

Kempsey Category 1

	SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CF50124b - Land west of Old Road South, Kempsey	CF50184 - Plot 1 - Land off Main Road, Kempsey	CF50185 - Plot 2 - Land off Main Road, Kempsey	CF50300 - LAND OFF BROOK CLOSE, KEMPSEY	CF51023 - Land off Napleton Lane, Kempsey
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	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	Category 1 - adjacent to 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
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	Partially. Flood Zones 2 and 3 along western boundary.	Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1
	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	Yes
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Access appears achievable	Access appears achievable	Access appears achievable	Yes	Potential access issues - further evaluation required
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	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.	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	impact zone SSSI	Site 135m from Napleton Meadow 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?	Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site has potential to conflict with Policy K12 (site 65m from South Ham) WBS (St Marys Church) and K18 (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 (Significance) Site 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 (Significance) Site 150m from designated Local Green Space (Policy K11/1)	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 Bannatt Hill Local Green Space (Policy K11/6)
	Are the adjacent/rounding land uses compatible with the 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. Adjacent to residential and Plovers Rise sports and recreation facilities, Kempsey Youth Centre and Bannatt Hill Local Green Space.
	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Networks?	GI - Protect and Restore	GI - Protect and Restore	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	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?	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 and possible further mitigation.	No. 110m from Conservation Area. Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential	No. 250m from Conservation Area. Prehistoric, Romano/British and Medieval potential. DBA survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Yes. Abutting CA setting of grade 1 Listed church. 120m from church	No	No	No	No. 130m from Draycott Lodge.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled 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. Abies boundary of Lower Hams LWS & grassland inventory site. Landscape Officer comments - 'Our 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 - 'encapsulates 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 the site. To the detriment of open views of the Maken Hills to the west. Ecological officer comments - SSSI'	Landscape officer comments - 'Overly visually prominent on the approach to the site. 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'	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 Bertram Lane to south and Beestmans Lane to east.'	
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?	Yes	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?	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	Possibly	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	
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.	Pans 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.	Some areas of site susceptible to surface water flooding - south of site and centre of 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?	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	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 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.	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.	Yes - bus stop. No - rail station.	Yes - bus stop. No - rail station.	Yes - bus stop. No - rail station.	Yes - bus stop. No - rail station.	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.	<400m from Kempsey Primary School <500m from Morrisons Daily store <500m from Kempsey Post Office. <600m from Kempsey Surgery. <250m from Kempsey Village Hall	<1km from Kempsey Primary School <750m from Morrisons Daily store <750m from Kempsey Post Office. <500m from Kempsey Surgery. <250m from Kempsey Village Hall	<1km from Kempsey Primary School <750m from Morrisons Daily store <750m from Kempsey Post Office. <500m from Kempsey Surgery. <250m from Kempsey Village Hall	<1km from Kempsey Primary School <700m from Morrisons Daily store <700m from Kempsey Post Office. <700m from Kempsey Surgery. <700m from Kempsey Village Hall	approx 850m from Kempsey Primary School approx 1km from Morrisons Daily store approx 1km from Kempsey Post Office. approx 1km from Kempsey Surgery. approx 1km from Kempsey Village Hall	
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	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	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	No	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	
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 CA, 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 CA, 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 CA, 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 CA, 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 CA, 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	Possibly. Would extend the development south-eastwards.	
Other Criteria	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Scale. Impact on historic environment. Flood Risk.	Out - Scale and high agricultural land value.	Out - Scale and isolated location.	In	Out - Scale and high agricultural land value.
OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No. Scale. Impact on historic environment. Flood Risk.	No. Scale and high agricultural land value.	No. Scale and isolated location.	Yes	No. Scale and high agricultural land value.
	Summary	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 PkRWF runs west to east through centre of site. Note that whole site is 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 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. Note that whole site is 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. It is close proximity to oil pipeline, potential sewerage and water supply issues and has potential landscape issues. Note that whole site is in sand & gravel safeguarding area.	Small site. Impact on SSSI 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 (most of site Grade 2 agricultural land). Also, potential impact on Napleton Meadow SSSI (130m 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). Note that whole site is sand & gravel safeguarding area.
OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Nature Designation	No Change	Out - Scale	Out - Nature Designation	Out - Scale and Nature Designation
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No Change	No Change	No	No - Scale and Nature Designation
Summary	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. Abies boundary of Lower Hams LWS & grassland inventory site.	No Change	Other sites Preferred. Also considered as a strategic site - see strategic site spreadsheet	Not taking forward as concerns about potential impact on SSSI	No Change	

