

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		Land at Kempsey (land parcels 167ha) - CFS0662, CFS0552, CFS0655, CFS0555, CFS0185, CFS0670, CFS0606, CFS0669, CFS0671 & CFS0558
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is there enough land available to accommodate growth on a strategic scale (i.e. housing, employment, GI and supporting infrastructure)?	Yes
	Could the site reasonably meet some of Worcester City's housing and employment needs?	Yes
	Is the site within reasonable walking / cycling distance of an existing or new rail station?	Within cycling (but not walking) distance to Worcestershire Parkway
	Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	Yes
	Is the site prone to fluvial or pluvial flooding? If yes can this be mitigated on site?	The site has the main river - Carrant Brook flowing along the SE boundary. However, due to the topography of the site, the majority of the site is unaffected.
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Sites. CFS0185, 0552 & 0555 all within 450m of oil pipeline
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway? If yes, can the surrounding road network accommodate the additional development?	Yes safe access can be achieved
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area or can it be improved to accommodate the additional development?	Sewerage: This site would double the population currently served by Kempsey catchment. The Kempsey Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) would require a complete overhaul and possible need to relocate due to access difficulties. Due to the size of the development in comparison to the existing network it would likely increase sewer flood risk and network reinforcements would be required. Water Supply: This site will have an impact on the network due to proposed growth already in progress. A growth scheme would be required to confirm the extent of the network reinforcements to provide additional capacity
	Would development of the site compromise an Internationality or Nationally designated site of ecological importance? If yes, can this be mitigated?	Part of site within impact zone of SSSI. Consult NE if Residential development of 100 units or more.
	Is the site in Green Belt?	No
	Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No
	Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	Yes. Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap).
	OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on the Green Infrastructure Network? If yes, can this be mitigated?
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?		No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?		No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on archaeology?		Further evaluation required to ascertain whether site would impact on any areas of archaeological significance
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)?		Listed Building (Upper Brookend Court) on CFS0669
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?		No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Ancient Woodland or Hedgerow / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site? If yes, can it be mitigated against?		The nearby River Severn LWS is a major ecological corridor running the length of the county and so buffering of impacts (including from runoff and recreation) would be a critical component of site design. Similarly, the nearby Kempsey Ham may need to be protected from increased recreational pressures.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs?		No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?		Yes
Would development of the site result in substantial losses of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?		No. Approx 95% of site Grade 3 agricultural land
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site close enough to impact its potential development? If yes, can it be mitigated against?		Number of small filled ground features in northern area of site or in proximity to the boundary - UFG - MHS56110007529, Quarry - WD182/CL, UFG - MHS56110007527, UFG - MHS56110007529, Quarry - WD1700/CL, UFG - MHS56110007532, UFG - MHS56110007531, UFG - MHS56110007533, Number of small infill features in mid and south western portion of site - UFG - MHS561100070892, Quarrying of Sand and Clay - MHS103100113763, Oil spill - WD182/CL (close to mid western boundary section - c. 15m) from boundary, UFG - MHS561100070890 (90m from boundary), UFG - MHS561100070881 (160m to west of boundary), Napleton Farm - Landfill Site - MH421 (c. 210m from southern boundary). Largely small infilled ground features on site. Some assessment would be necessary.
Can the existing education provision accommodate the increased need arising from the development? If no, can further provision be provided to meet the need?		No. Primary and Secondary provision would need to be provided on site
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision? If yes, can it be mitigated against?		Adverse impact on local health provision, but would be addressable
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 CL, including providing new community, recreation and sports facilities (Policy K16), improving community and leisure facilities (Policy K8) and promoting safe, accessible modes of transport (Policy K15).	
Outcome	Ruled in or out of SHELAA?	Out - Scale and isolated
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No
	Summary	Conflict with Significant Gap - would lead to coalescence of Worcester and Kempsey. The site is also not in a sustainable location close to a railway station. As it is not being taken forward it is being ruled out due to the scale of the sites and their isolated location not meeting the SWDPR development strategy. Secondary reasons include potential impacts on sewerage & water network, SSSI and site of regional or local wildlife importance. Also, conflict with made Neighbourhood Plan.