

Bishampton Category 3

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CFS0125 - Millhaven, Broad Lane, Bishampton	CFS0253 - Land off Main Street, Bishampton	CFS0254 - Land off Broad Lane, Bishampton	CFS0450 - Land off Broad Lane, Bishampton	CFS0455 - The Yard, Main Street, Bishampton
Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3
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.	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Access via private drive (also PROW)	Yes	Access via private drive - suitability questionable	Yes subject to meeting resident requirements	Access via private drive - suitability questionable
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply	Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply	Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply	Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply	Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply
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?	No	No	No	No	No
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	Yes - residential and pub	Questionable as nature reserve to north. Residential and agricultural ok.	Yes - residential and agricultural	Yes - community use and agricultural	Yes - residential and agricultural
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
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 or on archaeology?	No	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	Yes (private access drive adjoins listed building)	Yes - Creates sense of enclosure to the rear of listed building	Yes - Located to the rear of a cluster of listed buildings which form the core of historic core of the settlement	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	Prehistoric, medieval potential - Mitigation	Prehistoric, medieval potential - Evaluation, possible mitigation	Prehistoric, medieval potential - Evaluation, possible mitigation	Prehistoric, medieval potential - Evaluation, possible mitigation	Prehistoric, medieval potential - DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible 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	Further evaluation required	No	Landscape: on prominent rising ground at entrance to the village - would be visually unacceptable	Yes, this site overlaps a grassland inventory site. Landscape: Bishampton is within the Village Claylands Landscape Type and although a nucleated settlement pattern is typical of these landscapes, Bishampton exhibits more of a linear settlement pattern extending along Main Street, but with 'backland' development. There may be scope for some development on this site but I would not wish to see the western part of the site developed extending uncomfortably into open countryside away from the main pattern of settlement of the village.
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?	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?	yes overland flood flows from NW to SE and major flood flow route on eastern boundary	potential ponding at southern boundary but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	yes high risk of surface water flooding from highway and adjacent watercourse. Flood attenuation tanks located underground within upper part of the site	yes overland flood flows from SW to NE	potential surface water flows in western part of the site but 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	No	No	No
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	No History of Potential Contamination Land activities	Potential Contamination Land on site - Record of an oil leak. Risk Assessment and likely Site Investigation required.	Potential Contamination Land on site - Unknown Filled Ground (Pond). PQI site adjacent - Garage. Risk Assessment and likely Site Investigation required.	No history, but caution contamination from any previous agricultural practices?	No history, but caution contamination from any previous agricultural practices?
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Yes - 160m	Yes - 180m	Yes - 240m	Yes - 380m	Yes - 160m
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.	no primary school or doctors surgery, 230m from shop/post office and 180m from village hall	no primary school or doctors surgery, 440m from shop/post office and 500m from village hall	no primary school or doctors surgery, 140m from shop/post office and 170m from village hall	no primary school or doctors surgery, 390m from shop/post office and adjacent to the village hall	no primary school or doctors surgery, 430m from shop/post office and 720m from village hall
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	Yes - No local school, 20-30 min cycle or >30 min walk to nearest schools, reliance on car travel and isolated community. Local shop. Decision might be different if Throckmorton New Settlement goes ahead with a school.	Yes - No local school, 20-30 min cycle or >30 min walk to nearest schools, reliance on car travel and isolated community. Local shop. Decision might be different if Throckmorton New Settlement goes ahead with a school.	Yes - No local school, 20-30 min cycle or >30 min walk to nearest schools, reliance on car travel and isolated community. Local shop. Decision might be different if Throckmorton New Settlement goes ahead with a school.	Yes - No local school, 20-30 min cycle or >30 min walk to nearest schools, reliance on car travel and isolated community. Local shop. Decision might be different if Throckmorton New Settlement goes ahead with a school.	Yes - No local school, 20-30 min cycle or >30 min walk to nearest schools, reliance on car travel and isolated community. Local shop. Decision might be different if Throckmorton New Settlement goes ahead with a school.
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
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	No - but site looks too small to provide 5 or more dwellings in character with area	No - subject to access improvement requirements	Yes - because it is located to the rear of a cluster of listed buildings which form the core of historic core of the settlement	The site is to the rear of the village hall and rises relatively steeply, any development would therefore be potentially prominent.	Yes - site extends too far west
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	In	In	In	In	In
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No	No	No	No	No
OUTCOME PREFERRED OPTIONS 2019 Summary	Site looks too small to provide 5 or more dwellings in character with area and harm to setting of nearby listed buildings; issue with surface Water flooding (along access drive) - overland flood flows from NW to SE and major flood flow route on eastern boundary. Note - no air quality Mitigation Measures Required	Development would harm the setting of the adjoining listed buildings and could potentially harm adjoining nature reserve. Potential Contamination Land on site - Record of an oil leak, risk Assessment and likely Site Investigation required.	Located to the rear of a cluster of listed buildings which form the core of historic core of the settlement. High risk of surface water flooding from highway and adjacent watercourse - flood attenuation tanks located underground within upper part of the site. Note - standard air quality Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings	The site is to the rear of the village hall and rises relatively steeply, any development would therefore be potentially prominent. Surface water issues - overland flood flows from SW to NE. Note - standard air quality Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings	Bishampton exhibits a linear settlement pattern extending along Main Street, but with some 'backland' development. There may be scope for some development on this site but not the western part of the site which would extend uncomfortably into open countryside away from the main pattern of settlement of the village - but uncertain how smaller cut could be successfully achieved and access appears to be via a private drive and is therefore likely to be sub-standard. Note - Standard air quality Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings
OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022 Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
OUTCOME PUBLICATION 2022 Summary	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change