

Lower Broadheath

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		Land at Lower Broadheath (land parcels = 176ha) - CFS0235, CFS0236, CFS0085a, CFS0085b, CFS1110
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 / Tewkesbury's housing and employment needs?	Yes, Worcester
	Is the site within reasonable walking / cycling distance of an existing or new rail station	Periphery of the development will be close enough for cycle access to a train station.
	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?	Parts of parcels 0344 and 1110 are within the high risk flood zones and on historical flood mapping. Small pockets of 1 in 30, 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year surface water flood risk across the site - this would need to be managed through appropriate suole.
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	Yes
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway? If yes, can the surrounding road network accommodate the additional development?	Yes this site can be provided with safe access. Would impact the delivery of a Worcester West link road (LTP4 scheme)
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area or can it be improved to accommodate the additional development?	Sewerage: This site would be in addition to the existing strategic development at Temple Laugheme. An existing capital scheme is in progress to provide capacity and reduce the flooding and pollution risk of the existing planned development. Additional growth in this area draining to Worcester Bromwich Road Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) could be accommodated however additional Network and Treatment works capacity reinforcements would likely be required. Water Supply: This site is considered high risk due to the nature of the other developments proposed for the area, as such a growth scheme will be required to fully assess the total impact of all developments in the vicinity. Early engagement would be highly recommended with the council
	Would development of the site compromise an Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance? If yes, can this be mitigated?	WWT: We do not believe that there will be any adverse impacts on SSSIs but we recommend that this be confirmed through discussions with Natural England.
	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?	No
	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 formal public open space affected
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?		site does not fall within conservation area
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)?		No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?		No SAM within site
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?		Yes, there are several LWS and other areas of priority habitat within and close to the site. These areas must be removed from the developable area of the allocation and resilient ecological corridors must be maintained between them, together with appropriate buffering of the assets themselves. This mitigation may be effective but will require good site design in order to maintain ecological connectivity and function. Effects on ancient trees and hedgerows may be expected and the extent to which these can be mitigated will again depend on site layout decisions. Taken together these issues may lead to a reduction in the overall developable area.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs?		Yes
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?		Yes - entirety of site falls within significant gap
Would development of the site result in substantial losses of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?		Approximately one third of the site falls within grade 2 land - the remainder falls within grade 3
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?		A food processing plant sits within the centre of the site but outside the red line boundary. An AQMA adjoins the boundary to the west
Can the existing education provision accommodate the increased need arising from the development? If no, can further provision be provided to meet the need?		New primary school's will be required. Site is inappropriately placed for existing or proposed secondary schools in Worcester.
Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision? If yes, can it be mitigated against?		Further consultation required with health professionals to determine impact on health and mitigation measures
Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.		No
Outcome		Ruled in or out of SHELAA?
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	No
	Summary	Lower Broadheath is considered to be a further urban extension which will result in development further away from facilities and key infrastructure. The development of this site would see the loss of the significant gap. Only the peripheries of the site are considered close enough to a rail station. As it is not being taken forward it is being ruled out due to the scale of the site and the loss of a significant amount of open space - this would not meet the SWDPR development strategy. Development would subsume areas of ancient woodland meaning significant risk to ecological/green infrastructure value. These are precious assets and need to be given the highest priority. Development needs to be kept at a distance. Leisure access kept to a minimum/banded altogether. Woodland needs to be buffered from development by new woodland of considerable depth. Development would subsume the long-distance walking path, the Three Cloves Way, degrading the user experience. Also there would be significant risk of the loss of the well-established internal and peripheral hedgerow network