

Bayton Category 2

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CFS0820, Land South of Clows Top Road, Bayton	CFS0821, Land North of Clows Top Road, Bayton	CFS0822, Land at Bayton	CFS1206 Land to centre of Bayton	CFS1206ec Land to centre of Bayton	CFS1207 Land to North of Bayton
Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 2	Category 2	Category 2	Category 2	Category 2	Category 2
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 with support from land owner	No legal constraints, available within 5 years with support from land owner	No legal constraints, available within 5 years with support from land owner	No legal constraints, available within 5 years with support from land owner	No legal constraints, available within 5 years with support from land owner	No legal constraints, available within 5 years with support from land owner
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 1	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?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Yes	Further evaluation required	Yes	Yes	The site largely encompasses a previous SWDP adopted site and therefore the principle of safe access onto the site has already been established.	No - road too narrow to accommodate further development traffic
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	There is no public sewerage system in Bayton nearest Sewage Treatment Work catchments are at either Cleobury Mortimer or at Pound Bank both over 3km away. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourse/ponds where available. Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: High	There is no public sewerage system in Bayton nearest Sewage Treatment Work catchments are at either Cleobury Mortimer or at Pound Bank both over 3km away. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourse/ponds where available. Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: High	There is no public sewerage system in Bayton nearest Sewage Treatment Work catchments are at either Cleobury Mortimer or at Pound Bank both over 3km away. Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourse/ponds where available. Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: High	There is no public sewerage system in Bayton nearest Sewage Treatment Work catchments are at either Cleobury Mortimer or at Pound Bank both over 3km away.	There is no public sewerage system in Bayton nearest Sewage Treatment Work catchments are at either Cleobury Mortimer or at Pound Bank both over 3km away.	There is no public sewerage system in Bayton nearest Sewage Treatment Work catchments are at either Cleobury Mortimer or at Pound Bank both over 3km away.
Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	unimproved grassland? Boundary with woodland. Closer investigation of ecological assets needed. Coupled with CFS0822 this represents a very substantial allocation in a sensitive part of the county. Whilst we do not know of any designations on site there is a very significant risk of high value ecological assets being affected. Accordingly we recommend that further work be carried out prior to allocation to determine what, if any, constraints exist on site and what impact they may have on the developable area.	In accordance with comments received on other sites, due to the location and size of this site it is considered that there is a very significant risk of high value ecological assets being affected and as such more details are needed prior to establish what ecological assets might be affected.	Coupled with CFS0820 this represents a very substantial allocation in a sensitive part of the county. Whilst we do not know of any designations on site there is a very significant risk of high value ecological assets being affected. Accordingly we recommend that further work be carried out prior to allocation to determine what, if any, constraints exist on site and what impact they may have on the developable area.	No	No	In accordance with comments received on other sites, due to the location and size of this site it is considered that there is a very significant risk of high value ecological assets being affected and as such more details are needed prior to establish what ecological assets might be affected.
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	The site is bounded by fields and residential properties. It is located in a backland location and the amenity of the bounded residential properties would need to be safeguarded by method of sympathetic design.	The site bounds open fields along with a small residential estate. The gardens on the eastern boundary of this estate directly bound the site, and the amenity of these dwellings would be impacted by the proposed development.	This site bounds agricultural buildings, open fields and a residential property. A such, sympathetic design would be needed.	The site is located in the middle of Bayton and is surrounded, for the most part, by other residential properties. To the rear of the site is open grassland. As such the surrounding land uses are compatible with residential development.	The site is located in the middle of Bayton and is surrounded, for the most part, by other residential properties. To the rear of the site is open grassland. As such the surrounding land uses are compatible with residential development.	The site is located in the middle of Bayton and is surrounded, for the most part, by other residential properties. To the rear of the site is open grassland. As such the surrounding land uses are compatible with residential development.
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	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	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or on archaeology?	Adjacent to CA Prehistorical archaeological potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation needed.	Adjacent to CA Prehistorical archaeological potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation needed.	Part in CA Prehistorical archaeological potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation needed.	Yes the site is located within a Conservation Area	Yes the site is located within a Conservation Area	Yes the site is located within a Conservation Area
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Adjacent to GI LB	Adjacent to GI LB	The site is near to a number of Listed Buildings. Will also impact NDHA.	The site is near to a number of Listed Buildings. Will also impact NDHA.	The site is near to a number of Listed Buildings. Will also impact NDHA.	The site is near to a number of Listed Buildings. Will also impact NDHA.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	No	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodlands?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3 and 4