Kempsey Category 1

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0358 - Land of Pikhams Ferry Lane, Kempsey	CFS0505 - Land of Post Office Lane, Post Office Lane, Kempsey	CFS0552 - Land at Lower Broomhall Farm, Worcester, WR5 2NT, Kempsey	CFS0670 - Land at Brookend, Holdings Lane, Kempsey, Worcester	CFS0671 - Land at Brookend Lane, Kempsey, Worcester
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 1 - adjacent, but not abutting the development boundary	Category 1 - not adjacent to original SWDP development boundary, but adjoining revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary	No. Kempsey is a Category 1 village - site 300m from Kempsey development boundary. Site adjacent to Worcester South 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 contemporaneous to original SWDP development boundary or revised (Neighbourhood Plan) development boundary. About 10m from revised 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
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1	Yes. Flood Zone 3 brook runs from south-west to north-east through the site	Yes. Flood Zone 3 along western boundary of site
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	No. Site 130m from oil pipeline	Yes	No. Site 130m from oil pipeline	Yes	Yes
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Access possible but not a sustainable location	Access appears achievable	Access appears achievable	Access may be achievable but isolated location	Access may be achievable but isolated location
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	No	No	No	No	No
	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?	Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site 300m from South Ham (Policy K12)	Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017.	Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). Site is approx 220m from North Ham (Policy K12)	Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap).	Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017.
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Agriculture. New residential development to north of site	Agriculture. New residential development to west of site	Agriculture. South of Worcester South urban extension.	Agriculture. South-east boundary close to M5 motorway.	Agriculture	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Networks?	GI - Protect and Restore	GI - Protect and Restore	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	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No	No	No	No	Large site, only 300m from Conservation Area.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Site approx 130m from Draycott Lodge and 150m from Draycott Coach House	No	No	Upper Brook-end Farmhouse Listed Building is adjacent to the site	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled 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?	No	Site 170m from SSSI (Napleton Meadow)	Site approx 100m from Site of Regional or Local Importance (Kempsey Upper Ham).	No	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	No	Yes. Whole site in Significant Gap	Yes. Whole site in Significant Gap	No. Adjacent to the Significant Gap
	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?	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated
	Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	Parts on north and south west of site susceptible to surface water flooding	Most of north of site susceptible to surface water flooding	Yes. Large area running north to south of site susceptible to surface water flooding	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.
	Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	Whole site Grade 1 on Agricultural Land Classification	No	Western side of site Grades 1 and 2 on Agricultural Land Classification	No	No
	Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	Site 30m and 150m from 2 sites of contaminated land (Unknown filled ground (pond, river, stream, dock etc))	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.	No	No
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated
	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.	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	
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 CIL, 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 CIL, 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 CIL, 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 CIL, 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 CIL, 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.	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. Isolated development	Yes. Development of site would extend eastern boundary of Kempsey to the Roman Road.	
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out. Scale. High agricultural land value.	In.	Out. Scale	Out. Scale. Isolated location. Flood Risk	Out. Flood Risk. Scale. Isolated location.	
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	Out. Scale. High agricultural land value.	No. 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. Scale	No. Scale. Isolated location. Flood Risk	No. Flood Risk. Scale. Isolated location.	
Summary	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.	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 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 PRow runs from south to north through the site. Noted that western side of site in sand & gravel safeguarding area.	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.	
OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Scale	No Change	No Change	No. Scale and Flood Risk	No Change
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change
	Summary	No Change	No Change	No Change. Also considered as a strategic site - see strategic sites spreadsheet	No Change	No Change
OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Scale	No Change	No Change	No. Scale and Flood Risk	No Change
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change
	Summary	No Change	No Change	No Change. Also considered as a strategic site - see strategic sites spreadsheet	No Change	No Change

