

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0218 - Highfield, Church Lane, Tibberton	CFS0379 - Land on the north side of Church Lane, Tibberton
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2
	Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	Yes - Available within 5 years	Yes - Available now
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	100% Flood Zone 1.	100% Flood Zone 1
	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?	WCC Highways - access considered achievable.	WCC Highways - access considered achievable.
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	LOW IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network. No SW sewer or nearby watercourse. MEDIUM IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER, Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	MEDIUM IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - There are known hydraulic flooding incidents in the downstream network. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is undertaken. Possible additional risks if a surface water is unable to be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. Lack of surface water network and distance to watercourse indicates this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foul network. MEDIUM IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER, Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	No	No
	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?	No	No
	Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Yes - housing	Yes - housing
	OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Protect and Restore
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?		No - CA. Archaeology - Prehistoric, Romano/British, medieval potential/Evaluation, possible mitigation	No - CA. Archaeology - Significant site possibly of national significance. Land is contaminated from 2001 cattle slaughter with foot and mouth disease.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).		Yes	Yes
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?		CFS0379 and CFS0218 – Tibberton is within the Settled Farmlands with Pastoral Land Use Landscape Type which has an identified 'Dispersed settlement pattern of farmsteads and groups of wayside dwellings.' Whilst Tibberton does have some development extending further back from the main road, the main pattern of settlement relates to the main road through the village in a linear pattern of wayside development. Development on this site would result in a nucleation of settlement in the vicinity of the church and would not respect the identified or existing settlement pattern of the village as a whole, and in particular this part of the village – and so would not respect settlement pattern as an indicator of landscape character. Furthermore, the rural landscape character in the vicinity of the church would be adversely affected. May also involve the loss of established vegetation to site boundaries with the creation of an access and any required visibility splays, which would also impact adversely on the rural character of Church Lane.	Yes - large site in open countryside. Unacceptable visual impact in consideration of cumulative impact with Worcester 6 and loss of views towards Tibberton church and associated hamlet on hillside. Would not respect rural landscape character. CFS0379 and CFS0218 – Tibberton is within the Settled Farmlands with Pastoral Land Use Landscape Type which has an identified 'Dispersed settlement pattern of farmsteads and groups of wayside dwellings.' Whilst Tibberton does have some development extending further back from the main road, the main pattern of settlement relates to the main road through the village in a linear pattern of wayside development. Development on this site would result in a nucleation of settlement in the vicinity of the church and would not respect the identified or existing settlement pattern of the village as a whole, and in particular this part of the village – and so would not respect settlement pattern as an indicator of landscape character. Furthermore, the rural landscape character in the vicinity of the church would be adversely affected. May also involve the loss of established vegetation to site boundaries with the creation of an access and any required visibility splays, which would also impact adversely on the rural character of Church Lane.
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 details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	No details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?		No	No
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?		Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.		No - 890m	No - 820m
How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service.		School: 1000m. Village Hall: 918m. Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.	Yes. School: 740m. Village Hall: 625m. Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?		No but conditional	No but conditional
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.		No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton	No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	Yes	Yes	
OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Heritage / landscape	Out - Heritage
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No
	Summary	Impact on the rural character and does not respect the traditional pattern of development. Would impact on the setting of the church. CFS0630asc considered the preferred site.	Impact on the rural character and does not respect the traditional pattern of development. Would impact on the setting of the church. CFS0630asc considered the preferred site.
OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Heritage	Out - Heritage
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No
	Summary	No change	No