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 1:10 residential dwellings in regards to air quality No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required.	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 1:10 residential dwellings in regards to air quality No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required.	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 1:10 residential dwellings in regards to air quality No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required.	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 1:10 residential dwellings in regards to air quality No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required.	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 1:10 residential dwellings in regards to air quality No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required.	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 1:10 residential dwellings in regards to air quality No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required.
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Bus Stop 3-400m	Bus Stop -3-400m	Bus stop 400m	Bus stop 400m	Bus stop 400m	Bus stop 400m
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: 3-400m General Store: None in village Post Office: None in village Doctors Surgery: None in village Village Hall: 3-400m	Primary School: 3-400m General Store: None in village Post Office: None in village Doctors Surgery: None in village Village Hall: 3-400m	Primary School: 1-200m General Store: None in village Post Office: None in village Doctors Surgery: None in village Village Hall: 3-400m	Primary School: 1-200m General Store: None in village Post Office: None in village Doctors Surgery: None in village Village Hall: 3-400m	Primary School: 1-200m General Store: None in village Post Office: None in village Doctors Surgery: None in village Village Hall: 3-400m	Primary School: 1-200m General Store: None in village Post Office: None in village Doctors Surgery: None in village Village Hall: 3-400m
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	No	No	No	Yes but addressable	Yes but addressable	Yes but addressable
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	Yes, as the site would form backland development and would not follow the linear roads which other development within the village predominantly follows.	The site is large in comparison with the size of the village, the site would alter the character of the settlement due to the size and the currently sporadic nature of the village.	This is a relatively large site in comparison with the size of the village and as such development would result in the character of the settlement being altered.	No - land sits in the centre of the settlement, however site area considered to materially affect the character	No - land sits in the centre of the settlement	Yes - scale is too large and would materially affect the character at the northern end of the village
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Ruled out - scale, topography, historic environment and significant risk of high value ecological assets being affected.	Ruled out due to scale.	Ruled out - significant risk of high value ecological assets being affected and the topography of the site does not lend itself to allocation.	The site was submitted after the PO	The site was submitted after the PO	The site was submitted after the PO
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No	No	The site was submitted after the PO	The site was submitted after the PO	The site was submitted after the PO
Summary	Potentially should be ruled out on ecological grounds. Also will impact setting of LB and adjacent CA. Also a high risk to sewerage network and the ground is steep and undulating. The site would also form backland development and would materially affect the character of the settlement as far too large.	Nearby LB and adjacent Conservation Area. Also potential archaeological impacts. The site would also result in urban sprawl and would materially alter the character of the settlement due to its size.	Potentially should be ruled out on ecological grounds. Also will impact setting of LB. Also a high risk to sewerage network and the ground is steep and undulating.	The site was submitted after the PO	The site was submitted after the PO	The site was submitted after the PO
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Ruled out - scale, topography, historic environment and significant risk of high value ecological assets being affected.	Ruled out due to scale.	Ruled out - historic environment and the topography of the site does not lend itself to allocation.	Ruled out due to scale and impact on historic environment	Ruled in	Out - scale and access
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Summary	Potentially should be ruled out on ecological grounds. Also will impact setting of LB and adjacent CA. Also a high risk to sewerage network and the ground is steep and undulating. The site would also form backland development and would materially affect the character of the settlement as far too large.	Nearby LB and adjacent Conservation Area. Also potential archaeological impacts. The site would also result in urban sprawl and would materially alter the character of the settlement due to its size.	Potentially should be ruled out on ecological grounds. Also will impact setting of LB. Also a high risk to sewerage network and the ground is steep and undulating.	Ruled out - the site is its entirety would be too big for the location and as a whole would have a significant impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. It would also materially affect the character of the village. As such the whole site is ruled out.	By virtue of being a smaller cut of CFS1206 the sites impact on the historic environment is greatly mitigated. Further more the site of a smaller cut is not so overbearing on the village. Part of the site is allocated as a SWDP allocation and this smaller cut extends that.	The site in its entirety is too large compared to the village and would represent an unnatural extension to the village. The potential site for a smaller cut to be allocated is sloping and as such cannot be allocated due to the topography and access would also be problematic. The site is therefore ruled out.

MAJOR CRITERIA

OTHER CRITERIA

OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019

OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022