Kempsey Category 1

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0987 - Barn along Pixham Ferry Lane, Kempsey	CFS0887- Norton Road, Worcester Kempsey	CFS1177a - The Glasshouse , Rookery Road, Kempsey, WR5 3JP (f1)	CFS1177b - The Glasshouse , Rookery Road, Kempsey, WR5 3JP (f2)	CFS1194 - Land off Pixham Ferry Lane, Kempsey
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 1 - site not continuous to development boundary. Filtered out - 0.16 hectares - too small	Category 1 - adjacent to the development boundary.	Category 1 - adjacent to the development boundary.	Category 1 - adjacent to the 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 Ownership: Single Available Within 5 Years	Yes Ownership: Single Available Within 5 Years	Yes
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	Flood zone 1	100% Flood Zone	20% Flood Zone 2, 80% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 2
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Site 450m from oil pipeline.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No. Site 200m from oil pipeline
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Access appears achievable	Access appears achievable	Access appears to be via a track - would require further evaluation	Potential access issue - requires further evaluation	Access appears achievable
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required	Site ruled out through SHELAA - no further assessment required
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?		No	No	No	No
	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?	Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017.	Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in 2021	Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in 2023	Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in 2024	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 and residential	Residential to the north east. Bounded primarily by greenfield.	Yes - residential	Yes - residential	Agriculture. New residential development to north of site	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Networks?	GI - Protect and Restore	GI - Protect and Restore	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?	N/A	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?	No	No	No	No	No
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	No. Draycot Lodge 180m from site.	No	No	No	Site approx 130m from Draycot Lodge and 150m from Draycot Coach House
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled 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?	No	No	Yes - adjacent to Upper Ham site of regional or local wildlife importance	Potentially - 100m from Upper Ham site of regional or local wildlife importance	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	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?	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated
	Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	No	Parts on north of site susceptible to surface water flooding	Parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding	Parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding	Parts on north and south east 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?	Yes. Grade 1 Agricultural Land Classification	No	Yes. Grade 1 Agricultural Land Classification	Yes. 70% of site Grade 1 Agricultural Land Classification	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?	No. Contaminated land (unknown filled ground) approx. 130m from site.	No, but adjacent site (Barracks site) potentially has asbestos	No	Yes. Sawmilling (Timber treatment)	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.	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated
	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.	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated
	Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated	Further investigation required if the site were to be allocated
	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 CIL, 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 CIL, 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 CIL, 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 CIL, 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 CIL, 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	No	No	No	No.	
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Size - too small. High agricultural land value.	Out - Allocated	Out - Flood Risk	Out - Access	Out - Scale	
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	Out - Size - too small. High agricultural land value.	No - Allocated	No - Flood Risk	No - Access	No - Scale. High agricultural land value.	
Summary	Site not considered appropriate to be allocated because of size (too small) and high agricultural land value. Also, not continuous with the development boundary.	Site allocated in adopted SWDP as part of SWDP 45/1	Site adjacent to Kempsey development boundary but not considered appropriate because of flood risk. Also, proximity to Site of regional or local wildlife importance, access and oil pipeline	Site adjacent to Kempsey development boundary but not considered appropriate because of access. Also, proximity to Site of regional or local wildlife importance and oil pipeline	Site not considered appropriate because of scale and high agricultural land value (Grade 1 agricultural land). Also, 200m from oil pipeline and parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Site not abutting development boundary. Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area.	
OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Size	No Change	No Change	Out - Access	Out - Scale
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No Change	No Change	No Change	No - Access	No - Scale. High agricultural land value.
	Summary	No Change	No Change	No Change	Site adjacent to Kempsey development boundary but not considered appropriate because of access. Also, proximity to Site of regional or local wildlife importance and oil pipeline	Site not considered appropriate because of scale and high agricultural land value (Grade 1 agricultural land). Also, 200m from oil pipeline and parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Site not abutting development boundary. Noted that whole site in sand & gravel safeguarding area.