site allocation here could serve as rounding off the edge of the settlement with the new extended building line created by the SWDP allocation at Dilmore Lane. The site is not subject to any significant environmental constraints and is well located to public transport. |
| OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022 | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason? | No Change |
| | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR? | No Change |
| | Summary | No Change |