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0529 - Court End Farm, Tibberton	CFS0630a - Speed The Plough, Tibberton
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2
	Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	Yes - Available within 5 years	Yes - Available
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1
	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?	No - Highways advise the use of the existing access for the proposed housing allocation is unacceptable.	The site has been submitted to WCC Highways, no access concerns
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	LOW IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network. No SW sewer or nearby watercourse. MEDIUM IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.	HIGH IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - Development site is very large in comparison with existing network. Storage at Plough Rd SPS is likely to be deficient. Further hydraulic modelling recommended. LOW IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. Adjacent watercourse.
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	No	CA. Habitat, LWS, SSSI, TPO
	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?	No	No
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Yes - housing	Yes - housing / pub	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Protect and Restore	Protect and Restore
	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?	Yes impact on conservation area. Evaluation, possible mitigation. Romano/British, medieval potential	DBA survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation/Prehistoric, Romano/British, medieval potential
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).	No	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 landscape objection subject to retention and supplementation of boundary vegetation	Yes, this site overlaps a traditional orchard. This site overlaps a traditional orchard and sits next to woodland and large hedges. Any allocation here should avoid the features of ecological interest and will require mitigation and buffering from harm. Accordingly, the developable area may be reduced.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	TPO nearby	Yes - entire site
	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	Yes, possibly
	Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	yes overland flood flows form higher ground behind the site	The larger site (0630a) has various sources of surface water flooding within the site. The railway culvert at the NE corner of the site potentially generates large areas of flooding upstream
	Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	No	No
	Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities	Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings/PCL on site - Quarry, PCL sites adjacent - sewage works, railway tracks. Risk Assessment required.
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Yes - 180m	Yes - adjacent site
	How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service.	Yes. School: 370m, Village Hall: 350m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.	Yes. School: 180m, Village Hall: 420m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.
	Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	No but conditional	No but conditional
	Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton	No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	No	No	
OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	In	Out - scale
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	Yes	No
	Summary	Potential location to deliver a small scale development to replicate Hawthorne Rise.	The site as it stands would be ruled out for scale, however a smaller cut maybe acceptable. The most suitable access needs to be agreed by WCC, impact on sewerage will require mitigation. Hydraulic modelling would be required. Any allocation here should avoid the features of ecological interest and will require mitigation and buffering from harm. Accordingly, the developable area may be reduced.
OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Access	Out - scale
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No
	Summary	Allocation Removed. Update 2021: Highways advise the use of the existing access for the proposed housing allocation is unacceptable. This site (SWDP NEW 56) no longer a proposed housing allocation in the SWDP	No change

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0630asc - Speed The Plough, Tibberton (smaller cut of CFS630a)	CFS1180 – North of Court End Farm, Tibberton (north of CFS0529)
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Yes - Cat 2	Yes - Cat 2
	Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	Yes - Available	Yes - Available within 5 years
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1
	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?	The site has been submitted to WCC Highways, no access concerns	No - Highways advise the use of the existing access for the proposed housing allocation is unacceptable.
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	HIGH IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - Development site is very large in comparison with existing network. Storage at Plough Rd SPS is likely to be deficient. Further hydraulic modelling recommended. LOW IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. Adjacent watercourse.	LOW IMPACT ON SEWERAGE - Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network. No SW sewer or nearby watercourse. MEDIUM IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	Habitat, LWS, SSSI	No
	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?	No	No
	Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Yes housing	Yes - housing
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Protect and Restore	Protect and restore
	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?	DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation. Prehistoric, Romano/British, medieval potential	Yes impact on conservation area. Evaluation, possible mitigation. Romano/British, medieval potential
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building(s).	No	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?	Whilst this site is fairly well contained visually, development on it would not respect settlement pattern to this side of Plough Road. CFS1180 is preferable. Yes, this site overlaps a traditional orchard and sits next to woodland and large hedges. Any allocation here should avoid the features of ecological interest and will require mitigation and buffering from harm. Accordingly, the developable area may be reduced.	No landscape objection subject to retention and supplementation of boundary vegetation
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	Yes - entire site	TPO nearby
	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?	Yes, possibly	No
	Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	This comment relates to the larger site as a whole (0630a) - has various sources of surface water flooding within the site. The railway culvert at the NE corner of the site potentially generates large areas of flooding upstream.	yes overland flood flows form higher ground behind the site
	Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	No	No
	Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings/PCL on site - Quarry, PCL sites adjacent - sewage works, railway tracks. Risk Assessment required.	Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings. No History of PCL activities
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Yes - adjacent site	Yes - 250m
	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.	Yes, School: 180m, Village Hall: 420m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.	Yes, School: 370m, Village Hall: 350m, Doctors: n/a. No employment opps.
	Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	No but conditional	no but conditional
	Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton	No NDP in Tibberton
	Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	No	Yes
OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	In - smaller cut	Site considered following Preferred Options stage
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	Yes	n/a
	Summary	The site as it stands would be ruled out for scale, however a smaller cut maybe acceptable. The most suitable access needs to be agreed by WCC. Impact on sewerage will need to be mitigated against. Hydraulic modelling would be required. Any allocation here should avoid the features of ecological interest and will require mitigation and buffering from harm. Accordingly, the developable area should be reduced.	n/a
OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	In - smaller cut of CFS0630a	Out - access
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	Yes - Proposed allocation (SWDP NEW 57)	No
	Summary	No change	Allocation Removed. Update 2021 - Removed as a proposed housing allocation (was SWDPR NEW 56). Highways advise the use of the existing access is unacceptable.